United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1963

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

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

O Thou Immanuel, God with us, again by Thy grace the journeying months have brought us near to the shining glory of the holy night.

Amid the tumult and terror of man's inhumanity to man, we hear anew the tidings of the angels' song and the music that is not of earth. Amid all the bitterness and ill will of these days, we are grateful for the gentle, balmy climate of the Christmastide. May an understanding sympathy that knows no boundaries of border or breed or birth, find lodging even in hearts now hardened by cynicism.

In this happy season of thinking of others and of gathering around the family hearths, save us from a festivity that knows nothing of receptivity, and from decoration that forgets dedication. May the holly of this joyous time enshrine the holy, and its crimson beads be but emblems of the myrrh of sacrifice, the gift of contrite hearts. Hasten the day when the mighty melody above a little eastern town, "Peace to Men of Good Will," shall be the divine harmony of all earth's myriad tongues.

We ask it in the name of the Bethlehem Babe. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 11, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1243) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Further debate is limited to 2 hours, with the time equally divided and controlled, to be followed by a vote at not later than 2 p.m. today on the question of agreeing to the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 12, 1963, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is under control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday and last evening the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I made two major speeches on the floor of the Senate, in opposition to the conference report, and urging its rejection. Nevertheless, those who read the newspapers this morning would not know that the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon spoke yesterday against the conference report. However, that is typical of the journalistic concealment policies of the American Pravda press and is very typical of the abuse of the precious constitutional principle of freedom of the press that the American press, by and large, is constantly committing.

I know the wire service representatives will say they sent out stories, but that something happened to them "upstairs." The wire services did send out some of my remarks, so I assume that what happened did happen "upstairs."

It is too bad that I happen to be involved in this particular matter; but this treatment is also received by other Senators. The sad fact is that this instance is but another example of the situation in which the American press relates to the American people only what the press wishes them to read; and that is typical of the Pravda press in Russia.

However, Mr. President, these two major speeches contain a very great deal of factual material in strong opposition to and criticism of the conference report; in fact, these two speeches have set forth about all the statements which

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

those of us who are in opposition to the conference report care to make; and the speeches appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So I await with great interest the defense of the conference report by the chairman of the committee.

I yield back the remainder of the time assigned to me. I suggest that unless some Senator who wishes to defend the conference report wishes tc speak at this time, there now be a quorum call, with the proviso that the time required for it not be charged to the time available under the agreement, to either side, until a proponent of the conference report appears in the Chamber, to defend the report.

Mr. President, I wish to supplement my comments about the concealment practices of the American press by saying that my remarks apply particularly to the newspaper known as the Washington Post, of Washington, D.C., which purports to print all the news, and to another paper of propaganda in the United States—the one known as the New York Times.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 2 minutes.

IMPORTS OF LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee are holding hearings to determine the effects of imports of livestock and livestock products into the United States and to gain information that will be helpful in future negotiations with other countries on our import and export policies.

Some excellent presentations have been made. One of the most knowledgeable persons, and one who is a tireless champion of our American producers, is U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, of the great State of Wyoming. Having been Governors of adjoining Western States, Senator SIMPSON and I have found that there is no better way to learn firsthand the problems of a State than to be its Chief Executive.

Senator SIMPSON introduced proposed legislation, S. 557, which I cosponsored, to increase tariffs on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas. He also appeared and presented to the Tariff Commission and the Committee a statement which indicates the serious situation existing in the livestock industry at present and the effects on the livestock economy of recent accelerated imports of livestock and meat products. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the statement by Senator SIMPSON be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY MILWARD L. SIMPSON, U.S. SENATOR, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, DECEMBER 10, 1963

I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing here this morning. I come before the Commission as a representative of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, and the State of Wyoming.

Mr. Dean T. Prosser of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association was to be here, but he is unable to appear. I ask that his statement be made a part of the record and considered as a vital portion of the case against the inclusion of beef and beef products on the preliminary negotiation list.

Mr. Prosser's statement clearly demonstrates the importance of the beef industry to the State of Wyoming. He points to the damaging effect that the excessive beef imports are having on our Wyoming cattlemen and asks that no steps be taken which would further reduce the little protection that we do have.

Today I appear before this Commission in opposition to the proposed reduction in tariff on livestock commodities and particularly the reduction in tariffs on beef and beef products.

The need of America and the need of the livestock men of this great Nation is not to reduce tariffs on beef imports but rather to establish quotas and increase the tariffs on the excessive quantities of beef shipped into this country.

Today our livestock industry finds itself in a precarious position due to the excessive beef imports which are shipped into this country. The Foreign Agriculture Service Division of the Department of Agriculture has informed me that the beef and veal imports increased 41 percent in 1962 over 1961. And, further, that the imports during January through August 1963, were 22 percent above the same months of 1962. This clearly demonstrates that the problem is becoming more acute rather than diminishing or leveling off.

These beef imports are not filling a need which our suppliers cannot satisfy; but, rather, they are competing with our domestic suppliers, and they are capturing a substantial portion of the market.

In 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. Four and four-tenths pounds of the consumed beef was imported meat. In 1962 the per capita consumption was 95.4 pounds and 8 pounds of that total was imported beef. Thus, total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent.

With over 11 percent of our consumed beef, or about 1½ billion pounds, coming from foreign lands, it is easy to see that in a free market, such as our livestock market is, beef imports do have a direct relationship to the prices obtained by our American cattlemen.

Recently the fat cattle market slid better than $5 per hundredweight, and as a result of this catastrophe, the feeder markets have also declined from $3 to $6 per hundredweight. One of the reasons for this drop in prices was that beef imports can be sold here in the States 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than beef can be produced and marketed by our American livestock men.

A substantial portion of the imported beef is of a manufacturing or processing quality. In fact, about 40 percent of the processing beef consumed in America is imported. It is argued by some that the imported processing beef does not affect the price of our cattle. This is a fallacious argument. The Department of Agriculture has often reported that beef is its own worst competitor. Consequently, when cow beef or processing beef, 40 percent of which is imported, competes with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow prices have a direct effect on fat cattle prices and vice versa. To wit, if our American people are eating frankfurters and bologna made from cheap imported processing beef, they will not be buying our domestically raised beef, and our prices will be driven down.

I believe that current levels of imports are having an extremely adverse economic impact on our cattle industry and that further reductions in the present existing tariff would prove catastrophic to the major source of income for the ranchers and farmers of this country.

Both the Wyoming Stock Growers Association and the American National Cattlemen's Association are asking for a quota system. I feel that this is needed if we are to secure a permanent and successful cattle industry in America.

The President of these United States has the authority to establish a quota system. I urge and recommend that instead of the removal or reduction of the present tariffs that the administration act under the law in negotiating agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of livestock commodities.

In January of this year I introduced in the U.S. Senate a bill which would curb the excessive beef imports. It would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. The beef imports making up this quota would be taxed at the present rate. Imports coming into this country in addition to this quota would be subject to an additional duty. The bill has widespread support. It is cosponsored by Senators MECHEM, YOUNG of North Dakota, JORDAN of Idaho, BENNETT, TOWER, MCGEE, GOLDWATER, DOMINICK, ALLOTT, and CURTIS.

There is a drastic need for relief, and it is my hope that the President will act under his authority to establish a quota system. If he should refuse to do this, legislation will be needed to establish the system.

Gentlemen, I have spoken mainly of the beef industry, but the sheep industry is in the same precarious position. Imports of lamb and mutton continue to threaten the existence of our domestic sheep industry. Further tariff reductions would only cause additional economic distress for survival.

Poundage of dressed lamb imports has increased 89 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962. They were up 1,000 percent as compared to the same period in 1957. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 7,264 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 as compared to the same period in 1957.

Present low tariffs on live lamb and on dressed lamb and mutton do not meet differences in costs of production here and abroad. Additional reductions in duties at this time would further aggravate the present serious economic situation of the domestic sheep industry.

Protection is needed—not a reduction in tariffs. I urge you to strike from the list of commodities subject to a reduction in tariffs, beef, beef products, lamb and mutton.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the problems facing the livestock industry under existing conditions are of concern to all Americans, consumers as well as producers. The U.S. News & World Report of December 16, 1963, carries an article of general interest, entitled, "A Farm Problem That Closely Concerns the

New President." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A FARM PROBLEM THAT CLOSELY CONCERNS THE NEW PRESIDENT

(NOTE.—Farm troubles—declining cattle prices, wheat surpluses, cotton subsidies—may get more attention now. That's the hope of cattlemen and other farmers. President Johnson is a rancher and cattleman himself. He knows personally what it's like to sell cattle at low prices. One of the hottest issues: rising imports of foreign beef.)

OMAHA, NEBR.—There is one important U.S. business that now is depressed—the cattle business.

It just happens that cattle raising is the business in which President Lyndon B. Johnson is engaged on his ranch in Texas. The President is reported recently to have used strong language about the price he received for a batch of cattle.

Here in Omaha, on the Nation's largest cattle market, prices are down as much as 25 percent from a year ago for the kind of choice fat cattle that provide the most popular cuts of beef.

There is trouble, too, for the cattlemen on the ranges of the West and Southwest who raise the calves that go into feed lots on their way to dinner tables.

Cattlemen in the past have shied away from controls and subsidies. They are asking none now.

What cattlemen do want is a curb on the flood of imported beef that they hold is helping drive down prices they receive.

DISSATISFIED CONSUMERS

Cattlemen are irritated, too, because consumers are complaining about the high cost of beef, despite the sharply lower prices for cattle. Latest official figures show that while the average retail price of a pound of beef has dropped 6 cents in the past year, the farmer's share of that price has dropped nearly 10 cents.

Until now, the men who raise cattle on the range and those who fatten them in feed lots have received short shrift in Washington. Officials of the Department of Agriculture have brushed off complaints about rising beef imports.

The feeling now is that President Johnson, as one who understands the cattle business, will be more inclined to listen to cattlemen's complaints.

Other segments of the farming industry, too, are watching Washington for signs of the new President's attitude toward agriculture.

Throughout the Wheat Belt and the Cotton Belt, there is strong sentiment for new farm programs.

A GLUT OF WHEAT?

Wheatgrowers, last May, voted down a plan advanced by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman to apply rigid Government controls over all phases of their business from planting to marketing. Had the plan been accepted, the wheat price would have been supported at a relatively high level.

Mr. Freeman accepted the farmers' verdict. Now, with no compulsory production control, the result could be a huge wheat crop and much lower prices unless the present drought in parts of the winter wheat belt persists and spreads. Many growers of wheat hope that President Johnson will ask Congress to provide a voluntary control plan for wheat in 1964, as well as reasonably good price support for those who wish to cooperate.

A SUBSIDY PLAN

As for cotton, the House, on December 4, approved a new plan. This plan provides a subsidy payment to enable U.S. textile mills to buy American cotton at a price competitive with that at which it is now sold to foreign textile mills in the world market.

Many in the Senate favor a somewhat different approach to the cotton problem. It will be President Johnson's aim to find a compromise that is acceptable to both the Senate and the House.

At the moment, however, cattlemen feel that it is their industry that most urgently needs attention.

Early in December, cattle prices were still dropping, and latest available figures showed the flood of imported beef rising to an all-time high.

In the Omaha stockyards, low prices and beef imports were the prime topic of conversation. Farmer after farmer told of heavy losses.

FOR A YEAR'S WORK: A LOSS

A Nebraska farmer related this experience, which stockyard officials said was typical: A year ago, in November 1962, he bought 75 beef calves that weighed an average of 400 pounds apiece. After feeding them a year, he sold them on November 17 weighing an average of 1,117 pounds apiece. These fat cattle topped the market that day at $23.50 a hundredweight. The farmer lost $35 a head, and that figure included no allowance for his labor.

Over all, prices for fattened cattle have dropped steadily for a year. The kind of choice cattle that brought $29 a hundredweight in Omaha a year ago brought barely $22 early in December of this year.

The price decline for fattened cattle has been reflected on the ranges where calves are raised and sold to cattle feeders for fattening. On the average, prices for these "feeders" have been down by $2 to $4 a hundredweight.

In Denver, an official of the American National Cattlemen's Association reports that ranchers who got from $30 to $32 a hundredweight for calves in 1962, have been selling calves for $24 to $26 a hundredweight in 1963.

Secretary Freeman holds that the major factor depressing prices has been the large number of cattle coming to market. He says that 90 percent of the imported beef is of lower grades used for hamburger and low-priced cuts, and that there has been little or no price decline for cull beef cows and other kinds of cattle that supply the cheaper grades of beef in the United States.

Experts in the cattle business agree that heavy marketings of cattle have been a major factor in price declines. They disagree, however, with Mr. Freeman's view that beef imports have not been a factor. They are urging that quotas be set for imported beef, which now are subject to only a small tariff.

Fred W. Gilmore, president of the Omaha stockyards, points out that an estimated 30 percent of meat from U.S. cattle winds up as ground beef or hamburger. Thus, in his opinion, beef imported in the volume now coming into the United States does compete directly with American beef.

"FALL GUY"?

Says Mr. Gilmore: "If we expect to sell abroad, we must be willing to accept their produce in return. My only point is: Why should the livestock producer be the fall guy? For every dollar of beef or veal we export, beef and veal imports equal $25."

Cushman S. Radebaugh, president of the Cattlemen's Association, states: "Foreign beef shipped here during the past year literally displaced more than 3 million animals which could have grazed American grasses and eaten well into the huge grain surplus."

Official figures show that in 1957 total imports of beef and veal came to 616 million pounds and equaled 4 percent of total U.S. production. This year, it's estimated that total imports will be close to 2 billion pounds, or more than three times the 1957 level, and equal to 11 percent of U.S. production.

In Australia, where exports of beef to the United States jumped from 17 million pounds in 1958 to 445 million pounds in 1962, a farm paper noted that a delegation of American cattlemen had asked the Australian Government to cut down on the flow of beef to the United States.

Commented the Australian paper: "Contrast this with what would happen in Australia if our markets were depressed and we suspected that imports were the reason. More than likely we would have a delegation on the first plane to Canberra [the capital] and down would go the chopper in the form of a prohibitive tariff or an arbitrary control of imports."

In the view of U.S. cattlemen, it's time for their Government to do something. They are looking to the cattleman in the White House to lend an ear to their story.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I suggest that there be a quorum call, with the understanding that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] from the time available on the conference report.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to express my keen disappointment in the action of the conferees in striking from the conference report one-half of section 105 of the Senate bill, which dealt with the problem of controlling population growth.

Senators will recall the Senate provision stated on page 21 of the report of the managers on the part of the House:

> 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 report of the managers on the part of the House states that the managers agreed to a modification of the

Senate provision so that it would include the first part of the Senate amendment. The conferees, however, struck out the second part of the Senate amendment, which would have authorized the provision of technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The second part of section 105—that is, the part which the conferees struck out at the insistence of the House—was a valuable provision and should have been retained.

Senators will recall that this year, for the first time, the Senate took formal cognizance of the existence of the population problem, not only in the United States, but all over the world. I have had occasion frequently to advert to the problem, and so has the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] took the initiative in inserting section 105 into the Senate version of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. So far as I know, there was no objection either in the Foreign Relations Committee or on the floor of the Senate to section 105, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had steered the bill through committee and through floor action.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I had occasion to point out that the attitude of the Catholic Church toward measures of population control has drastically altered.

Dr. John Rock has published, with substantial support from the Catholic Church, of which he is a devout member, a book entitled "The Time Has Come." The burden of the book is that the time has come to speak out on the critical problem of population control. A number of other eminent Catholics, including Monsignor O'Brien of Notre Dame University, have spoken out on the same subject.

There is now developing a consensus among all religious bodies and thoughtful citizens of the need for the Government to take a good, hard look at problems of population control, particularly in underdeveloped countries.

I regret, therefore, that the House conferees were unwilling to accept the provision which passed the Senate without objection. I am glad, however, that the conference report recommends the expenditure of funds to conduct research into the problem of controlling population growth. I would hope that the Administrator of the program would construe this provision very broadly indeed.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator 1 more minute.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reiterate my hope that the Administrator of the program will construe the authorization retained in the conference report very broadly and that in the next fiscal year we shall see a real breakthrough in efforts to establish, through programs of research, a meaningful series of methods for investigating through statistical data, and for creating through planning programs population control which can begin to make an impact on the quite frightening problem of population growth which confronts the whole world.

I point out that two of every three human beings will go to bed hungry tonight and that an unlimited birth rate is perhaps the single most serious obstacle to bringing to those two of every three people an adequate diet and an opportunity for a healthy and useful life.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 3 minutes.

PHASING OUT UNNECESSARY MONEY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson by telephone and typed directives has ordered Government departments, including the Defense Department and all Government agencies, to report immediately further cuts made in employment and spending plans. He is demanding that the Defense Department, now costing American taxpayers approximately $1 billion each week, eliminate unnecessary spending and cut redtape. The generals and admirals are squealing.

This Nation has achieved an overkill capacity with 3,500 major delivery vehicles capable of deluging the Soviet Union with nuclear missiles. In addition we have a superfluity of manned bombers, each of which is capable of carrying a nuclear bomb with explosive killing capacity equal to all the bombs dropped in World War II by the Allies and Germans. Were the Soviet Union to unleash an attempted nuclear Pearl Harbor without warning, there is no possibility that in one strike, two strikes or more, they could destroy anything but a fraction of our missile bases, manned bombers, and very few of our Polaris submarines, each one of which fires 16 missiles with nuclear warheads. We have the competence to deliver 22 billion tons of TNT equivalent. In fact, the United States has 7 tons of TNT equivalent for each person on this planet. Talk about overkill. Yet, General Wheeler and other top brass still want more. Our President knows the facts that we have the competence to destroy every city in the Soviet Union by a factor at least 1,000 times overkill. Even were half of our atomic warhead delivery vehicles to be destroyed or miss their target in the Soviet Union, our overkill would be horrifying to any enemy.

Unnecessary spending has been discouraging to our taxpayers who now rejoice over our President's firmness and determination to cut and cut more. Secretary of Defense McNamara responded by ordering closing of many military installations including the Army depot in Port Clinton, Ohio, which must be phased out by January 1967. "Phased out" is Pentagonese for closing. Some Congressmen who have proclaimed themselves "watchdogs of the Treasury" are yelping the loudest when the economy ax is poised over their districts. Lord Byron, many years ago, wrote:

> Tis sweet to hear the watchdogs honest bark
> Bay deep-mouth'd welcome as we draw near home.

Some Congressmen who brag about their record favoring governmental economy now seem to be yelping the loudest when military installations within their districts are affected by President Johnson's cutback.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committe 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.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 seconds and ask for the attention of my good friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I want my friend the majority leader to know I am waiting with bated breath and great curiosity the rationalizations for the conference report from its proponents. Since I have now consumed nearly 30 minutes of my time, I wonder if they would oblige me with their first defense of this monstrosity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am interested in the extemporaneous remarks of the Senator from Oregon. Yesterday he talked about not taking people off the hook. Today I notice he is putting the "bait" on his breath rather than on the hook.

I do not really understand the full logic of the Senator's arguments. I shall take 2 or 3 minutes on the conference report, which Senators will be called to vote upon in the near future.

As one of the conferees, I freely admit that the proposal is far from perfect legislation. There are some things in it to which I feel almost any Senator could find objection. There are also things left out of it which I am sure any Senator could find reason to support.

We must realize that only about 3 weeks remain of the present year, and that the provisions of the conference report will apply only for the following 6 months. It is my opinion that during the 6 months the Congress and the executive branch of our Government should get busy to work out a revision not only of our foreign aid program, but also of the entire Foreign Service, and our relationships with other countries.

I believe the Senator from Oregon has performed a real service, although per-

haps he exasperated some of us at times during the length of time he took to perform that service. The Senator has performed a real service by pointing out glaring weaknesses in the program as it exists at the present time.

As I have said, we should pay attention to revising our foreign relations operations generally. I have received complaints from Ambassadors. One of them resigned because he was humiliated by other agencies of Government which perhaps did not have direct supervision over him. He was bypassed in undertaking to carry out a program about which he knew more than those who bypassed him knew.

He is not the only ambassador who has been humiliated by having to say, "I can't say yes or no, I can't say maybe, until I talk with Washington," and perhaps get an authorization from somebody who does not know much about the matter being discussed.

There have been other occasions when persons on lower levels, to whom the State Department has insisted on giving the title of ambassador, have been sent to foreign countries. We have seen ambassadors reduced to the level of clerkships; and we have seen clerks elevated to the role of ambassadors.

A great deal of work needs to be done. I feel, as I know many of my colleagues do, that we are only looking for trouble when we try to force our image on every country in the world with which we have relationships and which we are trying to help in some way or another.

Let the Senate approve the conference report. It has only 6 months to run. Then let us go to work on a more thorough revision of our foreign aid program—I do not say "review"; I am through using the word "review."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to do so, I wish to yield myself 2 minutes to take up certain measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. This is a most unusual procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will that be on the time of the proponents of the conference report?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It is very interesting, I should observe.

REPORT TO CONGRESS BY COMMISSION ON DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 753, Senate bill 2364.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2364) to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island", approved October 16, 1963 (77 Stat. 247), is amended by striking out "December 31, 1963" and inserting "six months after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 772), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island should have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to the Congress.

STATEMENT

The Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island was established by Public Law 88-138 (77 Stat. 247, approved October 16, 1963). Section 4 of the act provides that the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1963.

The December 31, 1963, date does not allow sufficient time for the organization of the Commission and the preparation of its report. The bill amends the act to provide that the report shall be submitted not later than 6 months after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report is a letter dated December 6, 1963, from the General Services Administration, and a letter dated December 9, 1963, from the Department of Justice, on a similar House bill, H.R. 9341.

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT OF ALIEN TO MAKE DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO BECOME CITIZEN BEFORE ENLISTMENT OF APPOINTMENT TO RESERVE COMPONENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 756, House bill 3005.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 3005) to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 775), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize enlistments in the Reserve components by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

EXPLANATION

Sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, prescribe qualifications for enlistment and appointment in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. Among the qualifications for enlistment or appointment is that the person must have made a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States or he must have previously served in the Armed Forces.

Before enactment of Public Law 87-143, similar requirements of a legal declaration of intention to become a citizen were imposed on aliens desiring to enlist in the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force. Public Law 87-143 repealed the requirement for declaration of intention to become a citizen as it applied to persons desiring to enlist in the Army or the Air Force. After enactment of that act the Army and the Air Force have enlisted persons who could furnish proof of lawful admission to the United States for permanent residency. This bill would conform the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in the Reserve components to those applicable to enlistment in the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 eliminated the requirement for the "declaration of intent" as a prerequisite to naturalization and made such a declaration an optional decision without any bearing whatever on the alien's eligibility to become a citizen of the United States.

An alien cannot now be enlisted in the Reserve components if he has not filed a declaration of intent to become a citizen. However, this same alien may enlist in the Regular components or he may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act and sent overseas. But while overseas he is ineligible to apply for officer candidate school or for a direct Reserve appointment with concurrent active duty because he has not filed a "declaration of intent," and he may not file one unless he does so while physically present in the United States.

This bill would remove the requirement for declaring an intent to become a citizen and requires instead proof of lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence. Thus otherwise qualified aliens would be permitted to become members of the Reserve components under the same conditions as those prescribed for enlistment in the Regular components.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES PERFORMED UNDER INCORRECT ORDERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 757, House bill 4338.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 4338) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the opposition ought to take some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair meant to say 56 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. What was the decision of the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator from Oregon ought to take some of the remaining time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am waiting for one of my beloved and able colleagues to come to the floor to speak for 15 minutes against the monstrous conference report. It is interesting that the only defense I have heard against it so far is that it will expire in 6 months.

I wonder if the proponents of the conference report would be willing to divide the amount authorized, and, instead of the agency getting $3.6 billion, in a further fleecing of the American taxpayer, cut the amount, on the basis that it has only 6 more months to go, because the pipelines are full. If we stop giving foreign aid a dime, the pipelines are full of hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money. We would not have to give foreign aid a cent.

It is a most interesting argument in defense of the conference report that we ought to adopt it because there are only 6 more months to go. The proponents do not want a review; they want a revision. It is the same old story as in the committee report. The committee report made our case. Now, in the last couple of hours of debate on the terrible conference report, the proponents of the report do not want a review; they want a revision. It is about time. It is long overdue. I should think they would be willing to come to an agreement that foreign aid be cut back $3 billion and give $600 million—$100 million a month for the next 6 months. That is too much, but I might be willing to agree to that. I would not agree to anything more.

Therefore, I shall vote against the conference report.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon made their case yesterday. There have been no comments from the proponents of the conference report concerning the devastating reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, an agent of the Congress, who, in report after report, as found on his on-the-spot checks, said he found waste of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers in the foreign aid program.

Now, in the dying moments of the debate, we are told by the proponents of the report that it ought to be revised. I think it ought to be stopped—s-t-o-p-p-e-d. It ought to be stopped. We ought to bring the whole fiasco to an end and stop deceiving the American people into believing that foreign aid, as it is now conducted, is of some benefit to this Republic. We ought to stop waving the flag behind the desk of the Presiding Officer into tatters with the old, fallacious lie that it is cheaper to keep men from foreign countries in uniform with American taxpayers' dollars than to put American boys in uniform and on foreign shores.

The undeniable fact is that the so-called foreign armies are no defense to the United States. Go to Korea. Go to Taiwan. Go to any place else in the world where we are supporting foreign armies. They are not protecting American security. Take the Pacific, for example. The U.S. 7th Fleet, the U.S. air armada, the thousands of American boys whom we have stationed in the Pacific, are the ones who are protecting American security. Yet the proponents wave the flag and give the American people the false impression that the forces in foreign countries would be of help to us in time of war. We would have to spend more American taxpayers' money for them and, at the same time, spend the billions of dollars required for full mobilization of the United States. We ought to cut it out. We ought to take a look at the foreign aid program, as I have said over and over in the debate, and start anew, on the basis of new conditions, new requirements, new restrictions. We ought to say to foreign countries, "If you want foreign aid on the basis of this kind of arrangement, come and ask for it. Commit yourself to these requirements and we will have a new type of foreign aid, which will take in only 50 of you. Only 50 of you—not 107—will be able to dip your hands into the U.S. Treasury.

Such a program would be based upon proved need. That means that Great Britain is out; France is out; Canada is out; Portugal is out; the Lowlands are out; Norway is out. Why in the world are the American taxpayers subsidizing those countries? Why in the world should the American taxpayers be building infrastructure in France?

This development in this country is a shocking thing. I am shocked by the developments in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government. We owe it not only to our people, but we owe it also to the security of this Republic, to end foreign aid and to begin again.

I am delighted that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has come into the Chamber.

I now take my seat in great curiosity and with more than bated breath to listen to the defense of the shocking, inexcusable conference report on foreign aid, by which it is proposed to continue to take from the American people hundreds of millions of dollars that ought to be saved for them.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. There was one thing in this morning's Washington Post that amounted to something. The article points to some abject poverty in the United States. We would give away $3,600 million in foreign aid. But, if we try to do something for the underdeveloped areas of America, for the poverty stricken people of America, we are confronted with the great economy drive argument.

Charity begins at home. It is about time that Congress took a look at the needs of the American people and appropriated some money for the benefit of underdeveloped areas of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this enlightening and shocking story of poverty in the United States be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

TWENTY-SIX MILLION OTHERS HAVE BARE ESSENTIALS: 1 OUT OF 10 AMERICANS LIVES IN ABJECT POVERTY, STUDY REVEALS

(By Eve Edstrom)

Twenty million Americans—about 1 out of 10—exist in such "abject poverty" that they must do without bare necessities.

Another 26 million—which adds up to almost one out of four Americans—live at "minimum adequacy" levels.

These are the conservative estimates upon which the National Policy Committee on pockets of poverty focused yesterday at the opening of a 2-day session here.

Its meetings come at a time when the Johnson administration is considering programs to eradicate mass poverty in affluent America.

The committee, which includes such distinguished political economists as Harvard's Seymour Harris, warned that "even with a more affluent America," the number of poor will increase substantially during the next two decades unless remedial steps are taken.

Furthermore, the committee released material drawn from a 2-year study which emphasizes that poverty will not be done away with "by policies aimed at bringing about full employment."

This is because today's impoverished families sit outside of the marketplace, their lot is not the direct result of inadequate economic growth rates because they are not part of the economic structure.

"Their poverty is the result of special circumstances rather than of the rate * * * of economic activity," it was stated.

In setting forth the "special circumstances," the committee put forth a formula for not being poor, as well as for being poor.

To not be poor, it was stated, one must be a white northern city resident between the ages of 25 and 45 who is married with no more than two children, who has attained as much education as possible, and who is in good physical and mental health.

The surest way to be poor is to be nonwhite, live in a rural area, and be a female who is over 65 and is the head of a household.

In the above circumstances, 84 out of every 100 of these nonwhite rural families live at lower than subsistence levels.

Actually, the committee emphasizes that all nonwhites, whether they live in the city or on the farm, all families headed by young or old females, all residents of rural areas and the South, and all persons over 65 have high-risk poverty rates.

AGED MAKE SOME PROGRESS

However, in the last decade and because of social security, the aged have made the most progress in moving out of the "abject poverty" state.

Another poverty prone segment of the population involves the young—male family heads between the ages of 14 and 25—and their numbers are increasing.

"The honor of being called family head bestowed too soon brings with it a greater likelihood of poverty, particularly since 1957," it was said. "For most, low income is no momentary detour but the foreshadowing of a life of poverty.

"Their situation is worsening and * * * the problem of the young in contemporary America typifies the problem of the poor: submerged like an iceberg."

Poverty also attacks those with less than 8 years of education and families which have more than 6 children under 18.

Such groups now comprise a "new class of Americans—those split off from our affluent society," said James G. Patton, chair-

man of the 38-member national policy committee.

"They constitute a shocking paradox in American life. When the economy dips their plight worsens but when it rises they benefit little if at all."

This is why programs must be developed to tackle the special problems of the underprivileged, in addition to programs to stimulate the economy, he said.

Poverty can be eradicated by the year 2000, Patton said, but only if the United States embarks on new or expanded educational, housing, public works, medicare conservation corps, and food stamp programs.

Patton, who also is president of the National Farmers Union, said he and other committee members had consulted with the late President Kennedy on ways to eliminate poverty and will consult with President Johnson after firm recommendations are adopted.

The committee, founded 2 years ago by the Farmers Educational Foundation, includes former President Truman and foremost economists, scientists, sociologists, business and professional leaders from every region of the country.

Much of the committee's data on poverty is based on a study which economist Oscar Ornati directed for the 20th Century Fund. It will be published next spring.

LESS THAN $2,500 INCOME

In explaining his economic groupings, Ornati stated that families of four, with income of less than $2,500 annually, were placed in the "abject poverty" group. Families of four, with annual incomes of less than $4,500, were included in " minimum adequacy" group.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor for the time being. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to speak at this time, or shall I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to speak now.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot help but express disappointment at the bill as it comes before the Senate from committee of conference. It seems to me that our conferees merely bowed down to the House managers and struck from the bill practically every amendment of any consequence which was adopted by the Senate after 3 weeks of debate.

One of the amendments stricken dealt with the $200 million in the investment guarantee fund. In the present bill, as it will be debated by the Senate, there is a fund of $270 million known as the investment guarantee fund.

When the investment guarantee fund was first set up in 1948, the law required that reserves of 100 percent be maintained. Over the years the law was amended and reserve requirements were steadily decreased.

In 1961, when the Attorney General was requested to render an opinion with regard to the necessity for reserves in the Development Loan Fund, he advised that in connection with guarantees made under the Development Loan Fund and the investment guarantee fund, reserves were not necessary because the guarantee contracts were backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

In fact, in the bill before us, the law has been changed regarding the reserve requirement. It provides that in accord with the Attorney General's opinion guarantee contracts are now unequivocally backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

In view of this fact, when this bill was considered on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment to reduce the reserves of $270 million presently existing in the guarantee fund by rescinding the $200 million borrowing authority. This amendment was adopted by the Senate, but unfortunately it was deleted in conference.

The investment guarantee fund has been in existence for over 15 years, and during this time the total losses of the fund have amounted to only $667,000. In view of this experience, it would appear that the $70 million that would have remained in the reserve, had my amendment been retained by the conferees, would have been more than adequate to take care of the losses that might have been sustained in any one future year. In fact, in the justifications presented by the Agency to the Senate Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid bill for fiscal year 1964, it was admitted that the $270 million presently in the reserve is far in excess of need.

That is why I cannot understand the action of the conferees in permitting my amendment to be stricken from the bill.

As I pointed out in the debate, which took place 3 or 4 weeks ago, efforts are even now being made by our administration to use a part of this fund for purposes other than guarantees for private investors.

As I pointed out, if the $200 million item were stricken, there would still remain $70 million, which would be more than adequate, to provide for losses.

However, our conferees receded on this amendment. I do not know what was behind their withdrawal. However, I understand that some of the big bankers were fearful that if borrowing authority were rescinded they would not feel so secure in making loans and investments abroad.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield myself such time as I will take to ask the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This question arose in conference. The Senator has made it quite clear that either way there is absolutely no effect upon the appropriation of money authorized by the bill. The House merely took the position, in accord with what the Senator has said, that since the Government is unquestionably liable for the amount, striking the notes which would be redeemed by the amendment would have no substantial effect. It was thought that psychologically, if the amount were struck out fears might be raised in the minds of some people who are not as thoroughly aware of the way it operates as the Senator from Louisiana and others are.

This proposal was considered to be a useless gesture. I personally thought it would be all right to keep it in the bill. The House objected. As often happens, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on their position. I did not envision any substantive damage that might be done; in fact, I do not believe it does any damage to our financial obligations, or does damage in any other way. It is strictly a bookkeeping operation. I believe the Senator has explained it that way. If the notes issued by the Treasury were redeemed, we would be liable. If a catastrophe occurred which would impose an obligation on this country to repay, we would have to do it under present understandings. So, Mr. President, it is purely a bookkeeping gesture. It did not seem like the kind of issue that we should fight to the death to sustain and thereby hold up the conference report. That is about all there was to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least, the administration would have had to return to Congress for the appropriations if my amendment prevailed. I do not know of any time when Congress failed to appropriate money to pay just bills. The conference report would take control away from Congress; and my fear, as I said in the original debate, is that sooner or later, if that money remains available, it will come to be used for purposes other than paying off losses on guarantee contracts. As I stated during the debate on the bill, the House has already attempted to use some of this money for other purposes. Fortunately, the attempt did not succeed. But if such a large sum of money remains available in the reserve, the chances are that some day it will be used for other purposes.

During the course of the extensive debate on the bill, the Senate adopted amendments which were offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, which closed to the executive branch a method of financing development loans that has been much criticized by the Congress.

In sections 204 and 253 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, it has been provided that payments made by borrowers of development loans and on Alliance for Progress loans could be reloaned to borrowers without congressional act. These provisions permitted the executive department to bypass the Appropriations Committees of Congress in the funding of its loan program.

If the junior Senator from Colorado had not offered amendments which in effect require that these loan repayments be reappropriated before they could be used again and thus close the "revolving door," I would have offered such amendments myself when the foreign aid bill was originally considered by the Senate.

It is most unfortunate that the conferees saw fit to lessen Congress' control of expenditures in this program by deleting the amendments of the junior Senator from Colorado.

I am a realist, however, and I know that at this late hour in the session there is no chance of reversing the action taken by the conferees, but I wish to point out that unless the "revolving door" financing provision is deleted from next year's foreign aid bill, I will do all in my power to have it stricken when the bill is considered in the Senate next year.

The conferees yielded on another very important amendment.

During the very first week of the great debate on foreign aid which occurred last month, the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, which deleted from the bill the $1,500 million of authorization for the Development Loan Fund for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

In advocating this amendment, the senior Senator from Oregon pointed out that it was absolutely essential for his amendment to be adopted, since it would put the Agency for International Development on notice that Congress was displeased with the foreign aid program as presently constituted, and that if this program were to continue, a completely new approach would be necessary for fiscal year 1965. The amendment was adopted by the Senate because of this reason.

The action of the conferees in effect, then, would express approval of the program as presently set up. I do not believe this is truly the will of Congress. I do not believe we are helping the program by perpetuating this continuing authority for the Development Loan Fund. I am surprised that the Senate conferees yielded on this amendment. I think they were wrong to do so.

I must iterate that I deeply regret that the Senate conferees were unable to retain more of the Senate amendments when the Foreign Aid Authorization Act, as approved and passed by the Senate, was taken to conference with Members of the House. I am sure that each of those amendments, if they had prevailed, would have done a great deal to strengthen our foreign aid program. Certainly their adoption indicated that the aid administrators had better look to their laurels and begin a businesslike review of the program for the coming fiscal year.

I was particularly disappointed to note the changes which occurred in the amendment, sponsored by me, designed to limit military aid to African countries to not more than $25 million in any fiscal year. The text of that amendment, as adopted by the Senate, is as follows:

SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—(a) The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, in any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1964, shall not exceed $25,000,000.

(b) Internal security requirement shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

Now the foreign aid authorization bill, as it came to the Senate from the House, also included a section dealing with aid to African countries. It provided that military aid could be given only for internal security requirements, and for public works, or civic action programs authorized by section 505(b) of the act. I have some arguments with the latter section, but I am completely opposed to allowing "internal security requirements" be the basis for the granting of military aid. This is exactly what I was striving to avoid. These three words "internal security requirements" are to blame for a large part of the current situation in Latin America. Once we get a military aid program off the ground in Africa, it will not be long before our friends to the south of us appear to be living in the utmost peace and prosperity by comparison.

I remind the Senate that my 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.

Reading from page 24 of the conference report, I find that the committee of conference accepted a compromise between the two versions; that is, between the House and Senate language relating to military aid to African countries. In my view, it is not very much of a compromise, because the impact of my amendment has been dissipated completely.

The compromise language states that grant programs of defense articles for African countries for fiscal year 1964 shall not exceed $25 million. Notice that the limiting figure applies only to fiscal year 1964. Nothing is said of future fiscal years, and it is the future that we must look to in the present. Action should be taken now to make as sure as possible that a tight lid is clamped, and kept closed, on the military aid program as it applies to Africa. Bear in mind that Africa is a new continent, so far as our military aid programs are concerned. I am certain that our military missions, if not kept reined in, will make sure that it grows up very rapidly until it becomes like so many other areas which are struggling under the armies built up and maintained by the American taxpayer.

The language adopted by the conference committee provides that grant military assistance may be furnished to African countries only for internal security unless the President determines otherwise. That is a far cry from my original language, adopted by the Senate, which stated very plainly that:

Internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise * * * be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

The committee of conference reversed that language; its intent is negated completely.

The danger in this matter lies in the definition of "internal security." When do armaments provided for "internal security" become the agents for external aggression? As I pointed out in my African report, I discovered our country had spent over $600,000 to train paratroopers for the newly emerging and desperately poor country of Mali. By what definition I asked, and I again ask, by what definition can the training of paratroops be justified as internal security? There cannot, of course, be any valid answer.

But beyond this, consider the injustice we are doing these newly independent nations, and their people, by encouraging their governments to build up large military forces which must be maintained, at least someday, by taxes on the native population. We are doing them a grave wrong, and apparently are doing it, with our eyes wide open and of our own free will.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On my time. I do not quite understand the Senator. The conference report retains $25 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but it is effective for only 1 year. And it is not necessary to secure the prior approval of the President. The military authorities can continue to use the money if they decide it is necessary to be used for internal security. It would not require positive action by the President. The President is only required to act if the aid is given for some reason other than internal security or civic action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am puzzled by the point the Senator from Louisiana is making. The language reads:

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.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is similar to to the language I placed in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is still in the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it has been changed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought I was reading from the conference report, on page 7. Perhaps I did not read it correctly; but I used to read correctly in the old days. What is the Senator from Louisiana reading from? The language of the conference report reads:

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.

I do not understand what the Senator from Louisiana is complaining about.

Mr. ELLENDER. My amendment, deleted in the conference, reads as follows:

SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—(a) The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, in any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1964, shall not exceed $25,000,000.

(b) Internal security requirement shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

The conference committee action would require no positive action by the President, and that is where the trouble is.

The conference committee has allowed the military authorities to do as they please. They may alone determine the requirements. Military missions exist in many countries of the world. If my memory serves me correctly, there are only six or seven military missions in Africa, although I do not remember the exact number. Those missions abroad continually send recommendations to the Department of Defense, in Washington. I have even known of places—such as Pakistan, Afghanistan, or India—where the military missions have said that a certain amount of money was needed to supply the needs of a certain number of soldiers.

Then the host country will say, "That may be true, but we cannot afford that much."

The reply is "Do what you can, and we will do the rest."

Let us consider the case of Mali, which I have already presented. We spent $600,000 in Mali, to train paratroopers. But anyone with commonsense knows that paratroopers are not necessary in order to protect the citizens of Mali. That training was requested in order to make possible some action against the neighbors of Mali.

There is also the case of Somali, to which we have furnished much aid. When that country asked us for weapons, we said, after conferring with the British and the Italians, "We think we can furnish you with about $17 million in hardware."

They replied, "Oh, no; that is not enough. Russia will give us $26 or $30 million. So we do not want yours." Now they will be getting that equipment from Russia while continuing to receive economic aid from us. Is that for internal security purposes? No; it is to enable Somali to take over part of Kenya. Somali is getting ready to annex a considerable part of Kenya, because Somali says that in that area there are more Somalis than Kenyans.

Such situations will continue; and if we let these countries have more military equipment than is necesary for their own police forces, we can expect trouble in the future.

It will be recalled that we tried to assist Pakistan, and the result was to make the Afghans angry with us. Today, we are trying to help India, and the result is that we have the Pakistanis angry with us. So I say we must limit our military assistance to the amounts required solely for domestic police forces as such needs are determined and reported by the President.

That was my objective in connection with this amendment. I thought it was necessary to apply some brake on the amount of military equipment to be given by the United States to the African countries, inasmuch as ultimately much of it may be used by them beyond their own borders, in order to annex or take over other areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. We are helping Pakistan, are we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree that when we are helping Pakistan, we are also aiding Red China?

Mr. ELLENDER. That seems to be the case, particularly if the programs now envisioned go into effect. I understand that Pakistan is now flirting with Red China, and that Chou En-lai is going there. Why he will visit there, I do not know; but undoubtedly it will not be merely to have a good time. Surely, he must have some ulterior motive. But despite the flirtation with Red China, we are furnishing Pakistan, too, with much economic aid and other aid. I do not know what the motive is but it may be that these countries are learning lessons from Western Europe. I well remember that when Schumann of France and others were up for election in Western Europe, at a time when we were giving their countries aid, they said, "You had better give us more aid, or the big Russian bear will catch us." So we gave them far more than had been anticipated by those who voted for the Marshall Plan.

However, there is not time now to discuss more instances of this sort.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana wish to have?

Mr. ELLENDER. Five minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has any adequate explanation been given of our folly in Cambodia, into which we have poured several hundred million dollars, only to find that not only has that money been wasted, and also that the military aid and arms we have provided Cambodia will be turned against us by Red China. Is a similar situation developing in connection with Pakistan?

Mr. ELLENDER. We never seem to learn. Many of those weapons are used against our friends, and there is no doubt that we shall come to regret that we have given much of our money and much military equipment to Cambodia and other countries.

So I am giving this warning to the Senate. The situation I have described has developed in the Far East and in almost all other parts of the world; yet we do not seem to learn from experience.

Mr. GRUENING. Perhaps my question should be addressed to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; possibly he has the explanation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot yield to him at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I requested the adoption of another amendment, and I spoke at length on it. It was an amendment to Public Law 480. I think the House committee went far afield by including in its version of the bill the provisions which dealt with Public Law 480.

May I call the attention of Senators to page 20 of my 1960 report on foreign operations of our Government, where I devote a section to what appears to be administrative abuses and inept business transactions with foreign governments, which result in financial losses to our country that can run into billions of dollars and also cause a serious and unnecessary drain on the U.S. dollar.

As you know, under the Public Law 480 program, we sell surplus agricultural products to foreign countries and accept payment in the currencies of these countries to be used for loans and grants to develop the economic resources of such countries and to defray expenses of U.S. programs in such countries. The United States subsidizes these exports, through private channels, by paying the difference between the U.S. price of the commodity at dockside and its price on the world market.

The exporter receives U.S. dollars but the commodities are paid for in the currency of the importing country. The currency is deposited in a U.S. Treasury account in a bank of the importing country to be allocated and used in accordance with the provisions and objectives of the Act and the provisions of the special sales agreement negotiated in connection with each sale or series of sales.

Under title I, alone, agreements for sale of agricultural commodities from 1955 to June 30, 1960, totaled an estimated $6.8 billion CCC cost. It can readily be seen that this is big business and that if properly handled, this program could go a long way not only toward assisting, through loans, the economic development of foreign countries, but in defraying the expense of U.S. programs overseas. However, I found that in many of these sales an unrealistic exchange rate, bearing little relation to the commercial market rate of exchange, was used in generating the foreign currencies from these sales.

For example, I selected 12 sales made to 4 countries which I visited; namely, Spain, Poland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. These sales, the agreements on which were entered into between 1955 and 1959, generated foreign currencies the dollar equivalent of which was $857 million plus. However, if these sales had been made at the commercial market rates of exchange, prevailing at the approximate time of the sales, these 12 sales should have generated approximately $1,488 million, or $631 million more than was realized. A schedule on

page 21 of my report reflects some of the details on the particular sales.

I have been unable to obtain any intelligent justification as to why such unrealistic exchange rates were used in the sales of these commodities to the great financial loss to the United States. The shocking thing about these transactions is that while the cost of subsidizing these commodities at the world market price is reported, in detail, to the Congress by CCC, no mention can be found anywhere of the losses sustained by accepting an import exchange rate well below the commercial rate prevailing at the time of the sale.

The acceptance of such arbitrary exchange rates is not unique to the agreements in the countries I have cited. There are at least 12 countries where sales agreements were entered into and a special import exchange rate was used which was substantially different from the commercial market rate of exchange prevailing at the time. In many countries where we accepted such import rates, which were less than the going rate of exchange, we are spending U.S. dollars to buy foreign currencies to pay for U.S. programs.

Actually, this is only one type of a series of unbusinesslike practices and administrative abuses growing out of these commodity sales, which are supposed to be carried on in a businesslike manner, but which result in huge dollar losses to the United States. For example, although in a number of countries that portion of the sales proceeds which is to be loaned to the foreign government is placed in a special account in a bank of that country and loan agreements are signed, the money is not actually borrowed and it lies idle, not bearing interest and depreciating to the extent that the country's currency may depreciate in relation to the dollar.

Further, it is not uncommon that although a Public Law 480 commodity sale may have generated only a portion of the proceeds it should have, because of the acceptance of an unrealistic exchange rate, the loan agreement calls for a different rate, which is more favorable to the borrower and further shrinks the proceeds of the sale. Further, many of these loan agreements provide that they can be repaid in U.S. dollars or in the currency of the foreign country, but the incentive for paying in dollars is only 1-percent reduction in the interest rate. Also most of these loan agreements can be changed at any time without the knowledge of the Treasury or the Congress and, too frequently, they appear to deteriorate into something resembling a gift rather than a loan.

In the sale of surplus commodities under Public Law 480, an interdepartmental committee, consisting of representatives of the various U.S. Government agencies which have an interest in, or will be users of, a portion of the sales proceeds, determine the percentage of such portion that will be used for the various purposes in the importing country. These committees are sometimes referred to as "buzzard" committees.

From some of the contracts which have been negotiated, it might appear that instead of the United States negotiating in its own interest, each agency was trying to obtain the largest possible percentage of the sales receipts for its own use, while the State Department seemingly was trying to obtain all it could for the foreign country involved, and one can only wonder who was present representing our Government and the taxpayer.

As a result, it might appear that particular agencies are allocated funds far in excess of their real or immediate needs, which funds are then frozen in bank accounts in the foreign countries involved and are subject to depreciation through the inflation of the currency of such countries, while, at the same time, the U.S. Treasury is going into the commercial market to buy currencies of these same countries with U.S. hard dollars, to operate its other programs.

We cannot expect to do business on such a basis without going bankrupt. We can afford to make gifts to peoples of underprivileged countries, or when a disaster occurs in some foreign land, but when we permit our business transactions with foreign countries, even though one of the objectives is the economic development of such countries, our transactions should be on a business basis. Otherwise, we are not only suffering huge losses, but we are gaining the disrespect of the people with whom we are dealing.

In my opinion, the practices which I have outlined present a fantastic picture of waste and irresponsibility which can amount to billions of dollars of losses to the United States.

In this connection and on the basis of these facts, to correct such abuses, I introduced an amendment to Public Law 488—section 101(f)—which was approved August 8, 1961, and which required this country, in making Public Law 480, title I sales, to obtain, under such agreements, rates of exchange which were not less favorable than the rates at which U.S. Government agencies could buy currencies from the U.S. disbursing officers in the respective countries.

This amendment, for the most part, stopped this practice. The House foreign aid authorization bill, section 402(a), changed section 101(f) of Public Law 480 so as to require only that the United States obtain the highest rates of exchange legally obtainable. This amendment would not only permit the relaxing of the terms of the sales agreements with respect to the rate of exchange; it would also permit U.S. Government agencies conducting programs with foreign currencies to purchase such currencies at rates other than those at which the commodities were sold.

House Report No. 646, at page 48, gives this as the only substantial reason for this amendment, and states that the Government agencies would like to get the currencies at realistic rates of exchange from the U.S. Treasury. Nothing is said as to why the U.S. Government should not get realistic rates when the commodities are sold—and, Mr. President, let no one tell you that these unfavorable rates we received for these sales resulted from a desire to get rid of the commodities. They resulted from political or giveaway considerations dictated by the State Department or the foreign-assistance groups.

Perhaps I can shed more light on this amendment by going into a little more detail. It is my understanding that in two countries—namely, Indonesia and Poland—the purpose of the Ellender amendment was defeated—although I do not know on what authority—by fixing the official rates of exchange between these two countries and the United States at arbitrarily low rates to correspond with the collection rates received in the Public Law 480 sales. This, of course, did not please the agencies downtown which had a need for foreign currencies, because when they came up for an appropriation from Congress for construction or other program purposes in certain foeign countries, they wanted to receive their full dollar's worth. In this regard, we cannot blame them; but why should we not also get our dollar's worth in making these Public Law 480 sales?

It probably was not surprising that at the hearings on the State Department appropriation bill this year, representatives of the Foreign Buildings Operations of the State Department, which uses substantial foreign currencies, complained:

> The recent Ellender amendment to Public Law 480 had the effect of requiring this program to purchase Public Law 480 Polish zlotys at the rate of 24 to $1 instead of the previous rate of 55 to $1, which overnight multiplied the cost by a 2.3 factor.

It was pointed out that this was not at all the result of the so-called Ellender amendment, but was due to the action of the executive department in accepting an arbitrarily low exchange rate in connection with Public Law 480 commodity sales to Poland. Inasmuch as the witnesses indicated that they had received their impression from the Treasury Department, there was addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, by the subcommittee chairman, a letter, dated September 12, 1963, which, in substance requested advice as to why such an arbitrarily low exchange rate had been established.

By letter of October 11, 1963, from the Secretary, after an explanation to the effect that 24 zlotys to $1 was the best rate the U.S. negotiators could get in negotiating the sales to Poland, it was pointed out that any of the sales proceeds which the United States did not use, would, by the terms of the agreement, be repaid by Poland in dollars, after a specified number of years, at the same rate, and that as the disbursing officer's sales to the U.S. agencies were also at 24 to $1, no loss to the U.S. Government was involved. In other words, it was simply bypassing the law. Accordingly, why is there any need to change section 101(f), if we are not losing money under it now, provided Poland lives up to its agreement and we do not decide later to give Poland most of the proceeds? Why should we change the law so that we shall begin to lose money on such transactions? Again, let me point out that we did not have to make the sales to Poland at substantially less than

half of the world market price; and, accordingly, the decision to make these sales had to be a purely political determination, and in the interest of foreign aid. Incidentally, it is my understanding that the Treasury Department reportedly was unable to advise the committee what a realistic exchange rate between the United States and Poland would be at the present time; but if we ask any traveler who recently has been in Poland, he will tell us that, except from the U.S. disbursing officer and from official Polish banks, one can obtain throughout Poland 75 zlotys to $1, and nobody asks any questions.

I think the facts that I have given show ample reason why an amendment such as this should not be attached to the foreign aid authorization act, and I urged my colleagues attending the conference with the House on this bill not to recede to the House position on section 402(a) of H.R. 7885.

Notwithstanding my plea for the deletion of the House amendment, the Senate conferees agreed to the House.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the agencies in attempting to obtain some shortsighted selfish gains for themselves and their employees abroad by this House amendment, have really outsmarted the U.S. Government. The language of the House amendment reads 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.

I emphasize "highest" and "legally obtainable." The highest legally obtainable rate in most multiple rate countries would be the tourist rate, which would be much higher than the so-called official rate or commercial rate for imports. As I interpret it, this amendment would make Public Law 480 agreements nonnegotiable in the very countries where our agencies want to get away from the Ellender amendment.

A good example is Brazil, where the rate of exchange in the community banks down there is about 1,200 cruzeiros to $1. This is the highest legally obtainable rate. Do you think the Brazilians are going to give us 1,200 cruzeiros to the dollar in purchasing our wheat and other agricultural commodities?

I do not want to hold up this bill, but I am giving fair warning to the agencies that the action they have taken by getting the House amendment adopted and deleting the so-called Ellender amendment is unconscionable. Until we have had a chance to review Public Law 480 in all of its facets and ramifications next year, I would hope, in fact I urge them, to continue the former policy under the Ellender amendment in the best interest of the American taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in regard to this question to Mr. Dillon and the reply of Secretary Dillon in which he has pointed out that I was right.

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

SEPTEMBER 12, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 29, 1963, in connection with appropriations hearings dealing with the Foreign Buildings Operations of the State Department and the use of foreign currencies, it was developed that the Department had inserted in its fiscal year 1964 justifications for funds that "The recent Ellender amendment to Public Law 480 had the effect of requiring this program to purchase Public Law 480 Polish zlotys at a rate of 24 to $1 instead of the previous rate of 55 to $1. Overnight, this multiplied costs by a 2.3 factor."

It was pointed out to the witness that the Ellender amendment[1] only required that in negotiating title I, Public Law 480 sales agreements, the President shall "obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sales of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the rates at which U.S. Government agencies can buy currencies from the U.S. disbursing officers in the respective countries." When the witness was asked who had made the interpretation of this amendment, the reply was that the interpretation had been made by the Treasury Department.

There was further discussion as to the validity of the Treasury interpretation and as to why U.S. agencies received only 24 zlotys to $1, when the regular rate was 55 to $1.

As chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the State Department, I have been requested to ask you why this interpretation had been placed upon the law by your Department. I should also like to know at what rate of exchange agricultural commodities are being sold to Poland, and further, if the rate set by the Treasury is responsible for other Government agencies receiving less Polish currency for the dollar than the regular rate of 55 to $1. If this is the case, it is further requested that you apprise the various agencies concerned that this is not the fault of the Ellender amendment, but results from an executive decision.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter of September 12, inquiring about the rate of exchange applied to the sale of agricultural commodities to Poland and also asking "if the rate set by the Treasury is responsible for other Government agencies receiving less Polish currency for the dollar than the regular rate of 55 to $1."

The rate of 55 zlotys to the dollar was a rate used solely within the U.S. Government but not used in dealings with the Polish Government or with exchange dealers. It was determined by the Treasury Department to be a reasonable rate, in view of the relative level of prices in Poland and the United States in 1954, and was utilized by the U.S. disbursing officer for sales of zlotys available under the Surplus Property Agreement of April 22, 1946, and later from title I sales to U.S. agencies and to authorized U.S. Government personnel.

As of February 11, 1957, the Polish Government announced establishment of an official rate of exchange at 24 zlotys to $1 for tourist and certain other invisible transactions and this remains the highest rate of exchange officially established by the Government. The U.S. disbursing officer continued to use the 55 to $1 rate, however, until it became necessary to observe the maximum official rate of 24 to $1 on December 15, 1961, as a result of discussions arising from negotiation of a new Public Law 480 sales agreement.

The U.S. negotiators had attempted during some 5 months of negotiations to obtain agreement to the rate of 55 to $1 for the Public Law 480, title I agreement signed on December 15, 1961. The Polish representatives remained adamant, however, and said they could not agree to a rate higher than 24 to $1 because of what they deemed overriding political considerations, and because it would be against Polish law. U.S. agencies were, therefore, confronted with a choice between accepting the more appreciated exchange rate, or concluding no Public Law 480, title I agreement with Poland. It was decided that the overall interest of the United States would be served by conclusion of the agreement with a 24 to $1 exchange rate.

Since 1957, the Public Law 480 agreements with Poland provide that, to the extent that the zlotys are not used by the United States, they will be repurchased by Poland with dollars at this same rate over a specified period of years in the future. Since relatively few of the zlotys are being used, the bulk of them will be subject to this provision and, to the extent that the zlotys are repurchased, no loss to the U.S. Government will result.

If a case arises where the negotiators of Public Law 480, title I sales agreements are unable to obtain a deposit rate as high as the rate at which U.S. Government agencies could otherwise buy local currencies in the market with dollars, the Treasury Department has regarded the Ellender amendment as requiring a conformity between the deposit rate that is obtained and the rate used by U.S. disbursing officers in making sales to U.S. agencies. The 24 zlotys to $1 is the highest deposit rate which the negotiators of the sales agreement with Poland were able to obtain and it is currently in force. The rate for disbursing officer sales to U.S. agencies is also 24 zlotys to $1. You will appreciate that what is a less favorable rate than formerly, from the buying agencies' point of view, is a more favorable rate from the point of view of Commodity Credit Corporation whose local currency is being sold; and that, therefore, there is no loss to the U.S. Government on the zlotys used by the U.S. Government agencies concerned.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

---

[1] Sec. 101(f), Public Law 480.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to note that the junior Senator from Wyoming, Senator MCGEE, in his report on "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development" has endorsed the so-called Ellender amendment to Public Law 480.

I would also like to call attention to an amendment that was adopted by the Senate and retained in conference. I make particular reference to the Senate amendment which added a new subsection (b) to section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell U.S.-owned foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.

Mr. President, this is a good amendment but it contains an error which I will correct when Public Law 480 is reviewed and rewritten next year. The error made is in connection with the dispositions of receipts. The amendment provides that the receipts from these sales will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. However, the receipts should be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation instead of the

Treasury. As I have stated I will correct this oversight when Public Law 480 is rewritten next year.

I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from his report printed in the RECORD and other material that I have on the amendment.

For the reasons I have advanced, I urge the Senate to reject the conference report.

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

EXCERPTS FROM MCGEE REPORT

The Public Law 480 programs administered overseas by AID, although receiving much more attention currently than under predecessor agencies, are still understaffed and are not receiving nearly the attention necessary to realize their full potential. These foreign agriculture programs, which have aggregrated approximately $19 billion (U.S. costs), have been sold short almost from their inception in 1954. They simply have not received the same treatment as those programs for which the administering agencies (AID and predecessor organization) have had to come to Congress for direct appropriations; for example:

Prior to the so-called Ellender amendment, agricultural sales at world market prices for foreign currencies (under title I) were made at unrealistically low foreign exchange rates, which admittedly resulted in rates below world market prices of approximately $700 million.

The loans to foreign governments of currencies generated by title I agricultural commodity sales generally have not been given the attention which dollar loans from direct appropriations have received.

Outright grants of these sales proceeds to foreign countries have, at times, been made in little short of a cavalier manner and, at times, under circumstances difficult to understand. Althought the law requires congressional sanction of such grants, except in cases where the President determines it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of the act, all such grants (approximately $1½ billion) have been made by the "exception" route, and, at times, have amounted to as much as 37½ percent of total sales proceeds.

There appears to have been a widespread misconception that as the commodities, the sales of which generated these currencies, were surplus to the needs of the United States, less value should be attached to these currencies. This has resulted in excessive concessions to some countries to the great detraction of this most important and valuable foreign assistance program.

The argument that is was necessary to make the concessions which were made in Public Law 480 title I sales in order to consummate such sales, does not hold water; first, because under the regular concessions permitted by the law—of subsidizing the commodities to world market prices, of accepting local currencies in payment, of financing much of the ocean freight, or loaning a large percentage of the proceeds back to the purchasing country, and of using the remainder of the proceeds in the country—make such sales competitive practically anywhere, and second, because the greatest concessions in the form of loans and grants back to the recipient countries were made in those countries which were the least able to purchase such commodities in the open market.

DEPENDENCY SCHOOLS ABROAD TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

In considering the foreign aid authorization act of 1964, the House, in addition to the amendments it made to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, also included a number of amendments to other laws.

It is not my intent to dwell on each of these amendments, but I would like to point out that it is bad legislative practice to amend other laws in this particular controversial legislation. I have already illustrated the evils that are inherent in this practice in the statement I made to the Senate in connection with the amendment of section 101(f) of Public Law 480.

At this time I would like merely to bring to the attention of the Senate some far-reaching legislation that was included in the bill by the House, stricken by the Senate, but finally incorporated into the measure because the conferees of the Senate yielded to the House. The particular amendment to which I have reference is an amendment to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, amending section 1081 thereof and providing as follows: "The Secretary [of State] * * * 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 Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, as amended * * * 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."

I wonder if this legislation would have been adopted at this time if it had been made subject to the complete scrutiny of the Congress. Does the Congress want the Secretary of State to operate dependency schools abroad? Is the Congress aware of the ultimate cost of this program? I heard no discussion regarding this legislation on the floor. I know nothing about its ultimate cost, and I am confident that the majority of Senators here today lack such knowledge.

This practice of amending other laws through the medium of the foreign aid bill must be stopped. There is a real deception inherent in getting Congress to focus its attention on foreign aid and then slipping in amendments to other laws, very often with far-reaching consequences. I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for keeping the foreign aid bill a clean bill, to include only legislation on foreign assistance, and not amendments to the Foreign Service Act, Public Law 480, and what have you.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that I have 10 minutes left on the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes remain to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] the fact that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] wishes to ask him some questions. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would yield to the Senator from Iowa a few minutes of the time available to him, inasmuch as I should like to reserve the 10 minutes I have left for final rebuttal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield some time.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield 5 minutes of his time to the Senator from Iowa so that he may ask his questions?

Mr. MILLER. I say to the Senator from Oregon that I believe I can say all I need to say in 2 minutes, but I should like to leave some time, of course, to the Senator from Arkansas to respond to one or two questions that I do not believe will take much time.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa to start with, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will yield him more time.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. On page 63 of the bill, as passed by the Senate, is a new section which was added by virtue of an amendment which would have provided a ceiling of $5 million annually for the U.S. shares of the contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization. This amendment would have meant that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the United States could spend up to $5 million for its share of the contributions to the work of the FAO.

The FAO operates on a calendar year basis. For the calendar year ending December 31, 1964, the United States will be committed to $5.7 million; so that after next June 30, in the fiscal year 1965 budget, we could well appropriate the money necessary to make up the difference between the $5 million limitation contained in the bill as passed by the Senate and the $5.7 million to which we are obligated under the budget now approved for the FAO.

Our own budget experts in the U.S. delegation to the FAO conference advocated a $36.7 million budget for the biennium, which would have required a $5.3 million as the U.S. share of the contributions. However, the Director General of FAO had recommended a $39.7 million budget, which was finally reduced $900,000 to $38.8 million for the biennium. This will entail the $5.7 million contribution by the United States.

I regret to say that the $5 million ceiling item was deleted by the conference committee, and I can find nothing in the conference report about it. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he would please explain why to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

As the Senator has already stated, the limitation of $5 million was in place of the former limitation or a percentage. We now contribute 32.2 percent of the FAO budget, as the Senator knows.

I believe he attended the conference. As the Senator has already pointed out, the $5 million would have required, we believe, a default in the obligation we heretofore have had in contributing 32.2 percent of the budget as accepted.

The House had no such limitation. We had the $5 million put in by the Senator from Iowa. We thought, as a practical matter, that we did not wish to take arbitrary action at this late date which might put us in the position of defaulting on what had been our previous agreement as to our percentage of the total. Heretofore we have operated on the general principle that in relation to most of the international organizations we would like to approximate that one-third. That is approximately what our contribution is to the basic operation

of the United Nations as opposed to certain specific operations, such as UNICEF, the labor organization, and so on. The proposal approximates the general principle of one-third of the amount. I believe that on other occasions the Senate has followed this principle in an effort to increase the contribution of other Members rather than appropriate specific amounts in dollars.

We have tried it both ways in the past. Usually we have come back to the percentage basis of computation.

I do not feel very strongly about the question. The House did. It had no such limitation. It said that the proposal would be unworkable.

We cannot anticipate what the programs will be from year to year. If we should put an arbitrary limit on it, we might run into difficulty. It does not allow for any expansion of the budget. It is believed that the maintenance of the percentage limitation is the more flexible and the more workable way to limit our contribution. That is about all I can say.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize the desirability of flexibility which the percentage formula provides. However, it seems that our budget experts on our delegation should have some backing by Congress. When our budget experts, after a great amount of time, come forward with a proposed budget of $36.7 million, which would entail $5.3 million a year as our share of our contribution, they should receive a little more consideration than they did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand the reasoning of the Senator from Iowa. Even that figure is above the specific limitation of $5 million proposed.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps the Senator did not hear me when I pointed out that since the FAO is on a calendar year basis, the $5.3 million would cover the entire calendar year of 1964; whereas the bill which the Senate is considering runs only through June 30, 1964, so there would be ample time in the 1965 budget to make up that $300,000 difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what else to say. I believe it is unnecessary to deal with these relatively small items and make special appropriations. If the Senator wishes, he could lower the percentage. I would be in favor of lowering the percentage so that we would not have to deal with individual items.

Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the conference report. I am happy that in my service in the Senate I have supported the concept of foreign aid. There are many people in the country who believe that the foreign aid program should be ended. It is evident from the actions of Congress this year that there are not many who believe that funds should not be cut. As I said in recent weeks, I have not felt, in this debate, that they should not be cut. I voted for cuts. Although I support the concept of foreign aid, I believe we do not have sufficient information to know whether the program is as effective as it should be.

What I say today is not in derogation of the work of the committee, because I am sure that members of the Foreign Relations Committee know more about the program than do we who are not its members, as interested as we are in it. I believe that this year, for the first time in many years, there has been a comprehensive and effective debate upon foreign aid.

I do not wish to belabor this subject, though it is of great interest to me. I wish to speak briefly to a point I raised in the debate.

I offered an amendment which was adopted by the Senate, the purpose of which was to establish, at the direction of the President, certain committees to be made up both of persons outside Government service and in Government service, to make searching examinations and reports on our foreign aid program in various areas of the world, such as southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and, if necessary, specific countries.

My purpose in offering the amendment was to suggest that the work of the Clay Committee should be extended. The Clay Committee and its report in respect to foreign aid have had a greater impact upon Congress, and indeed upon the country, than any other report ever made.

My purpose was to extend that work, to determine whether, in specific areas or in certain countries which receive the greater portion of our aid, 15 or 16 receive one-half of our economic aid, the program is effective, because if cuts are to be made, they will be applied generally to the program and will fall upon the just as well as the unjust.

The conference in effect struck the amendment which I offered, though not wholly. I believe the recommendation would permit the President to order such studies if he felt them to be proper. I note, also, that an amendment has been added which I believe is similar in intent to the one I offered. Section 102(f) reads:

> 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.

A great part of that language was in the amendment I offered.

I know the President of the United States is a man of good, solid, practical judgment. I say that not only from a general estimate of him, but also because of my memory of the report he made to us on foreign aid in various countries after he had made one of his first trips around the world, at which time he reviewed, in very practical terms, to 50 or 60 of us in the Foreign Relations Committee room, what he thought was the effectiveness of the program in various countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my only purpose in speaking today is to say that I hope the President will extend the work of the Clay Committee. I hope he will establish what he believes to be proper committees, to be made up of some men in Government service and some men of great ability outside of Government service, to make a report to the Congress and to the people regarding the effectiveness of this program.

I say, most respectfully, that no such information is available to us today. There have been five agencies since the Marshall plan. There have been 11 administrators. The reports which have come to us have not given us information about specific countries.

There is a division in the Foreign Relations Committee. There is a division in the Appropriations Committee. The Clay Committee has been the first committee able to give any kind of comprehensive report on the total program. I hope that similar committees will be established to give comprehensive reports on various countries. Unless this occurs, there will continue to be an ineffective program in many countries of the world and eventually—perhaps in a short time—this program will not survive. That is my reason for urging that we obtain the fullest information, because I believe the program should survive where it is effective. Many others believe the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a speech entitled "Foreign Aid" by Hon. Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank. In this speech he makes many of the points I make, although his authority is greater than mine.

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

FOREIGN AID

(Text of an address by Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, New York City, N.Y., on November 12, 1963)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches, and, on leaving the World Bank I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally, to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year; the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support of foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clear-cut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and I think quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do; I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on these three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foreign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban Government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq, and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or, as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed prime minister, Kassem, lacked staying power, he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian Government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not alined with the Communists.

If the Soviets have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and troublemaking interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I'm afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps toward action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions

necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which expropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate for our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities: Is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the Agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it becomes more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations, like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund organizations whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first, now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: "Should we continue foreign aid?" Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: "How can we improve the quality of the product?" Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the conference report. The only reason for taking time to speak is that the report carries out, in a very important respect, such a forecast for the future as to deserve to be marked significantly in this debate.

There seems to be a general feeling, which I share, that the foreign aid program, if it is to last—and I believe it must last, as an essential offensive against communism in the world and as an essential offensive for freedom in the world—must have a new direction, a new concept, and a new technique.

Very clearly, as always happens, what is coming is forecast by what is. To me the most significant aspect of the report for the future, though it is not by any means the most important provision in an absolute sense, is the establishment of an advisory committee on private enterprise, which is now contained in the report and can be found at page 8.

The language provides that the advisory committee, which will meet frequently—a working committee meeting every month—shall furnish information as to exactly how the private enterprise system is being utilized. I emphasize that this does not mean only private enterprise as we generally think of it, as business and profitmaking concerns, but includes, as is set forth, "labor and professional," "universities and foundations," and "persons with extensive experience in government," who are now out of government. They will chart the way in which the foreign aid program can be carried on by private enterprise.

I predict that beginning with the fiscal year 1965, and in the years after that, the foreign aid program of the United States will be extensively carried on under contract with business, and nonprofit private enterprise organizations will be intimately woven in with consortiums of business concerns which at one and the same time will be pursuing manufacturing and other activities directly and with partners in underdeveloped areas and will be carrying out Government programs for training, technical assistance, and other activities in the most economical way.

I believe that the absolute dollar amount to be spent can be materially cut in respect to the entire conduct of this Government, and yet I believe the program can be carried on with infinitely more efficiency and greater fidelity to the real purposes—the encouragement of freedom and the encouragement of private enterprise—if we readapt the program completely along those lines.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the American people may be interested in investing in a foreign aid corporation very much along the lines of the Communications Satellite Corp., now in the process of development, as an additional way in which the massive sums required—which are required in credit as well as in money and in technical assistance as well as in more tangible resources—may be invested in this effort.

At one and the same time that foreign aid appropriations in a governmental sense may be reduced, the aggregate amount utilized for foreign aid must be materially increased. The only way to accomplish that is to harness the private enterprise system.

Finally, the insistence in the proposed legislation upon the absolute indispensability of participation by other nations, especially the European nations, is a major point of emphasis. This must be the primary thrust of American foreign policy in the foreign aid field.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I are trying to work on this problem with a great Latin American investment company. The unity and the consortium of foreign private enterprise—notably in Europe and Japan—with American private enterprise, in partnership with Latin American private enterprise, such as the company we are endeavoring to have succeed, and with private enterprise in other areas—whether it be Africa, Asia, or the Middle East—will be the ultimate answer to the problem.

I emphasize this forecast for the future. The United States is becoming much more hardheaded about the program. That is clearly shown by the amendment a number of Senators sponsored along with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] concerning President Nasser.

The country is also becoming more hardheaded about the utilization of the totality of its resources, including private enterprise, for the purpose of making the program a success. I predict that will be the program of the future.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one-half a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, some persons who are vitally interested in this program would like to see the transfer of funds from development research to supporting assistance because they feel it could be better carried on. I ask the chairman of the committee if that cannot be done under existing law, and also if there is anything in the conference report that would prevent it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is clear authority to take that money from any source in part 1, from supporting assistance or from grants.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the amount involved, it would be perfectly proper to put it into supporting assistance.

Mr. President, I commend to the Senate the adoption of the conference foreign aid bill for 1963. It is, in my judgment, a fair and reasonable compromise between the original Senate and House bills, between which there were many differences and conflicting provisions.

There is much in the conference bill which may be displeasing to Members of the Senate. I myself am by no means satisfied with every detail of the compromise bill.

In introducing the presentation of the bill as it came from the committee, I made quite clear in my statement that I was not satisfied with the present form of the program, and recommended certain additional changes in my initial statement. I still think the program needs revising, but I do not recommend that it be completely mutilated, or that the power to administer efficiently be destroyed.

There is nothing alarming or shocking about this. It is in the nature of any compromise that no one can be satisfied with it in all its particulars. The important point is that an accommodation has been reached that includes many of the preferences of each House and that on the whole should be satisfactory to both Houses.

The conference bill has been criticized for what is said to be too high an authorization. I am at a loss to understand the basis of this criticism. It will be recalled that the administration originally asked for an authorization of $4.9 billion and then, after the Clay Report, reduced its request to $4.5 billion. The Foreign Relations Committee reduced this amount by $300 million and the Senate reduced it by another $500 million to a total authorization of slightly more than $3.7 billion. The conference bill reduces this figure by over $100 million to a total authorization of less than $3.6 billion. I do not see how the Senate conferees could have reduced this amount further without putting themselves in clear violation of the will and intent of the Senate.

The conference bill has been criticized on the ground that certain policy provisions included by the Senate have been omitted or altered. This is perfectly true. It is also true that certain provisions of the House bill have been omitted in deference to the wishes of the Senate. This, as no one needs to be reminded, is the normal and traditional procedure of conferences between the two Houses.

Major provisions of the Senate bill which were not in the House bill were retained by the conference. Among these are the following: A provision for research into problems of population growth; a provision for assistance to Latin American cooperatives; restrictions on military assistance to Latin America; restrictions on military assistance to Africa.

I am still at a loss to know exactly what the Senator from Louisiana was complaining about. I thought, and still believe, as I read this restriction, that it is in accord with his argument. In any case, there is a restriction of a rather strict limitation on military assistance to Africa.

There is a provision for the sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes; an expansion of the Hickenlooper amendment regarding the expropriation of U.S. property to cover the nullification of contracts with American citizens and providing for the evaluation of claims by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; a ban on assistance to economically developed nations; a provision encouraging the participation of private enterprise in the technical assistance program; the inclusion of fish in the list of commodities available for sale under the provisions of Public Law 480; and finally, the restoration of the President's authority to grant most-favored-nation trade treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia.

The conference bill is a fair and reasonable compromise between the House and Senate bills. It cannot be entirely satisfactory to every Member of each body or to either body as a whole. It represents a consensus of the wishes of the two Houses, which is precisely what a conference bill is supposed to do. As the senior Senator from Oregon noted in his speech to the Senate yesterday on this bill, "after all, in the legislative process it is necessary to count noses."

That is exactly what was done in conference. Under the circumstances, I believe the compromise is a very fair one, and does not depart in any material way

from the usual processes that have been followed in the past with regard to conferences between the two bodies.

A moment ago the Senator from Alaska asked a question, and wished to know if I would comment on Cambodia. Our experience in Cambodia was most unfortunate. It is unfortunate that the Dyna-Soar project was abandoned because, according to the press it was a false start. It cost only $400 million. I regret that fact. I suppose the Secretary of Defense would say, "We were mistaken in that particular undertaking." Perhaps we were mistaken on Cambodia.

I remind the Senator that Mr. Sihanouk, head of that country, has his own views. I do not know what the Senator from Alaska thinks we should do—whether we should stay in there, go over there and take it over; or whether he thinks we should have gone in the first place. It may well be that we should not have interested ourselves in that country; but at the time we did, it was the policy of the then administration, and Congress, as is usually the case on matters of foreign policy, to recognize the primacy of the Executive, under our Constitution, in these matters, and to follow those suggestions as a matter of policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier in the foreign aid debate, I referred briefly to the role which the cooperative movement is playing in the development of Latin America. I mentioned that I offered an amendment to the existing aid bill to assist in the development of an Inter-American cooperative finance system, an amendment which was accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee. This bill, with one modification, was passed by the Senate.

A significant breakthrough in expanding the self-help, private enterprise feature of our assistance program in Latin America is made by new provisions included in H.R. 7885 which authorizes the President to:

> Assist in promoting the organization, implementation and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

This was the amendment I introduced 2 years ago, to encourage giving further attention to the cooperative movement in this hemisphere.

There are today nearly 6 million people in Latin America who are already members of more than 16,000 cooperatives. These cooperatives are urban and rural. They deal in credit and fishing. They are trying to provide housing and transportation. In short, they include people from every walk of life. The charter of Punta del Este and the inauguration of the Alliance for Progress are offering new hope and new expectations among these people and among the millions who are not yet a part of any institution or system which permits them to participate in their own economic development and the economic development of their countries. A strong integrated cooperative movement offers one of the finest means through which a significant segment of these masses can organize their own institutions to permit them to participate economically and which, incidentally, will teach them the value of a private enterprise system and the value of practicing democracy. It gives them a stake in the stability of their own government since they will, for the first time, own something which can be lost.

To make the cooperative program more effective, I proposed and the Senate recommended the local currency be made available to suport the establishment of an Inter-American cooperative finance institution. The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee states clearly the views of the Senate:

> The committee has long been impressed with the constructive role which cooperatives can play, not only in promoting economic growth, but also in contributing to the democratic development contemplated by the Alliance for Progress. In order to give special emphasis to the importance which the committee assigns to the role of cooperatives, special provision is made in this bill for the use of certain foreign currencies available to the United States in Latin America to assist the cooperative movement.
>
> First, a new subsection is added to section 251 of the act, which contains the general authority for the Alliance for Progress. This new subsection provides that 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."
>
> Second, a new provision is inserted in section 253 of the act, which relates to Alliance for Progress fiscal provisions, to make foreign currencies available for this purpose. The foreign currencies involved are those which have accrued as a result of loans which are repayable in foreign currencies. Most of these loans were made by the Development Loan Fund between 1958 and 1961. Since the latter date, all development loans have been repayable in dollars. However, as a result of earlier development loans, the United States now has about $7 million in Latin American currencies. This amount is expected to increase, as a result of repayments, to about $60 million over the next 5 years. The President is authorized to reserve up to $25 million of these currencies in any fiscal year, for loans to cooperatives. These funds will be available for this purpose without regard to section 612 of the act, or of any other act which makes foreign currencies available only as specified in appropriations acts.
>
> The foreign currencies to which this amendment applies can be used not only for loans to individual cooperatives but also to provide seed capital, should that prove desirable, to a central inter-American cooperative finance institution for relending.

In the debate in the Senate, one sentence was struck out—that which would make local currency available without going through the appropriations process.

I would like to make it clear that the Senate has not changed its mind in regard to the priority which cooperatives should enjoy under our aid program. In the distribution of local currency which may become available, it is the intention of the Senate that the inter-American cooperative finance institution shall have the highest priority.

Mr. President, I make this statement because I realize that priorities are established on the availability and use of so-called foreign currencies. I can think of nothing more valuable than to promote reform in the agrarian or agricultural areas of Latin America. A rural development program or agrarian reform program is utterly worthless unless it is possible to have supervised credit. That credit usually comes from a cooperative movement. The only way in which poor people in rural areas have an opportunity to improve their lot in life is through a cooperative institution. It is no longer a matter of an individual farmer having his own individual plot of land. We are now faced with the fact that the choice is between cooperation and collectivism. We do not want collectivism; therefore, by having individual ownerships pooled through cooperatives such as we have known in the United States, and as are known in Scandinavian countries, much can be done to lift the standard of living in the rural sections of Latin America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would put clear emphasis upon the Alliance for Progress program, in particular. The tendency is to look upon the program primarily as a capital development program. It seems to me that greater emphasis must be placed upon the human needs, the social needs—the needs of the people in those areas.

Capital development is important, but if we can develop a reasonably stable political environment, private capital development will fulfill much of the need that is now being filled by public capital.

I hope there will be no diminution in our desire to see to it that the Alliance for Progress, in particular, will work in the fields of education, health, community development, and the improvement of transportation, particularly with reference to farm-to-market-type roads, communication, and telecommunication; and that, above all, we will see to it that the needs of the young people in vocational training and technical training fields are satisfied.

In many programs entirely too much emphasis is placed upon the sheer financial aspects, and not enough upon the social aspects. Therefore I hope that there will be a more rapid processing of projects. The delay is intolerable. I have spoken about this situation on many occasions. I understand the administration will make some reorganization of the foreign aid program, particularly with reference to the Alliance for Progress. I hope, if it does so, it will give more authority in the field, to the mission directors and those on the spot doing the job, rather than requiring clearance on a

project through 25 different desk operations. Twenty-five of them will not do a better job than two or three. If a decision cannot be made in the field, and on one or two levels higher than that, the decision will never be made, at least not satisfactorily. To have it go through 25 desks is nothing but nonsense.

Finally, I know that in the conference report the House managers made a statement to this effect:

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make it clear that that is the view of the House, not the view of the Senate. Certainly it is not the view of the Senator from Minnesota. There will be excess foreign currencies in Latin America. Those currencies ought to be utilized for programs that give direct benefits to the people who need these programs the most. Too much attention is being given to people who need little help and are getting much, and far too little attention is being given to people who need much help and are being given little.

I saw yesterday in the public works bill an instance of this, when the people of Minnesota were denied a part in the accelerated public works program. I do not like it, and I intend to make a point of it for the record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am shocked, disappointed, and saddened. I have been waiting with bated breath and great expectation and high anticipation for the ultimate defense of this monstrosity. I thought that at some time during the debate in the weeks that have been given to it, something might have been said which would make sense in defense of this shocking waste of taxpayer dollars.

I have listened in vain. I feel somewhat like the little boy who had waited for a long time for his Dutch uncle to take him to the theater. He had been told what a great play he would see.

Finally he got into the theater, with all its glamour—something like this Chamber—and discovered that it was a Greek tragedy, with the players speaking Greek.

I feel that that is what I have been listening to in defense of the bill.

Let the record speak for itself.

I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks in opposition to the concurrent conference report on foreign aid there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these items from the New Republic.

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

[From the New Republic, Nov. 23, 1963]

AID BUT NOT COMFORT

The President is of the opinion that "this is the worst attack on foreign aid we've seen since the Marshall plan," but the administration invited attack before the battle began. First, Mr. Kennedy appointed a Commission headed by General Clay which he must have known would not be disposed either to firmly endorse the President's original request for $4.9 billion (it was trimmed to $4.5 billion in the Clay report), or come up with any radically new approach that took into realistic account the urgent and growing needs of developing nations over the next decade. Then in the Senate, almost before debate had opened on the President's foreign aid request, Senators MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT, Senator DIRKSEN concurring, volunteered to cut it by $385 million. From then on, it was every man for himself. At one point, Senator ANDERSON rose to ask what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, really thought of the bill. Liberals like FRANK CHURCH and ERNEST GRUENING, neither of whom is up for reelection for another 5 years, teamed up with budget balancers and America-firsters like BARRY GOLDWATER to hack away. Not Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, but the Oregon maverick WAYNE MORSE took charge. Anti-Kennedy southerners, many of whom had heretofore voted for the program, now took pleasure in slicing a bit here and a bit there. What Senator LONG of Louisiana termed the most ridiculous piece of amending legislation in his experience was approved—"no assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country which has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond 3 miles from the coastline of such country." The Chilean, Ecuadoran and Peruvian peasants who will be hurt by this are in no position to compete with the tuna fishermen of California and Washington, represented by Senators KUCHEL and MAGNUSON; the crabmen of Alaska, backed by Senators GRUENING and BARTLETT; or Senator TOWER's Texas shrimpers—whose collective difficulties with foreign boundary makers led to the amendment's adoption. Senator PROXMIRE gave the show away when he stated in support of his own amendment to deprive the President of any discretion in giving assistance to Yugoslavia (adopted, and unadopted 24 hours later): "I honestly believe that the vast majority of people in Yugoslavia do not approve of this dictator. Certainly the people who have come to Wisconsin from Yugoslavia have nothing good to say about him."

Foreign aid, it is always said, has no constituency and is therefore especially vulnerable. Yet Congressmen say privately that the hostility of their constituents this year is very little, if any, greater than in the past. Nor can one explain the abandon with which internationally minded Senators have been trying to write a new bill on the floor of the Senate on the grounds that something is wrong with the program. Many things may be wrong with it, but they will not be righted this way.

Who is to blame? To a large extent, the very leaders who clearly see the importance of foreign aid. It has been presented by them for the past decade not as a continuing obligation of the rich to the poor, which it is, but as "a weapon maintaining the influence of the United States," as the President said on November 14, or as good for American business. Congress then steps in and decides to cut off funds to countries where U.S. influence has waned or which restrict U.S. fishing rights. And if, as its salesmen have been saying for so long, aid is a weapon against communism, why give it to Poland or Yugoslavia? The appeal that has been muted is the appeal to conscience. The Government has been and still is willing to cast its bread upon the waters, for we have wheat in embarrassing and expensive surplus, but thereafter the discussion is in terms of mutual backscratching. A magnanimous enterprise is reduced finally to a slush fund.

[From the New Republic, Nov. 30, 1963]

THE AID PROGRAM—A SENATORIAL DISSENT

The New Republic's lead editorial last week entitled "Aid but Not Comfort" missed completely the significance of the 3-week debate in the Senate on the foreign aid authorization bill. The editorial gave the impression that a small band of willful, liberal Senators imposed their will upon the majority of the Senators in order to protect local interests in their home States. Then you sounded slightly bewildered in trying to explain the Senate's actions despite the alleged lack of increased hostility to the foreign aid program as expressed in letters received from home.

What has happened in the last decade is that when the friends of foreign aid complained about the program's operations, they were told to suppress their criticisms lest they lend aid and comfort to the program's opponents. They were told that if they would but vote for increased authorizations and appropriations the deficiencies would be remedied. This has gone on year after year, but the changes in the program, repeatedly promised, have not been made. Every few years a bone is thrown to the complaining friends of the program by renaming it.

This year the suppressed emotions of the friends of foreign aid exploded on the floor of the Senate.

Fifty-seven Senators (of the 86 voting) voted for Senator KUCHEL's amendment on the arrest of U.S. fishermen in the belief that it was ludicrous for the United States to continue paying Ecuador $152 million a year while that country continued to use the naval vessels given them as part of our Latin American military aid program to arrest U.S. fishermen 200 miles off the coast of Ecuador. (The wording of the amendment in the New Republic was not correct.)

Sixty-five Senators (of the 78 voting) voted for my antiaggressor amendment because they felt strongly that it made no sense to continue to pour $224 million per year into Egypt (nearly $1 billion to date) while that country continued to spend approximately the same amount waging aggressive wars in Yemen and continued to purchase offensive Communist weapons, including ground-to-ground missiles, submarines, jet fighter planes, to carry out its repeatedly announced intention of waging war against Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel, and Morocco.

The Senate itself, by a voice without dissent, agreed to add my amendment cutting off military aid to Latin America in view of the repeated instances where that aid has been used by military juntas to overthrow constitutionally elected governments.

Seventy-eight Senators (of the 80 voting) joined Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in his amendment to authorize the President to appoint committees to "review, evaluate, and make recommendations respecting foreign aid programs."

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in its report on the bill, had itself, in no uncertain terms, pointed out the need for changes in the program, but failed to reflect its beliefs in the bill it reported.

The admission by the majority and minority leaders, almost at the beginning of the debate, that the total could be trimmed an additional $385 million cast doubt on the validity of all authorization requests, especially since high administration officials, a few short weeks before, had pleaded with members of the Foreign Relations Committee that the higher figure was absolutely essential for our security.

After the vote on the final passage of the bill in the Senate, a State Department employee was overheard to remark that the Department had done remarkably well since it had padded its request by $1 billion just to take care of congressional cuts.

The fact is that the program has had too much money and has been profligate in its

use of the vast sums appropriated, oftentimes hurting rather than helping the countries aided.

One reason for the faulty analysis by the New Republic may well be that there has been an almost complete blackout of news about the program. Recently I completed a lengthy study of the foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries for the Senate Committee on Government Operations. My findings were contained in a printed report (472 pages) which, for the first time, went into the program in those countries in depth. Yet the press and periodicals contained very little, if any, mention of those findings. That report demonstrated with facts and figures how too much U.S. aid could hurt rather than help the economy of a country. The more recent example of Colombia being unable to spend our aid is another instance of the same prodigality.

In addition to our giving certain countries more money than they can absorb, we are giving AID dollars to countries which are not really interested in economic development or are not ready for the type of economic development they need to undertake.

Why should we continue to give aid to the rich European countries, which our aid has rehabilitated, to the tune of $899.1 million in fiscal year 1963? Japan belongs in that same category.

Should we continue to pour our dollars (140 million of them in fiscal year 1963) into Indonesia so that Sukarno can destroy Malaysia while his domestic economy goes from bad to worse?

How long are we to continue to sink $172 million a year into Brazil which continues to break its promises of economic reform?

How long should the United States agree to send over $156 million a year to Argentina while it permits its chaotic politics to disrupt any worthwhile efforts at economic development?

Our Greek, Lebanon, and Israel programs are supposedly stopped. Should not, therefore, the foreign aid tab be less by the amount ($200 million) they received in fiscal year 1963?

Just adding the amounts of aid to the countries named—without naming others which are indifferent to their own best interests—we reach a total of over $1.5 billion by which the grant and loan authorizations can be cut. A $2.5 billion appropriation would be entirely adequate apart from the fact that $6.5 billion in the foreign aid pipeline are unspent and available.

The astounding fact is that our aid now goes to 107 countries around the world. In some of these countries our AID program is large—in others it is small. Money is the new weapon of diplomacy. No funds can be spent from the Treasury unless it has been appropriated by the Congress. That is what the Constitution provides. In appropriating funds, the Congress must state the purposes for which they may be spent. The administrators of all programs—both foreign and domestic—would, of course, like to have a blank check. But we do have a government of checks and balances. Congress cannot delegate its duties to the Executive any more than the Executive can shift its duties to the Congress.

What has happened during previous years is that the Congress has not fulfilled its duties with respect to the foreign aid program. The loud shrieks of anguish heard on Capitol Hill and echoed in much unperceptive newspaper and magazine comment concerning the recent foreign aid debate really reflect the realization that the Senate was seeking for the first time to regain that control over the foreign aid program which it should have exercised all along, and by doing so has substantially improved the program.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

[From the New Republic, Nov. 30, 1963]

PROGRESS FOR WHOM?

Senator GRUENING's statement to the New Republic in this issue reflects a spreading pessimism in high as well as low places about Latin America. The Alliance for Progress seems not much of an alliance, and not much progress can be reported either. The Organization of American States, in the words of a distinguished Bolivian author and diplomat, Fernando Diez de Medina, "has demonstrated its bureaucratic paralysis. It acts sporadically. It reflects the thinking in Washington rather than the thinking in Latin America." AID injections to prevent political infection are increased, and the patient gets sicker. The hoped-for healing effects of new investment are canceled out by the low prices of basic commodities Latin America has to trade, and by a population that at present rates will give that continent a half-billion people by the end of this century. Long-term economic development requires confidence in the future. But there is little of that. Latin Americans have sent more than $11 billion overseas since the end of World War II. One military coup succeeds another. In his speech to the Inter-American Press Association last week, President Kennedy recited once more the sad statistics of poverty and repeated the ritual warning, surely wearisome by now to Latin Americans, that Communists must keep out. But it was tired stuff.

The United States has offered $1 billion a year to buy reform (also known as "modernization"). But who will judge which reforms, where, and how speedily accomplished? The administration says the Latin Americans must answer that question. It does not really mean that, however; obviously the Latins cannot decide for themselves how money from American taxpayers is to be used; too much of it would go into unwise public works, or into very wise private pockets. For their part, most South American governments resent interference from the north, but they also resent noninterference which takes the form of no help. There is another paradox. Although the administration is urging more private investment in Latin America, it acknowledges the sovereign right of any government to expropriate these investments so long as just compensation is given. Not only does the prospect of just compensation add nothing to the attractiveness of private investment abroad, but as the government of President Illia in the Argentine is demonstrating, that very investment is a club with which a government can beat further concessions out of the United States. Argentina has replied to protests at her cancellation of oil contracts with American business firms by threatening to seize other American properties if the United States takes retaliatory action. Mr. Illia perhaps thinks that he can go far before U.S. aid is withdrawn, for by permitting us to help them, the Latins offer us an excuse to provide more employment at home. Of $1.8 billion given to date to Latin America under the Alliance, 80 percent has gone to buy goods and services in the United States.

In 1961, the administration announced plans to spend $260 million to finance the development of the wretched northeast section of Brazil. Almost none of that money has been spent. (It takes about 2 years to get AID approval for a project; it is always manna mañana.) AID officials refused to grant Peru funds to buy picks and shovels for Indian workers; that's against regulations, not a sound business proposition—picks and shovels could be lost or stolen.

As for the importance of constitutional government in this hemisphere, the President at one point in his address last week may have invited new coups. That is the meaning certain groups in Latin America, fearful of a "leftist" takeover, will read into his words: "The American States must be ready to come to the aid of any government requesting aid to prevent a takeover linked to the policies of foreign communism rather than to an internal desire for change." Nor will it soon be forgotten in South America that the leaders of recent military coups were trained and equipped by the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report.

First, in the bill which was passed by the Senate there was a provision to the effect that no aid was to be granted under the act to any country which contemplated using money in establishing a Government-operated enterprise in competition with private enterprise, unless it clearly appeared that private enterprise was not adequately doing the job.

That provision in the Senate bill has been stricken.

I do not believe that our country can give money for the purpose of socializing countries around the world without eventually endangering the security of our own Nation.

Second, the bill which passed the Senate prohibited the granting of any aid, of any type, under the act to Communist countries. That provision has been stricken.

Third, in the Senate committee the Mundt-Lausche amendment was adopted, providing that when loans are made they shall bear interest at not less than 2 percent a year, beginning in the 5th year, and that they shall have an amortization period of not more than 35 years.

The Mundt-Lausche amendment was diluted in committee. Our amendment initially provided a rate of 2 percent from the date the obligation began. The dilution by the committee has been aggravated by the dilution by the conferees. There are other reasons why I shall vote against the conference report, but these three I definitely state.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join in the expression of disappointment just expressed by the Senator from Ohio. I, too, shall vote against the conference report. I deeply deplore the backtracking which was done on our constructive work in raising interest rates on foreign aid loans to a more realistic figure.

I take the remainder of the time yielded to me to call the attention of the Senate to a rather astonishing development from the standpoint of our trade concessions to Red Russia and her slavish satellites. Many Senators and taxpayers will be shocked to learn that on December 11 the Department of Commerce announced that it had granted a license to sell and ship wheat to East Germany, a Communist country whose government we do not even recognize. The announcement is eloquently silent as to whether the credit guarantees the American taxpayer is expected to extend on Red purchases generally will be made

available to a government which we deny exists. I shall try to ascertain those factors and discuss them later. If Export-Import Bank credit is to be extended to East Germany it will indeed be a curious procedure in view of our nonrecognition of Communist East Germany and our opposition to the Berlin Wall it has erected as a barrier to normal East-West city relations..

This action demonstrates the importance of the issues of S. 2310, which would have prohibited extension of American public credit to communist countries. These issues remain undecided in this body. All we decided by the rollcall vote on November 26 was to defer the decision, by laying the bill on the table. The basic issues are as vital and significant today as they were then.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Grain Sale Prospect Up; East Zone to Get Wheat," written by Frank C. Porter, and published in the Washington Post of December 11, 1963; and an artcle entitled "$3.2 Million Export of Wheat to East Germany Authorized," written by William M. Blair, and published in the New York Times of December 11, 1963.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1963]

GRAIN SALE PROSPECT UP; EAST ZONE TO GET WHEAT

(By Frank C. Porter)

Prospects for wheat sales to the Soviet Union brightened yesterday. At the same time, the Department of Commerce licensed the shipment of $3.2 million of wheat to East Germany.

Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., emerged from a meeting with shipowner groups and announced that U.S.-flag vessels are expected to be fully employed on other business for the next 6 or 7 months.

In reversing the ban against shipment of subsidized commodities behind the Iron Curtain, the administration decreed that 50 percent of wheat commitments must be carried in domestic bottoms where available.

But operators of U.S. tramps and tankers charge at least $3 a ton more on Soviet routes than do foreign shipowners. The Russians have balked at paying this higher delivered price.

Not so the Hungarians, who have purchased some $15 million worth of U.S. wheat. But on the second shipment of 100,000 tons, the domestic seller sought a waiver of the shipping preference.

Last week the Commerce Department granted it, ruling that U.S. ships were then completely tied up with food for peace, other foreign aid and oil cargoes.

National Maritime Union President Joseph Curran promptly fired off a blast, insisting that the ships were available, and that specifications and orders had been "jockeyed"—a protest that he subsequently softened.

But representatives of the American Maritime Association and the American Tramp Shipowners' Association said after their meeting with Roosevelt yesterday that they support the waiver and agree with administration policy.

Roosevelt also said the Department is seeking reaction from the shipping trade on the draft for a proposed tightening of waiver procedures. The draft would require applicants to solicit all U.S. shipowners before seeking a waiver. It would also require traders to seek domestic bottoms on a 30-day-availability basis.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1963]

$3.2 MILLION EXPORT OF WHEAT TO EAST GERMANY AUTHORIZED

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, December 10.—An export license for the sale of $3.2 million worth of wheat to East Germany was issued today by the Commerce Department.

This will be the first agricultural commodity sale made to a Soviet bloc country since November 21 and the first since negotiations with the Soviet Union for the sale of $250 million worth of wheat became stalled.

The American seller of the wheat, believed to be about 1.5 million bushels, was not named.

The Department announcement came as representatives of the U.S. tramp shipping industry conferred with Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on what both sides labeled a "misunderstanding" over cargo preference on part of a shipment of wheat to Hungary.

Tramp ship operators and maritime labor unions protested the waiver granted to Cargill, Inc., to permit the grain concern to ship 91,000 tons of a 100,000-ton commitment of wheat sold to Hungary on foreign-flag vessels.

The Maritime Administration waived the requirement that 50 percent of the shipment must be carried in U.S.-flag vessels because Cargill reported it was able to obtain ships for only 9,000 tons.

In public statements, Mr. Roosevelt and the tramp ship representatives pictured the conference as having cleared up the "misunderstanding." But privately both sides appeared to agree that only future developments would tell whether the matter had been settled.

After the meeting the Maritime Administration announced, in effect, that it would get out of the shipbroker business. In the future, it said, exporters or grain dealers must show if American vessels are available for shipments to Communist countries.

The Maritime Administration said it was circulating a proposal that applications from grain dealers for waiver of the 50-percent cargo preference provision must be accompanied by certification that the dealers had canvassed all possibilities.

This canvass would include publication of the shipping requirements in a daily ship news outlet, with the shipping industry allowed 30 days to reply.

If the grain dealer then applied for a waiver, the Maritime Administration will publish the application in a shipping news daily and allow 5 days for protests. After this the waiver will be granted.

The proposal, circulated for comment by dealers and the shipping industry, also noted that the Government's guideline on rates for U.S. ships in the 15,600- to 30,000-ton class would apply.

This limits the waivers to larger vessels on which the Government has reduced cargo rates by 20 percent to promote the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. The Russians had complained of the U.S. rates, which are higher than foreign-flag charter rates.

Smaller vessels, including 10,000-ton Liberty ships, are still under the higher rates applicable to foreign aid shipments of farm commodities under Public Law 480, the surplus disposal statute.

Max Harrison, president of the American Maritime Association, said after the conference that "we're in accord with the program" and wished to "help the administration carry out its program."

"We have no problem with the administration," he said.

Mr. Roosevelt said both the labor union representatives, with whom he met yesterday, and ship management "fully support the program."

It is obvious, he said, that the sale of wheat to Communist countries and sales under Public Law 480 "will keep the American merchant marine fully occupied for the next 7 months."

"We do not want to grant waivers," he said, adding that waivers would be granted "only when a seller fully documents his case that American ships are not available."

In the Cargill case he said, the lack of American ships, including Liberty vessels, was "documented to the satisfaction of labor and management." Earlier, the American Maritime Association and the labor unions—the National Maritime Union and the Seafarers International Union—had contended that U.S.-flag vessels were available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to that great leader of the opposition, the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate, when it was debating the foreign aid bill, vastly improved it. Although it was far from satisfactory, I felt obliged to vote for it, for the Senate had accepted two of my amendments, and others which I had supported. And feeling that the bill had been improved and favoring foreign aid, I voted for it. Most of that improvement has been undone in conference. I spelled out that undoing fully in a long speech yesterday. I shall therefore be obliged to vote against accepting the conference report.

It is shocking to think how these errors—these wasteful practices, these subsidizations of unworthy governments, these giveaways to curry a dictator's favor, these ill-considered projects—continue. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in answer to a question as to why we had committed follies in Cambodia—$300 million worth and the arms and military training we have given the Cambodians now will be used to help Red China—pointed out that we make mistakes at home, such as in the case of the Dyna-Soar.

The point is that we continue to make the same mistakes in the foreign aid program over and over again. Year after year, we have pointed out the folly of providing military aid to countries that either misuse it for purposes other than mutual security or which could not use it effectively if war came. Yet we keep right on doing it.

Apart from the gross errors in the foreign aid program, which I cited in 3 weeks of debate last month and particularly in my remarks yesterday, I point out also that if we consider the program country by country, and eliminate the countries that should not have foreign aid, we could reduce the present authorization by $2 billion. Those are plain facts.

Consider the new and prosperous countries of Europe, countries made prosperous by our past lavish aid. They are still getting it and should not. Consider Japan in the same category. Consider Taiwan, that little island which has now received $4,500,000 in every form of economic and military aid from us, but which will be defended, if it ever needs defense, by our 7th Fleet.

Consider aggressor nations such as Egypt and Indonesia, which are waging costly wars or preparing to wage them with the funds we supply them to help

their presumably undernourished and unemployed people. Go through the gamut of countries, including the newly independent, into which we rush immediately with our aid, including colonies of mother countries, and into which we have rushed our aid even before they are set free.

The minute a new nation is spawned, we rush in without even knowing what it needs, if indeed it is our obligation to take care of it. Why do we feel compelled to rush in and assist a former colony all over again, the very minute its independence is announced, when we scarce know what would best serve our objectives? Why do we not let the old colonial powers carry over this obligation? We do not require them to contribute their share. We have given aid to British Honduras, British Guiana, and Dutch Guiana while they were still colonies. How can the powers whose colonies they are, be expected ever to assume their responsibilities in assisting our aid programs to the underdeveloped nations seriously when we insist on playing Lady Bountiful in their own bailiwicks?

There is one other aspect I wish to stress. While the debate has been taking place, and with no interruption in the flow of our AID dollars abroad, the domestic aid program, the accelerated public works program which would put our mounting numbers of unemployed Americans to work, is starving for lack of funds. An ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works has been holding hearings this week. Before that committee have appeared Governors, mayors, and State officials to tell of the vast number of useful projects which are processed, approved and ready to go but for which there are no funds. The accelerated public works fund of $900 million—which has done splendid work while it lasted has long since run dry and there will be no replenishment for months.

The contrast between what we do not do for the people at home and what we insist on doing for people abroad is shocking. Such a practice—such a double standard—must stop.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over the years, it has been my feeling that the cause of American freedom and American liberty and their perpetuation would be enhanced, in the never-ending struggle with international communism, by a program under which we would be of assistance, economic and military, to the friendly nations, which desire to maintain their freedom and which would stand with the free nations of the West in opposing the onslaughts of communism in any fashion.

I have supported the foreign aid program. It has not been easy. I wish to reexpress today my bitterness at the cavalier fashion in which the conferees dealt with an amendment I sponsored in the Senate and which was approved by the Senate by a 2 to 1 vote. I wish also to express my supreme dissatisfaction with some of the other amendments which were torn out of the bill as it left the Senate by the conferees of the House and the Senate.

However, I do not care to tear down the temple merely because of a great and inexcusable error which was committed in conference.

Nevertheless, with considerable pain, I shall support the conference report today.

I voice the hope of one humble American that the Government of the United States will stand by the rights of its citizens in the use of the open seas. I express the hope, too, that when a foreign aid bill comes before the Senate again, next year, it will be presented in a far more acceptable fashion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of the adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If the senior Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], 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 Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would vote nay.

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken	Hayden	Moss
Allott	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Anderson	Hill	Nelson
Bartlett	Holland	Neuberger
Bayh	Humphrey	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pearson
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy	Randolph
Case	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Church	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Clark	McCarthy	Scott
Cooper	McGee	Smathers
Dirksen	McGovern	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hart	Monroney	
Hartke	Morton	

NAYS—26

Beall	Johnston	Russell
Bennett	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Tower
Ellender	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—13

Carlson	Goldwater	Robertson
Cotton	Gore	Talmadge
Dominick	Hruska	Walters
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	
Engle	Magnuson	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 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. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. 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 of December 10, 1963, pp. 24268–24273, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on the conference report be limited to 15 minutes to a side, with the rule of germaneness to apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF THE KOOTENAI TRIBE OR BAND OF INDIANS, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2139) to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 2139 is to provide for the distribution of an award to the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians by the Indian Claims Commission. The Senate passed S. 2139 on October 22, 1963.

The House has amended the bill by striking the word "approved." In its report No. 903, accompanying the companion bill H.R. 8527, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs explained its amendment as follows:

H.R. 8527 was amended to provide that the judgment funds may be used only for programs jointly authorized by the tribal governing body and the Secretary of the Interior. In a number of cases on other Indian reservations similar funds have been expended for programs authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary. Instances have been cited wherein recipients have willfully violated the spirit of family planning by purchasing furnishings or equipment for resale at ridiculously low prices. It is hoped that reported loopholes in the present system of using family funds to purchase items which are readily disposed of for cash can be closed.

As the sponsor of S. 2139 in the Senate, the House amendment is satisfactory to me and to other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 2139.

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

The motion was agreed to.

ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations", approved August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986; 25 U.S.C. 309), is amended (1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof immediately after "twenty-four months," the following: "and, for nurses' training, for periods that do not exceed thirty-six months," and (2) by striking out the period at the end of the last sentence in such section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or with any school of nursing offering a three-year course of study leading to a diploma in nursing which is accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Secretary.".

(b) Section 2 of said Act of August 3, 1956, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act the sum of $12,000,000 for each fiscal year, and not to exceed $1,500,000 of such sum shall be available for administrative purposes.".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, S. 1868, as passed by the Senate on August 28, 1963, amended the act of September 22, 1961, entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $7,500,000 to $12 million annually and by increasing the portion of this amount that may be used for administering the program from $1 million to $1,500,000.

The House has amended the Senate bill by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting new language that would enable Indian students to enroll in a nurse training program at accredited schools for 36-month periods. All other vocational training programs would continue to be limited to 24 months. The purpose in extending the time for the training of nurses is to allow them sufficient time to earn certificates as registered nurses. The Public Health Service endorses this proposal, and it is expected that a sizable number of students will take advantage of the extended training period provided by this legislation. The House did not change the authorized appropriations for vocational training, which is increased to $12 million annually.

As the sponsor of S. 1868 in the Senate, the House amendment is satisfactory to me and to other members of the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 1868.

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

The motion was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of 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. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on H.R. 4955 of which part A is the Vocational Education Act of 1963; part B is the extension and amendment of the National Defense Education Act; and part C is the extension of the federally impacted areas legislation Public Laws 815 and 874.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the text of the conference report and the statement of managers on the part of the House relating to this act, together with a table which sets forth on a State-by-State basis the estimated distribution of the funds under section 2 of the conference bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts, statements, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1025)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, 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 to the text of the bill 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:

"PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"Declaration of purpose

"SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and

which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $60,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $118,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $177,500,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $225,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 3. (a) Ninety per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(4) An amount which bears the same ratio to 5 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(d)(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .40 or more than .60, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .60.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) The term 'per capita income' for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"Uses of Federal funds

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

"(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

"(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

"(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

"(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

"(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

"(b) At least 33⅓ per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

"(c) Ten per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

"State plans

"SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

"(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

"(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons

are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

"(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

"(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

"(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

"(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Definitions

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'vocational education' means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

"(2) The term 'area vocational education school' means—

"(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(B) a department of a high school exclusively or principally used for providing vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(D) the department or division of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State of an area of the State designated and approved by the State board, and if, in the case of a school, department, or division described in (C) or (D), it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

"(3) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(4) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

"(5) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(6) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(7) The term 'State board' means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

"(8) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

"(9) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(10) The term 'Vocational Education Act of 1946' means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg).

"(11) The term 'supplementary vocational education Acts' means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

"Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

"SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Committee'), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'). Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4(c) and section 14.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

"(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

"(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

"(c)(1) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

"(2) at least 10 per centum of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) to a State for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment under subsection (a), or both.

"(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

"(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

"Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

"SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out 'of the next eight fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out 'of the next seven fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out 'of the five suceeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

"SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

"(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

"(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

"(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"Work-study program for vocational education students

"SEC. 13. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 15 and determined to be for the purposes of this section for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums so determined for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all of the States in such preceding year.

"(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (b) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such

year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

"(b) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a 'supplementary plan'), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (a) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (c), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

"(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

"(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

"(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

"(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

"(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

"(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

"(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

"(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

"(d) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of noncomformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

"(e) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (a) for such fiscal year.

"(f) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (a).

"(g) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

"Residential vocational education schools

"SEC. 14. For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants, out of sums appropriated pursuant to section — to State boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this section, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

"Authorization for sections 13 and 14

"SEC. 15. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 13 and 14, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year. The Commissioner shall determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of each such section.

"Federal control

"SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

"Short title

"SEC. 17. This part may be cited as the 'Vocational Education Act of 1963'.

"PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"Amendments to title I—General provisions

"SEC. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,' each time it appears therein.

"(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting 'or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner' after the words 'as determined under State law' wherever such words appear in such subsections.

"(c) Subsection (i) of such section 103 is amended by striking out 'does not include' and inserting in lieu thereof 'includes' and by inserting before the period ', except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act'.

"(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school'.

"Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

"SEC. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education'.

"(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out

'$250,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$800,000'.

"(d)(1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting 'or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner' after 'at an institution of higher education'.

"(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting 'or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States' after 'State'.

"(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205 (b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out '1968' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1969'.

"Amendments to title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

"SEC. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b)(1) The third sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965'.

"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year.'

"(c) Section 303(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting 'and published' after 'printed', and (2) by inserting 'of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and' after 'or both, and'.

"(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years'.

"Amendments to title IV—National defense fellowships

"SEC. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 402.', and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine'.

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition.'

"Amendment to title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing

"SEC. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year'.

"(b)(1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'.

"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 502.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.'

"(c)(1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and'.

"(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out 'public secondary schools' and inserting in lieu thereof 'public elementary or secondary schools', and by inserting 'who are not below grade 7' after 'students' in clause (A) thereof.

"(d)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years', and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years', and by inserting before the semicolon ', including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan'.

"(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out 'the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools', and inserting in lieu thereof 'the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools', and by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(e)(1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and to insert in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(2) Such section is further amended to insert 'who are not below grade 7 in elementary or' after 'students', and to insert 'elementary or' after 'counseling or guidance in a public'.

"Amendments to title VI—Language development

"SEC. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years', and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'As used in this section "modern foreign language" includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.'.

"Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

"SEC. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' and after 'auditory aids,'.

"(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions

"SEC. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,'.

"(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Amendments to Public Law 815

"SEC. 31. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1963' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1960–1961' and inserting in lieu thereof '1962–1963'.

"Amendments to Public Law 874

"SEC. 32. Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1963' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 33. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall be effective July 1, 1963."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
PHIL M. LANDRUM,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN H. DENT,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose: The declaration of purpose contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a provision in the Senate amendment which reflected the addition by the Senate amendment of a program to provide part-time employment for certain youths. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the Senate provision in light of the action of the conferees with respect to such Senate program.

Authorization of appropriations: The sums authorized to be appropriated by the House bill and the Senate amendment for the purpose of making grants under this part and sums agreed to in conference are as follows: For the fiscal year 1964, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $45,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $108,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $60,000,000 for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1965, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $90,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $153,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $118,500,000. For the fiscal year 1966, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $135,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $198,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $177,500,000. For the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $180,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $243,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $225,000,000.

Allotment to States: The House bill provided that 95 percent of the annual appropriation should be allotted among the States, and the Senate amendment provided that 85 percent of the annual appropriation should be so allotted and accordingly deleted the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4) (prescribing an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 percent of the annual appropriation as the sum of all the allotments to a State based on age groups bears to such sum for all the States). The substitute agreed to in conference provides that 90 percent of the annual appropriation shall be allotted among the States and accordingly retains the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4).

The allotment formula in the House bill was based on the number of persons in various age groups needing vocational education, and the Senate amendment inserted the factor of per capita income (expressed in terms of an allotment ratio) into the formula and added provisions for determining per capita income and allotment ratios which were to be not less than 0.25 or more than 0.75. The Senate formula, based on both population and per capita income, and the corollary provisions relating to per capita income and allotment ratios are adopted by the substitute with a change in the limits on allotment ratios to a minimum of 0.40 and a maximum of 0.60.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

1. Expenditures for construction: As a corollary to its expanded definition of area vocational education school facilities, the Senate amendment limited expenditure for construction of certain of such facilities to 10 percent of a State's allotment. The House bill contained no comparable limitation. The substitute agreed to in conference deletes such limitation and adopts the language of the House bill.

2. Teacher training: The House bill provided that expenditures made for the training of teachers could be used only for inservice teacher training, while under the Senate amendment expenditures could be made for all types of teacher training. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

3. Required expenditures for vocational training of certain youth and construction: The House bill required that at least 25 percent of a State's allotment be used for the vocational training of youths who have left or graduated from high school or for construction of area vocational education school facilities, or both. The Senate amendment increased this percentage for the first 4 fiscal years to 40 percent. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the percentage figure of 33⅓ for the first 4 fiscal years and provides for 25 percent of such allotment to be so available for each of the subsequent fiscal years.

4. Percentage of annual appropriation available for research and pilot programs: The House bill provided that 5 percent of the annual appropriation was to be used by the Commissioner to make grants for research and pilot programs. The Senate amendment increased such percentage to 15 percent. The conference substitute fixed 10 percent of such appropriation as the amount to be used for grants by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed to in conference adopts a provision of the Senate amendment to make it clear that the Commissioner can make grants to colleges and universities independently of the State boards.

The House bill provided that the Commissioner could make grants to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions as well as State boards, and the Senate amendment limited such grants to colleges and universities and State boards. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the provision of the House bill.

The House bill provided that the cost of certain research and pilot programs could be paid by such grants, and the Senate amendment included the cost of leadership training programs. The substitute agreed to in conference includes the cost of training programs as well as the cost of such research and pilot programs.

The Senate amendment provided that the pilot programs aided by grants from the Commissioner should be directed at the needs of communities with substantial numbers of school dropouts and unemployed youths. The House bill did not provide such a direction, and the substitute agreed to in conference deletes such direction.

State plans: The language of the Senate amendment and the House bill are identical except that the Senate amendment included a statement that the Federal funds were to be made available so that ready access to vocational training will be provided as soon as possible to all persons in all communities of the State. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

Labor standards: The language of the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a technical amendment, made by the Senate amendment, with respect to the Contract Work Hours Standards Act which is adopted in the substitute agreed to in conference.

DEFINITIONS

1. Vocational education: The definition of vocational education contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except that the Senate amendment made clear the inclusion of the training of semiskilled workers, included instructions related to the occupation for which a student is being trained, and deleted the requirement that teacher training be limited to inservice training of teachers. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

2. Area vocational education school: The House bill defines the term "area vocational education school" as a school principally used for vocational training which admits as regular students both persons who have left or completed high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market. The House bill and the Senate amendment require that the training provided by area vocational education schools be available to all residents of a State or a designated area thereof. However, the Senate amendment in an expanded definition enlarged the term from schools principally used for vocational training to: (a) specialized high schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; (b) departments or other units of a high school; (c) technical or vocational schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; and (d) departments or other units of junior colleges, community colleges, or universities. Further, the requirement of availability for full-time study was attached to the schools or departments described in (a), (b), and (c) above, and the requirement relating to the training of both persons who have left or completed high school was attached to the school described in (c) above. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the definition contained in the Senate amendment except that (1) only departments of high schools and only departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities are included in the definition, (2) departments of high schools must be used exclusively or principally for providing vocational training

in no less than five different occupational fields, and departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities must also provide such vocation training, and (3) the requirement as to whom the school must admit applies only to the schools described in (c) and (d) above.

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education: The House bill and Senate amendment are identical except that the Senate amendment provided that the advisory committee was to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the approval of pilot projects aided by grants from the Commissioner of Education and with respect to the program to provide residential vocational education schools. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts: The House bill and the Senate amendment were identical, except that in providing a broader use of funds allotted for training in home economics, the House bill required that at least 25 percent of the funds so allotted be used for training of persons to fit them for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skill in home economics subjects or be transferred to another allotment, or both. The Senate amendment did not contain such a requirement. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the requirement but reduces to 10 percent the percentage of the funds allotted that must be so expended.

Work study programs for vocational education students and residential vocational education schools: The Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to enable local educational agencies to provide part-time employment in public schools and other public agencies to students in full-time attendance in vocational education courses. The bill as it passed the House contained no comparable provision. Further, the Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to demonstrate the feasibility of providing residential schools, particularly in large urban areas with school dropouts and unemployed youths, to provide vocational training to youths who need full-time study on a residential basis to benefits from such training. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts both programs for 4 fiscal years starting with fiscal year 1965. The conference substitute, in section 15, authorizes an appropriation for both of these programs in the following amounts: $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1965, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $35,000,000 for the next 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Commissioner of Education is directed to determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of either program.

In providing authorizations at this level the House conferees expressed the unanimous belief that the District of Columbia metropolitan area should be given the highest priority in the establishment and construction of a residential vocational education school, which belief was concurred in by the Senate conferees in the light of the conference agreement which excluded the District of Columbia as a participant in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate amendment, in part B, provided for a 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 beyond June 30, 1964, its present expiration date, and included a number of amendments. The House bill contained no comparable provision, since this was being considered in committee as a separate piece of legislation. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides for a 1-year extension, to June 30, 1965, with certain amendments. The following statement describes the provision of the Senate amendment and the action recommended with respect thereto by the committee of conference.

Title I—General Provisions: The Senate amendment—

(1) extended the coverage of the act to American Samoa,

(2) permitted teachers in federally operated schools to receive benefits under the act,

(3) extended the benefits of the act to schools, such as laboratory schools and State schools for the deaf, which are under the administrative control and direction of any public institution or agency, even though not considered a part of a local public school system.

The substitute agreed upon in conference includes these provisions.

Title II—Student Loans: Title II of the act, due to expire at the end of fiscal year 1964, was extended by the Senate amendment for a period of 3 years. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also increased the amounts authorized to be appropriated for this title for fiscal years 1964 to $125,000,000 and established an authorization for fiscal year 1965 of $135,000,000. The conference agreement adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) raised the institutional loan ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000.

(2) extended the moratorium on the running of interest and repayment of principal on loans while student borrowers are continuing their higher education, to cover periods during which the borrower attends an approved institution of higher education located outside the United States, and

(3) extended the forgiveness feature, under which up to one-half of a student loan is canceled for service as a public elementary school teacher at the rate of 10 percent for each year of such service, so that such feature would cover teachers in elementary or secondary oversea schools of the Armed Forces.

The conference substitute includes these three changes.

Title III—Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction: The Senate amendment extended the provisions of this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallocate to other States any unneeded State allotments.

(2) broadened the categories of equipment and materials which may be purchased with funds made available by the title to include test-grading equipment, equipment used in connection with audiovisual libraries, and certain published materials such as charts, and maps, all of which are now excluded, and

(3) made certain technical changes in the provisions governing the promulgation of allotment ratios.

The conference substitute includes these first two changes, and, in lieu of the third amendment, provides for the use of the allotment ratio promulgated in 1959 for the distribution of title III funds for 1965.

Title IV—National Defense Fellowships: The Senate amendment extended this title, which provides for a program of graduate fellowships for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reward any graduate fellowship under the act which is vacated before the expiration date of the period for which the fellowship originally was awarded, provides such reawarded fellowship cannot exceed the time period of the original award, and

(2) provided for the payment to institutions of higher education of a flat sum of $2,500 per year, less tuition charged the fellow, to cover the cost of educating fellowship recipients under the act. This payment would be substituted for the variable payment provided under existing law for this purpose.

The conference substitute adopts these two provisions.

Title V—Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) increased the annual authorization of appropriation for grants to the State educational agencies by $2,500,000, from $15,000,000 per year to $17,500,000 per year,

(2) extended the guidance and counseling program to all seventh and eighth grades,

(3) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallot to other States any portion of a State's allotment under this title which is not used,

(4) increased the minimum State allotment from $20,000 to $50,000 under this title,

(5) excluded support of any program of clinical or psychiatric experimental testing.

The conference substitute adopts only the first four of these changes.

Title VI—Language Development: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also authorized institutes for the training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language. The conference substitute includes this change.

Title VII—Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years and authorized support of research and experimentation in the use of printed and published materials. The conference substitute includes the latter of these changes, but extends the title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

Title X—Miscellaneous Provisions: The Senate amendment provided for a 3-year extension of this title. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The Senate amendment, in part C, amended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend the temporary provisions of both laws for 3 years—that is, until June 30, 1966. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends these laws for only 2 years.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) extended the laws to the District of Columbia,

(2) provided that property which is sold by the United States would continue to be considered Federal property for 1 year, and

(3) provided for a comprehensive study of these laws.

The conference substitute does not include any of these provisions.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
PHIL M. LANDRUM,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN H. DENT,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Estimated distribution of funds for vocational education, conference report, H.R. 4955, fiscal years 1964–67 [1]

State	State amount, 1964	State amount, 1965	State amount, 1966	State amount, 1967
United States and outlying parts	$54,000,000	$106,650,000	$159,750,000	$202,500,000
50 States and District of Columbia	52,906,612	104,492,582	156,518,423	198,403,635
Alabama	1,268,414	2,505,166	3,752,464	4,756,645
Alaska	63,180	124,783	186,911	236,930
Arizona	438,040	865,145	1,295,892	1,642,680
Arkansas	669,939	1,323,155	1,981,941	2,512,320
California	3,654,428	7,217,634	10,811,226	13,704,370
Colorado	505,768	998,910	1,496,258	1,896,665
Connecticut	558,543	1,103,143	1,652,387	2,094,575
Delaware	100,897	199,275	298,492	378,370
Florida	1,556,079	3,073,316	4,603,490	5,835,410
Georgia	1,546,666	3,054,725	4,575,642	5,800,110
Hawaii	212,849	420,385	629,691	798,200
Idaho	247,058	487,949	730,894	926,485
Illinois	2,312,227	4,566,737	6,840,472	8,671,020
Indiana	1,407,891	2,780,639	4,165,093	5,279,695
Iowa	857,805	1,694,197	2,537,721	3,216,830
Kansas	677,784	1,338,650	2,005,150	2,541,740
Kentucky	1,163,400	2,297,760	3,441,792	4,362,835
Louisiana	1,214,104	2,397,903	3,591,795	4,552,980
Maine	342,715	676,875	1,013,884	1,285,205
Maryland	839,073	1,657,201	2,482,306	3,146,585
Massachusetts	1,270,573	2,509,430	3,758,850	4,764,740
Michigan	2,184,647	4,314,761	6,463,039	8,192,585
Minnesota	1,051,318	2,076,394	3,110,210	3,942,520
Mississippi	860,873	1,700,256	2,546,798	3,228,335
Missouri	1,248,904	2,466,633	3,694,745	4,683,480
Montana	218,496	431,538	646,396	819,375
Nebraska	$424,284	$837,977	$1,255,197	$1,591,095
Nevada	66,284	130,914	196,094	248,570
New Hampshire	187,582	370,481	554,940	703,445
New Jersey	1,321,132	2,609,286	3,908,424	4,954,340
New Mexico	357,590	706,255	1,057,892	1,340,990
New York	3,691,084	7,290,030	10,919,666	13,841,830
North Carolina	1,863,731	3,680,939	5,513,643	6,989,125
North Dakota	235,587	465,294	696,960	883,470
Ohio	2,633,317	5,200,902	7,790,381	9,875,130
Oklahoma	843,440	1,665,826	2,495,224	3,162,960
Oregon	505,574	998,528	1,495,686	1,895,940
Pennsylvania	3,180,644	6,281,893	9,409,587	11,927,645
Rhode Island	260,056	513,621	769,348	975,230
South Carolina	1,010,796	1,996,362	2,990,331	3,790,560
South Dakota	240,650	475,293	711,937	902,455
Tennessee	1,374,089	2,713,879	4,065,093	5,152,935
Texas	3,327,550	6,572,039	9,844,194	12,478,555
Utah	327,996	647,805	970,341	1,230,010
Vermont	138,908	274,349	410,944	520,915
Virginia	1,508,984	2,980,301	4,464,164	5,658,800
Washington	801,227	1,582,454	2,370,343	3,004,660
West Virginia	700,045	1,382,616	2,071,007	2,625,220
Wisconsin	1,155,150	2,281,465	3,417,384	4,331,895
Wyoming	95,294	188,210	281,917	357,360
District of Columbia	183,947	363,303	544,187	689,815
American Samoa	10,000	17,685	26,491	33,580
Canal Zone	------	------	------	------
Guam	27,119	53,562	80,230	101,700
Puerto Rico	1,043,256	2,060,470	3,086,358	3,912,285
Virgin Islands	13,013	25,701	38,498	48,800

[1] Authorizations of $60,000,000, $118,500,000, $177,500,000, and $225,000,000 for the years 1964–67, respectively. 10 percent of each authorization reserved for grants by the Commissioner of Education. State distribution is based on product of (1) the Federal allotment percentages with limits of 40 percent and 60 percent based on average per capita income for 1959, 1960 and 1961, and (2) the State population (a) aged 15 to 19, (b) aged 20 to 24, (c) aged 25 to 65, plus a distribution on the basis of the total amount received by the State under (a), (b), and (c), above, with a minimum of $10,000.

COST OF H.R. 4955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I should like to stress that the new vocational education program is a permanent program. The work-study and residential school parts of part A are, however, 4-year limited programs. Part B of the bill, which contains the National Defense Education Act extension beyond its current expiration date of June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, is a 1-year extension of that program, and part C of the bill relating to extension of impacted areas legislation from its current expiration date of June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1965, is a 2-year extension of the laws.

I underline these points, Mr. President, so that Senators will understand the import of the cost figures on each part of the bill which I shall now place into the RECORD:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
Vocational education [1]	60.0	163.5	247.5	280
National Defense Education Act	40.0	279.6	------	------
Public Laws 815 and 874	252.8	274.8	------	------
Total	352.8	717.9	247.5	28
Grand total, 4 years	1,598.2			

[1] Includes work-study, residential schools, and the conversion to permanent programs of the practical nurse training and area vocational education programs. The work-study and residential school programs start in operation in fiscal year 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMPROMISE

As a matter of legislative history on the bill and as chairman of the Senate conferees and as chairman of the conference committee, I wish to direct the attention of Senators to that portion of the House managers' report which states:

In providing authorization at this level the House conferees expressed the unanimous belief that the District of Columbia metropolitan area should be given the highest priority in the establishment and construction of a residential vocational education school, which belief was concurred in by the Senate conferees in the light of the conference agreement, which excluded the District of Columbia as a participant in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress.

I wish to indicate to the Senate that the Senate conferees concur fully in this statement. We assured the House conferees we would make this legislative history at this time.

It is a deep source of regret to me, as a member of the Senate District Committee, that we were unable to obtain an agreement to include the District of Columbia this year within the purview of the impacted areas legislation. I was quite candid in conference in indicating that it was my intention to continue to strive to obtain the benefits of the impacted areas laws for the District. We were, however, in a parliamentary situation whereby by yielding on this point, we could accomplish, through the postponement of our objective, a tangible benefit to the metropolitan area of the District through locating in this metropolitan area a residential vocational school.

We were informed that such a school would need to have provided $1 million for the first year, $5 million for the second year, and $2 million a year approximately thereafter for its construction, operation, and maintenance. Establishment of a school of this type in the metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital, in my judgment, will provide the young people of the District serviced by it with an immediate and tangible benefit of lasting value.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT EXTENSION

As a conferee I was naturally disappointed that we were unable to obtain, as in the Senate version, the full 3 year extension of the National Defense Education Act titles, which have demonstrated their value to many areas of American educational endeavor. I am confident, however, that the record made under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will fully justify its further future expansion and extension.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I give my pledge that I will do everything in my power to give prompt consideration to legislation emerging from the other body affecting the National Defense Education Act next session and I have indicated, that, in my judgement, the Senate Labor Committee will also seek to legislate further modifications and amendments to the act designed to strengthen it.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell on the legislative history of this bill to cover two additional points.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING

I should like to refer to section 4(c) where 10 percent of the sums appropriated are, for each fiscal year, reserved to the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges and universities and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State boards, and with the approval of the State board, to local educational agencies, to pay for the costs of research and training programs and of experimental, developmental or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards and agencies, etc.

In the version of the bill passed by the Senate, in this section preceding the word "training" there was the word "leadership." In agreeing to drop from the language of the bill the term "leadership," the Senate conferees did so under the understanding that the word "training" could be broadly construed to include all

types of program operations training, including management, administrative or State leadership training.

The point I wish to make is that, in our view, the Commissioner of Education is to be permitted, under this section, to make grants for the carrying on of short-term institutes which could be attended by a number of prominent vocational educators drawn from various States for the purposes of exchanging program information and the disseminating and interpretation of research findings.

HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

Section 10(c)(2) of the bill, as it came from conference and as it is before the Senate, contains one other compromise, which, although it was resisted during four tough bargaining sessions, finally had to be made. Ten percent of the present home economics money, or about $800,000 a year nationally, must be used in providing home economics training to fit young people for gainful employment. The House bill required that 25 percent of the existing money be used, and to get the conference bill we accepted the concept but at a 10-percent figure.

We wish to make it clear that the 10 percent applies to the State allotment only, however, and it need not mean that it has to be applied in each school. We understand that perhaps this change in the present program can be absorbed in urban areas, if the State so desires, leaving the rural schools untouched.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS AND STAFF

In closing, Mr. President, again I wish to express to each of my colleagues on the Senate side in these difficult negotiations my deep and sincere appreciation for the support they have given me in accomplishing our objective of bringing back to the Senate a conscionable compromise fully deserving Senate support. The other day, I paid tribute, by name, to a number of my colleagues. On this occasion I wish particularly to thank the very distinguished and able Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the equally able and distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and my wonderful friend from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

I again wish to emphasize that the signing of the conference report would never have come to pass, had I not received unfailing cooperation from my great chairman, Senator HILL, and from our Republican colleagues, Senators JAVITS and PROUTY. Unfortunately, Senator GOLDWATER could not be present at all our deliberations, but his very capable staff assistants, Minority Counsel Michael J. Bernstein and Associate Minority Counsel Raymond D. Hurley were very helpful to us.

Technical assistance from the Office of Education, provided through Dr. Peter Muirhead and his associates, Dr. Samuel Halperin and Mr. Gordon Ambach, and particularly the statistical work of Mr. Kenneth Simon and his associates, was invaluable to the conferees in reaching our compromise agreements.

I have already expressed my appreciation to Mr. Stewart McClure, chief clerk of the committee, and to Mr. Charles Lee, professional staff member of the subcommittee, for their help to us in the conference proceedings.

I am particularly indebted to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for having made available to me in this conference the services of Mr. Donald Baker, legislative counsel for the Labor Subcommittee who in the last conference meetings stepped into the breach created when the counsel of the full committee, Mr. Jack Forsythe, became ill.

Mr. President, I know I speak for each of my colleagues when I say that we are all deeply appreciative of the sterling work of Mr. Forsythe and that we wish him a speedy recovery.

In concluding, Mr. President, I wish to say that in my judgment the conference compromise is sound legislation which has accepted, in principle, vitally important parts of the President's June 19 message and that its enactment and operation will materially strengthen in the decades ahead our great educational system in this country. It deserves and should have the support of the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from West Virginia would like to ask me a question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Under the provisions of H.R. 4955, section 8, part (1), as agreed to by the conferees, could the State of West Virginia or the State of Oregon or any other State enter into a contract with a private school to provide vocational education?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "yes."

The bill provides that "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency. Thus, a State board or local educational agency may arrange for vocational or technical training or retraining under contract with a private school insofar as the Federal law is concerned.

I should like to note, however, that this bill is designed to assist the States in strengthening, improving, and expanding their existing programs of vocational education so that persons of all ages and all communities might have the opportunity to obtain training suited to their needs and interests and their ability to benefit from such training. The matter of whether any arrangement for training or retraining under this bill should be made under contract with a private school in a particular State will, of course, be determined by, or under policy established by the State board of vocational education.

I wish to stress that, because we have been careful to protect the State prerogatives throughout the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the clarification and the assurance given by the Senator from Oregon. Before taking my seat, I wish to state that not only is the Senate fortunate, but also the Congress and the country are fortunate to have the leadership of the Senator from Oregon as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, in bringing to fruition this most important measure.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I paid a very deserved tribute to the Senator's help in my earlier remarks.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for his help and for his strong effort to keep in this bill my amendment to provide a 1-year grace period during which communities would continue to receive federally impacted area funds at the existing level, when the Federal Government sells its facilities to a private company.

He and his fellow Senate conferees did their best, I know, and I understand it was not until the final stages of the conference that they receded because of the necessity to do so in order to insure congressional approval of the bill this year.

Certainly I do not quarrel with this decision. H.R. 4955 is too important a bill to hold up because agreement cannot be reached on one or two amendments which relate to only one aspect of the legislation.

Because H.R. 4955 would greatly expand our vocational education effort, extend the National Defense Education Act, and also extend for 2 years Federal assistance to school districts with a large number of Federal employees living and working in them, I think it is probably the most important education bill we have considered this year.

Congress has not distinguished itself this year in the number of important bills approved and I have been critical of our record. But I think we can point with pride to the record we have made in the field of education.

Earlier this week we gave final approval to a program of aid to higher education. And already on the statute books is the program of assistance for the construction of medical, dental, and other health professions teaching facilities.

So the vocational education bill is our third major education bill and I certainly have no intention of holding up final congressional approval.

I regret that my amendment is no longer in the bill, since its passage would have benefited Groton and about 20 other towns in southeastern Connecticut.

A difficult problem was created in these communities when the Federal Government sold some facilities to the Electric Boat Co. Even though workers continued to perform the same tasks as before, the fact that they work for a private company rather than the Federal Government means that they are not counted as previously in connection with allotting funds to the school districts.

And this situation was made unusually severe because the sale of the property took place during the school year, after the school budget and plans for the year had been adopted.

In terms of dollars, approval would have meant approximately $250,000 for Groton and about $100,000 for the other towns affected by the sale. This is a substantial amount of money for any

small school district to lose. And it has been lost because of the lapse of time between the sale of the property and the payment of taxes by the private company.

My amendment would have bridged this gap, not only for the communities in Connecticut but also those in any other State where a similar situation develops.

This is a definite weakness in the two impacted areas programs, as the Senator from Oregon knows, and I hope he will have an opportunity to look into this and other impacted areas problems next year.

The announcement this week that a number of military installations will be closed down emphasizes the need for a thorough study of both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. Perhaps the areas that will be affected by the closing of these installations will need help similar to what we have tried to provide for my State, to ease somewhat the transition period.

The able Senator from Oregon knows much more about this subject than I, however, and I am not trying to advise him on how to do the job that he has been doing so well for a number of years now.

Mostly, in speaking today, I wanted to thank him for his efforts. I know I speak for thousands of my constituents in southeastern Connecticut when I say that we are grateful to him for trying to help out.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I also wish to join the Senator from West Virginia in the very properly stated compliments to the Senator from Oregon for his outstanding work on this legislation.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much. We did our best. We tried to split the amendments, when we saw we could not get both. We tried to secure your language on Public Law 874. We ran into an adamant position on the part of the House. The House conferees would not accept even this. We did our best. I am sorry we failed the Senator. It was not because we did not try.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated that the program will be permanent as to the area vocational schools defined in section 8 of the bill, but that the residential vocational school program is for 4 years only.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know how the area vocational schools to be provided under the bill would differ from those under the program we now have for vocational education throughout the United States, on a matching basis?

Mr. MORSE. The curriculum could be considerably enlarged. We are expanding the program under the bill, so that such schools could train students in many more skills than under the existing programs. That is an important difference. With respect to home economics subjects, for example, we can expand the training of young women into commercial fields of home economics in convalescent care establishments or motel operation. Under the new definition typing, filing, and other business work can now be offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would this new work be carried on in the vocational schools which have been operated on a matching basis by the States with Federal funds?

Mr. MORSE. The new programs will not need to be matched in fiscal year 1964, unless the State wishes them in that year to be devoted to construction of the area vocational schools. If the State plans to use the 1964 funds for construction, then the Federal money must be matched. Funds in fiscal year 1965 and thereafter must be matched on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. The residential schools, as I understand, will be constructed entirely with Federal funds.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will be in the nature of boarding schools.

Mr. MORSE. They will be residential. That does not mean the schools will be prevented from permitting so-called day students.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. The primary object will be to take in students from various parts of the State and permit them to board at the school if they so desire.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, particularly from the urban areas of high unemployment in this age group. I wish to stress that we are dealing with a category of young people of the ages of 15 to 21 years who, by the thousands, come from crowded slums where the home environment, if it can be called a home, makes it impossible for them to obtain an education. Many of them almost literally live on the streets since they have no other place to go. They constitute a great educational challenge because of their economic and social problems. By enrolling them into the residential schools we can help them to salvage themselves for gainful employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Insofar as those residential schools are concerned, will they be on a matching basis in any way, or will the Federal Government bear the entire expense?

Mr. MORSE. The Federal grants will be given to the State boards or to colleges and universities, to construct and operate these schools. The funds will be administered by the State boards or these other local agencies I have mentioned, though they will be Federal funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. No area vocational schools will be constructed entirely from Federal funds—only the residential schools?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The area vocational school construction is on a matching basis. The residential school is all Federal grant funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many residential schools would be provided for over the period of 4 years?

Mr. MORSE. We are authorizing funds for a program which could, as an experiment, establish not more than five residential schools. We estimate for each a cost of about $1 million planning money, $5 million for construction, and $2 million for operation and maintenance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of Senators? I should like to request an extension of the time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if no Senator desires to speak in opposition, the 15 minutes allotted to the opposition are available.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to answer the Senator from Louisiana further.

We really are not specifying the number of schools. We are only saying that not more than five can be built under the amount of money we would allow. We would allow over the 4-year period $60 million for this purpose. It would not be possible to build more than five schools.

We are making a legislative record, without earmarking the funds in the bill, because it would be subject to a point of order in the House if we earmarked them; that the first one of these residential schools, under the bill, should be in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to these five schools, the funds necessary to construct them will be furnished by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the operation will be furnished by the Federal Government? Teachers and all the equipment will be paid for by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but they will be administered by the State school boards.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wanted to make the differentiation in this new program of vocational education. As I understand, for these experimental schools all the money will be put up by the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, they will be operated under the jurisdiction of the school board under which the school may be constructed.

Mr. MORSE. The State board, the local school board with the approval of the State board, or by the college or university to which the grant is given.

Mr. ELLENDER. All students who boarded there would be boarded at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, indirectly through the grant money to the operator of the establishment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. There are two points about the bill that should be clarified for the legislative record. There are two provisions for training. One provision is contained in section 4(a)(6), which relates to activities of the States. One provision is contained in subsection (c) of section 4, which relates to activities of the Commissioner.

Is it the understanding of the Senator in charge of the conference report on the floor that the Commissioner could administer his relationship to both provisions together—in short, that he may,

within the confines of one program, bring about discharge of the responsibility under the allotment for training, as well as the training activities which would be financed under section 6?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "yes."

Mr. JAVITS. The work-study programs contained in section 13, for both residential and nonresidential students, was one of the very difficult points for settlement by the conference. It was settled by providing a lump sum for the use of the program, provided that it should be experimental and be conducted by the administrator.

I wish to impress on my colleagues that when we said "experimental," we meant experimental. We said there would be no expectation of building a new hierarchy of people or functions or institutions which we would be compelled to continue because we had so much in it, whether it worked or not. We said that the purpose was to find out what was the best plan. If it was ascertained in less than 4 years, that was fine; the Department would make the recommendation. But the purpose was to determine what was the best program.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. We also stressed that the money should be spent for the benefit of the students, and that none of the money should be spent to build up unnecessary administrative cost. As the Senator has pointed out, these are experimental programs with a time ceiling of 4 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator. This was one of the hardest fought conferences that I have ever participated in, or have seen.

It would be most unfair to conclude action without paying tribute to my beloved colleague [Mr. MORSE], who carried it through not only with consummate skill, but often against his convictions, in order to bring about results. The people of the country owe him a great debt in that regard.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who joined us in conference, did great good. There were times when he had to subordinate his deep convictions in order to arrive at a result, which was accomplished both on the Senate side and the House side.

Mr. MORSE. I have already stated my appreciation for the great support of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on the bill. Without their support there would have been no bill. This particular subject was really a compromise. It was only through the ingenuity and skill of the Senator from New York in suggesting the common funding of the two programs and the wonderful cooperation of the Senator from Vermont in resolving the area vocational school definitions problem that we were able to arrive at the point of agreement which made it possible to have a bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from New York.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent. He asked me to place a statement in the RECORD relative to the Goldwater amendment, which was dropped in conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on that subject, prepared by the Senator from Arizona.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER ON THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4955

The conference report on vocational education now before this body stands as a testament to the vigorous, resolute, and tireless efforts at the bargaining table of the Senate conferees, headed by my good friend and colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

I think it would be helpful to review briefly the course of the vocational education bill through the legislative mill culminating in the conference report now under discussion. H.R. 4955, as passed by the House on August 6, authorized a total of $630 million over the first 5 years for expanding and upgrading vocational education. When the bill reached the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee it underwent major surgery and in lieu of reporting out the House-approved bill, the committee adopted a substitute containing the following important elements:

1. A permanent program expanding and upgrading vocational education at a cost of $945 million over the first 5 years (in contrast to the $630 million approved by the House);

2. A 5-year program of grants for the construction of residential vocational education schools costing $180 million;

3. A 5-year program of grants for work study for vocational education students totaling $310 million;

4. A 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act together with certain amendments; and

5. A 3-year extension of Public Laws 815–874 (Federal Impacted Areas Act).

In this form, the Senate, on October 8, passed H.R. 4955 with a total authorization of $1.645 billion for new programs.

On November 8, after several unproductive meetings, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House conferees, addressed a memorandum to Senator MORSE, chairman of the conference, stating the position of the House conferees on the disagreements existing between the Senate and House versions of H.R. 4955. In general, the House conferees agreed to a compromise figure for vocational education, a deletion of the residential schools and work-study programs, a 1-year extension of the National Defense Education Act, and a 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. In response to this memorandum, Senator MORSE, on December 3, countered with a statement outlining the position of the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees, while offering slight concessions here and there, stood firm, with one exception, for every part of the substitute approved by the Labor Committee and adopted by the Senate.

The only feature of the Senate proposal on which the Senate conferees were willing to recede was contained in the amendments to the National Defense Education Act. The Morse memorandum of December 3 stated, "A 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act titles is proposed with Senate amendments in all titles adopted, except the testing restriction in title V which would be dropped."

This amendment, which the Senate conferees were so willing to drop, prohibited the use of any funds appropriated for guidance, counseling and testing under title V of the National Defense Education Act, "for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any questions in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested." This amendment has now been referred to as the Goldwater amendment, inasmuch as I offered a similar amendment to a bill amending the National Defense Education Act 2 years ago, although I had nothing to do with its inclusion in the Senate bill on this occasion. As a matter of fact, my amendment of 2 years ago would have prohibited personal and psychological testing of school children only without prior parental consent and therefore was not as restrictive as the Senate amendment to H.R. 4955.

Up to the time of the Morse memorandum to the House conferees, there had been no discussion in the conference concerning the so-called Goldwater amendment. To my knowledge, there had not been any indication on the part of the House conferees that this amendment was not acceptable.

It is strange indeed that the Senate conferees were so eager to sacrifice one of their own proposals, especially in view of the fact that there had been no demand made by the other side for its deletion. It is even stranger when it is realized that the testing amendment, which was approved unanimously by the committee majority, was included in the committee substitute on their initiative, not mine, and was substantially identical to the amendment I had offered in 1961 and which the same majority had then rejected.

There is no doubt in my mind that an impartial observer, comparing the House bill with the Senate substitute, will come to the conclusion that the Senate conferees were victorious over their House counterparts in all major conference battles with the exception of the testing amendment, and there, strangely enough, the battle was never joined because even before the House had the opportunity to accept or reject, the Senate conferees forsook the battle and gave up the fight without a shot being fired.

Once again I wish to pay tribute to the Senate conferees for the magnificent job they did in carrying out the will of the Senate on vocational education. My only regret is that the same dogged determination exhibited by them in behalf of the other provisions of the Senate bill could not have been employed to rescue the testing amendment from the cutting room floor to which it was so disdainfully assigned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] was not present, he was more helpful than many may realize. His representative, Mr. Bernstein, was present.

Although the Senator from Arizona had made it clear that he would vote against the bill, as to the Goldwater amendment, on which the Senate conferees receded, I wish only to say that the regulations of the Federal authorities do not permit Federal financing of the type of test the Senator from Arizona sought to prevent in S. 2345 of the 87th Congress. Furthermore, the States have the authority to conduct the testing they wish to conduct with their own funds. Therefore, the States themselves could ban such tests if they so desire but they could not be prevented by Federal action from financing such tests as they find helpful in their local and State-supported testing programs.

We believe we have a good compromise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement dated November 4, 1963, issued by the Office of Education relating to this question, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT ON PURPOSES, IMPLEMENTATION, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE V–A, NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Title V–A of the National Defense Education Act authorizes grants to State educational agencies to assist them to establish and maintain programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. States participate under this part of National Defense Education Act in accordance with a State plan approved by the Commissioner of Education which sets forth—

1. a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

2. a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

Programs under State plans are conducted under administrative policies and interpretations, promulgated on the advice of the General Counsel, which assure that the intent of the act is carried out. These policies specify that "testing" as used in the act means the use of only those tests which measure abilities from which aptitudes for the individual's educational development validly may be inferred. Further clarification of testing acceptable under the act is made in a policy bulletin which states:

"The purposes of section 503(a) of the act and the regulations would preclude expenditures for tests, scales, inventories, or other devices for the collection of information relative to the student's social, moral, spiritual, or family values, relationships, or adjustments. Consequently, there can be no Federal financial participation, either under National Defense Education Act testing or National Defense Education Act guidance and counseling programs, in the costs of information collecting devices designed for the above purposes and commonly referred to as:

"1. Personality tests, inventories, or checklists.

"2. Personal or social adjustment tests, inventories, or checklists.

"3. Projective techniques."

H.R. 4955, as passed by the Senate on October 8, amends subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of the National Defense Education Act to read as follows:

"(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades to other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program: *Provided*, That no such program shall provide for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any question in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested."

In clarification of this language, the committee report on H.R. 4955 (S. Rept. No. 553, Oct. 1, 1963), page 19, reads as follows:

"While the testing program is being extended to the seventh and eighth grades, the committee has added a provision to assure that this program will be concerned with academic achievement and intelligence tests, thus excluding specifically clinical or psychiatric experimental tests."

In the light of this committee commentary and our own interpretation of the proposed amendment we wish to make it clear that the only change in the existing testing program which would be effectuated by enactment of the amendment is that all seventh and eighth grade students, whether in public elementary or secondary schools, would be eligible to participate in the testing program. So-called personality tests, now excluded by our policy interpretations from financial participation under the National Defense Education Act testing program would continue to be excluded, now by virtue of the amended statute. Aptitude and achievement tests, now eligible for purchase under the program, would continue to be supported. The guidance and counseling portions in section 503(a)(2) would also be unaffected since the proposed amendment clearly applies only to the testing programs carried on under section 503(a)(1) of the act. Further, the type of tests excluded from Federal financial participation may, of course, be used by the States and local educational agencies in testing programs other than those supported under title V–A of the National Defense Education Act. Finally, we understand that the proposed amendment, which precludes Federal payment for the conduct of certain specified tests, "or the asking of any question in connection therewith," refers only to questions contained in tests administered under the act. The amendment imposes no restrictions upon the questions asked by guidance counselors in their interview situations with students who are being advised with a view toward the selection of "courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes and skills" or who are being encouraged "to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions."

Thus, as we review the potential impact of the proposed amendment upon the guidance, counseling and testing programs supported under title V–A, we conclude that existing State plan programs would continue to operate as they presently do under the administrative interpretations of the Department.

However, notwithstanding his conclusion, it seems highly desirable that the proposed statutory prohibition—a prohibition not contained in the administration's legislative program outlined in S. 580—of types of tests and questions be deleted in the pending bill, H.R. 4955. This recommendation is based upon numerous communications addressed to the Department, the majority of which reveal widespread alarm and confusion as to the intent and effect—actual and potential—of the proposed amendment. For example, it has been stated by leading educational and psychological authorities that the proposed amendment would greatly inhibit much-needed educational research into such areas as the role of sociological and psychological factors in determining educational achievement or failure to achieve.

In view of the fact that (1) the instant amendment does not produce an effect beyond that now brought about by our policy interpretations, (2) has been widely construed as congressional condemnation and restriction of the existing title V–A programs, and (3) could, in the opinion of responsible educational leaders, result in impairment of the vital functions of research in improving educational quality and opportunity, we would strongly recommend deletion of the proposed statutory prohibitions in section 503(a)(1).

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for their kind references to me. The Senator from Oregon has been our leader on this vocational education bill. His patience, courage, and skill are in large measure the chief reason we are about to enact a significant piece of legislation. He deserves the highest praise from all people of the country who are really interested in this greatly needed and highly desirable program. In this endeavor the Senator from New York was a valued and skillful ally. Mr. President, I believe the compromise reached by the conferees is much better than either the House or Senate version of the bill. True, there are some provisions in the compromise with which I am not entirely sympathetic, but overall, it is an excellent proposal.

Vermont is the winner under the vocational education program agreed upon in conference.

The formula by which funds are distributed to the States will be based on per capita income rather than population and that makes all the difference in the world to Vermont.

At my suggestion the original House-passed bill, which had a population formula, was amended in the Senate to take into account per capita income. There was a hard protracted fight about the issue in the Senate-House conference but we won out in the end.

The table I shall read shows how much money Vermont will get under the per capita income formula approved by the conference and how Vermont would have been penalized under the House formula.

	Conference report	House formula	Difference
1964	$138,908	$119,931	$18,977
1965	274,349	236,863	37,486
1966	410,944	354,795	56,149
1967	520,915	449,740	71,175
Aggregate	1,345,116	1,161,329	183,787

Vermont won out also on the matter of area vocational schools. The State wishes to use and expand existing regular high school facilities for its vocational schools that will be set up to serve various regions of Vermont. Such a plan would have been ineligible for assistance under the House bill but my amendment to take care of the problem was accepted by the Senate-House conference with a minor technical change.

In addition, the conference accepted my proposal, previously approved in the Senate, that training be given for semi-skilled as well as skilled occupations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Senate-House conference increased the amounts authorized for student loans and this should help many Vermont students who are in need of financial aid.

There has already been made available to Vermont $333,587 for student aid during the current fiscal year. The bill would increase that allotment by approximately $130,000.

The bill would authorize for fiscal 1965 an allotment to Vermont of $500,380 for student loans.

Even with these proposed increases all of Vermont's needs will not be met. I understand that approximately $650,000 is the amount that could be utilized.

Science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in Vermont will be eligible for aid to the extent of $211,067 for fiscal 1965 if the full amount authorized is appropriated.

The bill would also help Vermont guidance counseling and testing activities. It increases the State's allotment from $20,000 to $50,000.

Many of the changes I have spoken of which benefit Vermont were achieved over the vigorous objections of the wealthy more heavily populated States. Adjustments were made, however, in other portions of the bill to take special account of their problems. I refer to the work study and residential school provisions.

Each week new machines and new production methods take away jobs from 35,000 people. There is a technological revolution going on and we cannot stop it even if we were backward enough to want to do so.

This bill takes account of that revolution and of the fact that over the next 5 years we must create over 16 million new jobs. If we fail to accomplish this objective unemployment will rise to more than 7 percent of the labor force.

When I addressed the Vermont Legislature on March 28, 1963, I spoke about the need to provide education and jobs for a new age.

The bill we are about to approve is an important step toward the solution of this challenging problem.

In closing may I say a word or two about our staff lieutenants who paved the way toward a sound and well-written bill. Charlie Lee of the majority staff of the committee has been an endless fount of information and reliable guidance. Our minority staff members, Ray Hurley and Mike Bernstein, especially, have been of great help at all times, and I am grateful for their outstanding assistance.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in consideration of this conference report, I call attention to the new part of the National Defense Education Act program on the educational system of Montana during the last 5 years. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIVE-YEAR REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT—STATE OF MONTANA

The National Defense Education Act authorizes Federal assistance for student loans and graduate fellowships, for technical education, for the expansion of guidance, counseling, and testing of students, for the strengthening of education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, for the improvement of communications media for educational purposes, and for strengthening educational statistical services.

Enacted originally for a 4-year period, the National Defense Education Act was extended by the Congress last year for an additional 2 years. As the programs under the act go into their sixth year of operation, the Office of Education reported these achievements:

STUDENT LOANS

About 2,000 students in nine colleges and universities borrowed approximately $1,308,767 under the student loan program in Montana.

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Awards were made to 59 graduate students for study at Montana State College and Montana State University. About one-half of the $674,787 so far expended or obligated under this program has gone to the fellows for stipends and allowances; the remainder to participating graduate schools, to help cover the costs of the programs in which these scholars are studying.

During the 1963 fiscal year, 12 students received awards for study beginning in 1963–64. These fellows are enrolled in five new or expanded graduate programs at Montana State College and Montana State University.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Approximately 194 new technicians have completed training in Montana under the area vocational program of the National Defense Education Act. This program is designed to help meet the demand for highly skilled manpower in electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical fields.

Four hundred sixty-nine youths and adults were enrolled during the school year 1962–63, of whom 198 were students in 2- and 3-year preparatory programs, and 271 were working adults in upgrading and refresher courses. These estimated numbers represent an increase of 53 over enrollments for the previous school year.

The number of participating institutions has increased from 2 in 1959 to 11 in 1963.

The Federal Government has contributed about $41.3 million to this program for salaries and equipment, of which $96,308 went to the State of Montana. States and communities on a national average have overmatched Federal dollars by about two to one. Montana has contributed $104,496 to the National Defense Education Act training since 1959.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Federal grants totaling approximately $257,000 for local guidance programs made possible a significant increase in the State total of full-time school counselors. The number has risen from 39 in 1958, to 57 in 1963. During this same period, from 1959 to 1963, more than 315,000 scholastic aptitude and achievement tests were given with the help of Federal funds, to public secondary school students and 1,389 to nonpublic secondary school students.

By the end of the summer of 1963, more than 120 secondary school counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors had attended 5 special institutes to improve their capabilities in counseling and guidance at a cost of $206,000.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

During the 5-year period, about $884,000 in Federal funds has been paid to Montana on a 50-50 matching basis for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in public elementary and high schools. In addition, loans totaling approximately $8,700 have been made to private elementary and secondary schools.

Language laboratories in public secondary schools have increased from none in 1958 to 32 at the end of the 1963 fiscal year. During the same period, more than 1,500 local public school projects have been approved for the acquisition or remodeling of equipment and materials for instruction in these subjects.

Montana now employs two specialists supervisors in these subjects at the State agency level as contrasted with none before the act was passed.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (FIRST TIME 1960)

Over 260 elementary and secondary school language teachers had attended 5 modern foreign language institutes by the end of the summer of 1963. About $394,102 has been obligated since 1960 for this activity, including $87,859 for an institute conducted during the summer of 1963 at Montana State College, enrolling 60 secondary school teachers of German.

IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES

Montana has received $139,746 under title X since the beginning of the program. In 1963 the State received $50,000, the maximum limit for any State. With the aid of Federal funds the Montana Department of Public Instruction has developed a system of automatic data processing. Steps have been taken to begin processing of teacher certification data by developing a master file from existing certification records. Plans are underway to cordinate classroom unit assistance data and instruction data. Procedures for State reimbursement for schoolbus transportation are presently handled with the new equipment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL, ENLARGEMENT AND EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT ARE GREAT FORWARD STEPS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are approaching the end of a congressional session which has seen more different legislation beneficial to education enacted than any other single session in our history. In this 1st session of the 88th Congress, we have passed the first Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the higher education construction bill, and now are approaching final congressional action on the so-called vocational education bill of 1963, which also includes extensions and broadening of the National Defense Education Act and the aid to federally impacted school districts. This is a mighty record of accomplishment in this the 1st session of the 88th Congress. This progress can be credited to the two leaders of our Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in education and health matters: the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose dedication and skill and tact and patience have kept the legislative gears grinding away. They have written a whole new chapter in the history of the advancement of American education this year.

We have before us the conference report on H.R. 4955, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which is basically the same bill as passed by the Senate October 8. Not much of substance has been lost in conference with the House; as a conferee on the bill I can testify to the skill with which the Senator from Oregon has worked to this result.

This program is still a major addition to this country's vocational education programs. It will provide great impetus toward providing our economy with the

skilled individuals it needs, while helping individuals attain space age skills that are in demand. Essential provisions of the Senate bill were retained that allow experimental programs in new federally built residential vocational schools and in new experimental work-study programs. The overall cost of the program was reduced somewhat in the conference, but not its authorization of new ways of approaching our vocational education needs.

A 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 is authorized by the bill. This is not so long as the 3-year period I had wished, but it will allow the many school districts so vitally affected by this program to plan ahead for a period.

The National Defense Education Act extension will be of tremendous value. The improvements in the National Defense Education Act that the Senate bill called for were retained in the conference. Under this bill there will be a substantial increase in the student loans available, an increase clearly called for by student needs. The increase in dollar amount is more than 33⅓ percent over last year. Under this enlarged loan authorization—up to $125 million a year—250,000 students a year will be able to stay in college who would not otherwise be there. Study courses have been broadened in some respects, and the amount authorized to be loaned in one installation has been raised to workable size.

This has been a long hard year in Washington. One consolation we may take from the year is the record Congress has made in education legislation; there we have been a "do something" Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the conference report has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], 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 Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken	Hartke	Moss
Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bennett	Inouye	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Pell
Boggs	Javits	Prouty
Brewster	Johnston	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Russell
Cannon	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kuchel	Scott
Case	Long, La.	Simpson
Church	Mansfield	Smathers
Clark	McClellan	Smith
Cooper	McGee	Sparkman
Dirksen	McGovern	Stennis
Dodd	McIntyre	Symington
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Morse	
Hart	Morton	

NAYS—4

Curtis	Thurmond	Tower
Eastland		

NOT VOTING—14

Cotton	Gore	McCarthy
Dominick	Hruska	Robertson
Edmondson	Lausche	Talmadge
Engle	Long, Mo.	Walters
Goldwater	Magnuson	

So the report was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Reserve training," 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.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Retired pay," 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.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Operating expenses," 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.

CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a telegram from the President of the Senate of Belgium, expressing condolence on the death of President John F. Kennedy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a tribute to the late President Kennedy, offered in the National Assembly of Ghana on November 26, 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON OVERPRICING OF MODIFICATION KITS UNDER CONTRACT WITH GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpricing of modification kits for interrogator sets under fixed-price contract with General Instrument Corp., Newark, N.J., Department of the Army, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON HIGH COSTS PERTAINING TO ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN SITES FOR SELECTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the high costs pertaining to acquisition of sites for selected low-rent housing projects in the eight-State area administered by the New York Regional Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF DEFENSE LENDING, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

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

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

REPORT ON SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING

A letter from the Assistant Surgeon General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Second National Conference on Public Health Training, August 19–22, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two resolutions adopted by the Town Council of Buckley, and the Buckley Chamber of Commerce, both in the State of Washington, favoring the inclusion of funds for the Port of Tacoma project in the public works appropriation bill; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the designation of November 22 as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2214. A bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association (Rept. No. 779); and

H.R. 7406. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 777).

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

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 778).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2384. A bill 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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2385. A bill to permit States, in the administration of State plans for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to titles I or XVI of the Social Security Act, to cooperate with volunteer nonprofit health insurance groups or associations for the purpose of facilitating coverage by such health insurance of individuals who might also be eligible for medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 2386. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2387. A bill for the relief of Jacques Maseri and his wife, Adela Maseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 2388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

EXPLORATION PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF NEW MINERALS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a proposed bill submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior to amend the act of August 21, 1958, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior in explanation of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The committee has already received suggested amendments to this proposal. The bill as introduced will be considered only as a draft on which hearings can be held. Efforts will be made to report a measure which is in the best interests of the mining industry.

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

The bill (S. 2384) 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, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill 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.

It is recommended that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The present exploration program authorized under the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), has now been in operation for several years. As a result of the experience gained during this period, we are proposing amendments in order to carry out two objectives: (1) to make the program more effective; and (2) to make it easier to administer.

The proposed legislation amends the existing law in the following respects:

1. It changes the method of providing assistance for exploration and related development loans.

Under existing law assistance is provided by a loan program which provides for repayment of the loan, plus interest, only out of 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the production in the area described in the contract, for a period not exceeding 25 years. The proposed change would convert this method to a program analagous to a joint venture where: (1) the United States and the applicant pay equal amount of the exploration and related development costs, and (2) the U.S. shares in the profits by receiving periodic royalty payments, for a mandatory period of 25 years, of 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the production in the area specified in the contract, subject to a refund of any amount in excess of 50 percent of the net operating profits, determined at the end of each taxable year. Since there will be no loan there will be no interest. This change also eliminates any need for the present requirement that the applicant must furnish evidence that funds from commercial sources are unavailable on reasonable terms.

The bill contains an expanded definition of "related development" and that term is carefully defined. The whole concept of the change is to provide liberalization of the program.

Justification: While the present program has provided incentive, its effectiveness has been reduced considerably by an interest charge that at times has been 6½ percent. This rate of interest added to operator costs acts as a deterrent to long-range projects which necessarily carry a high risk element and keeps many operators from participating in the program because it represents a fixed claim on a goodly part of the potential profit for many ventures. On the other hand there is no opportunity for the Government, when participating in the financing of these necessarily risky ventures to share more fully in the profits of highly successful enterprises. Elimination of this interest charge and its replacement by a concept analagous to a joint venture, plus expansion of the definition "related development" would be more suitable in the area of minerals exploration, and should provide greater incentive for far more operators to participate in the program.

2. It raises the single contract limitation from $250,000 to $500,000.

Justification: The present $250,000 limitation prevents the Office of Minerals Exploration program from being responsive to modern-day needs. Practically all of the low-cost, surface mineral occurrences have long since been found. This means that nearly all of the future ore discoveries of significant size will be found below the surface. To find them will require expensive geophysical and geochemical surveys to indicate favorable areas for surface drilling, which alone is an expensive item. If drilling be successful, it is usually followed by very expensive shaft sinking, drifting, and crosscutting, the overall cost of which increases geometrically with increased depth. In many cases, single exploration projects involve millions of dollars. Raising the limit will get a project to the stage where normal financial arrangements can be made.

3. The term "exploration" is redefined and the term "related development" is newly defined.

Justification: There is no clear-cut authority for exploration by air under the present act. As revised, the authority is expressly

set forth. The new definition of "related development" will permit liberalization of the program.

4. It provides for annual rather than semiannual reports to the Congress.

The estimated cost and personnel data required by 5 U.S.C. 642a are not enclosed because no determination has been made that such costs will exceed $1 million for each of the first 5 years. If such determination is made we will furnish the required data at a later date.

This report was prepared in collaboration with the Treasury Department and is endorsed by them.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Social Security Act, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2385) to permit States, in the administration of State plans for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to titles I or XVI of the Social Security Act, to cooperate with volunteer nonprofit health insurance groups or associations for the purpose of facilitating coverage by such health insurance of individuals who might also be eligible for medical assistance for the aged, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this bill would amend present law to make it possible, but not mandatory, for any State in its medical assistance for the aged program to allow older persons to have the full benefits of both prepaid health insurance and medical assistance for the aged.

This is accomplished by allowing an otherwise eligible aged person to obtain for himself health insurance supplementing the benefits available to him under his State's medical assistance for the aged program, with the assurance that those benefits will not thereby be reduced.

Under existing provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, if an aged person has resources in excess of those exempted by his State for his ordinary living costs—no matter how small those additional resources may be—his medical-assistance-for-the-aged benefits otherwise payable are reduced by the amount of such excess. Furthermore, if he has health insurance, his medical assistance for the aged benefits are also reduced by the amount of his insurance coverage for the same health needs.

The result of these provisions is that every medical assistance for the aged recipient has his resources reduced to the minimum necessary for ordinary living expenses. This is true even if he attempts to protect his other income and assets by paying health insurance premiums so as to be able to meet medical care costs not covered by medical assistance for the aged without depleting his resources.

This bill would permit any State that so desires to allow a person to have health insurance to cover health care costs not paid under that State's medical assistance for the aged program. The combination of medical assistance and health insurance would enable aged persons to have better health care than would be possible under either system separately.

At present, a person whose hospital bill is $500 and who has $300 of resources in excess of those exempted by his State to meet his ordinary living expenses, must pay the first $300 of the hospital bill himself; medical assistance for the aged pays the remaining $200. If he tries to protect his $300 to meet other needs by buying health insurance of that amount, he is no better off; the health insurance benefits are added to his $300 excess resource and he is not considered eligible for any part of the $500 hospital bill. In fact, only if his hospital bill were more than $600 would any part of it be paid by medical assistance for the aged.

Under this bill a person who has a $500 hospital bill and who has $300 of excess resources could obtain $300 worth of health insurance coverage without losing any of his medical assistance for the aged benefits. The $300 payable out of his own resources would be met by the insurance benefits; the remaining $200 would be paid by medical assistance for the aged.

The aged person would be able to obtain needed medical care without depletion of his resources, or he could use his resources to pay for medical care needed which is not covered by his State's medical assistance for the aged program.

The bill would further the objective of existing legislation of increasing the dignity afforded to older citizens who are not eligible for public assistance, but who are unable to pay the full cost of their medical care. It encourages self-help in the finest American tradition. It allows a four-way partnership between the Federal Government, the individual State government, the citizen, and our great health insurance enterprises.

HAZARDOUS PAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which amends the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay for Government employees in certain areas.

Existing law permits the payment to certain categories of Federal employees of pay differentials or premium compensation for periods of work which they are required to perform under unusually hazardous conditions. These employees include a number employed by the Public Health Service, certain military personnel, and wage board personnel of various departments and agencies. For example, wage board employees of the Departments of the Army and the Air Force are paid up to twice their basic hourly rate for work performed at heights of 100 feet without the benefit of scaffolding or other adequate safety measures.

Extra compensation may be provided Classification Act employees through the regular position classification process when the unusual physical hardship or hazard is inherent in the position when it regularly recurs, and when it it performed for a substantial part of the working time. However, there does not now exist for Classification Act employees any means of providing adequate compensation for this purpose where the unusual hardship or hazard occurs at such irregular or intermittent intervals that it does not constitute a regular part of the job for position classification purposes.

Legislation is needed to correct this inequity. This proposal authorizes the U.S. Civil Service Commission to establish a schedule of pay differentials for Classification Act employees for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazard. The differentials will be paid to the employees for any period in which they are subjected to these conditions while not usually involved in carrying out the duties of their positions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2386) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT, NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this project is vitally needed to relieve a critical water supply situation in the area, to protect and conserve the dwindling ground water resources in Clark County, Nev., and to provide the firm additional supply of municipal and industrial water as required to serve a rapidly increasing population, as well as to provide for the optimum development of the natural resources of the southern Nevada area.

This section of Nevada has experienced a rapid increase in population since the early 1940's, and for most of the past decade, this growth has been and continues to be phenomenal. A favorable climate, availability of large areas of undeveloped land, a strategic location in relation to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Nevada atomic test site, plus activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have all contributed to this development. The rapid growth of the area is best exemplified by the fact that the population has increased from an approximate 50,000 people in 1950 to 141,400 people in 1960. The estimated population, presently, is 215,000. A projection of future growth

indicates that over 300,000 people will be in need of water in this area by 1970, and that by the year 2000, over one-half million will call it home.

So great is the local interest in this project that the State of Nevada, at the last session of its legislature, designated the Colorado River Commission of Nevada as the State agency to contract with the United States for the repayment of project costs, and to operate and maintain the project when construction is completed. It has the active support of the Nevada congressional delegation, the State of Nevada through its Governor, the Honorable Grant Sawyer, the department of conservation and natural resources, the Eldorado Valley Advisory Board, the Clark County Commissioners, the Southern Nevada Industrial Foundation, and all of the municipalities and city groups located therein.

Previous activity on this proposal had been delayed pending the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Arizona against California to which Nevada was a party. This decision, among other things, allocated to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre feet of the waters of the Colorado River. It is these waters that will be utilized through the distribution system provided for in the bill.

The major problems faced by the project area are those associated with the availability of water and the need to bolster the economic base as the foundation for continued economic health and future growth. An increased water supply must be made available for the expanding population, or industrial growth will not be able to continue, and the heavy investment of the Federal Government in the Nellis Air Force Base, the atomic energy test site, and the NASA project will be seriously hampered.

At present, the principal source of water in this area is the underground artesian basin, supplemented by a small amount of water pumped from Lake Mead. Withdrawals from the ground water basin have for several years exceeded the safe-yield with a resulting critical depletion of the underground waters. The Nellis Air Force Base, which relies entirely on water from wells drilled in the basin, is faced with an especially critical situation. Water supply for fire protection is inadequate during the summer months, and a constant patrol has been necessary to enforce water conservation measures.

The magnitude of the problem to service the entire area has been recognized by the State and local interests, and all are agreed that the proper solution requires the development of a single comprehensive master plan for supplying additional water to meet the needs of the entire area. This project is the answer to that need.

In addition, I would like to point out that the entire cost of the project will be repaid to the Government with interest over a 50-year period, normally used for this type of development.

It should also be called to the attention of the Senate that this project is a part of the Southwest Pacific water plan, recently proposed by Secretary Udall as a solution to the overall problem facing the fastest growing section of the United States.

This project, like the central Arizona project, in Arizona, and the Dixie project, in Utah, need not wait action on the complete plan. While they are integral portions of the Secretary's proposal, they can be authorized and constructed individually without in any way interfering with the complete plan slated for long-term action.

The report of the Secretary outlining the Pacific Southwest water plan has been submitted to the States in the river basin and the interested Federal agencies as required by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The 90-day review period expired on December 5, and there is no reason why the Congress cannot proceed to consider all or any portion of the proposal.

Because of the demonstrated need for the authorization of the southern Nevada water project without delay, I urge the committee to proceed immediately to favorably consider the matter, and thereafter the Senate of the United States take affirmative action to authorize this project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2388) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 361)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, 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 was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—ADDITIONAL CONFEREE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added to the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, H.R. 7431.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be allowed to file a report, while the Senate is in recess, on Executive N, the Chamizal Treaty with Mexico.

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

ANNUAL REPORT OF MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and also as a Senate document the annual report of the minority leader.

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

ANNUAL REPORT OF REPUBLICAN SENATE AND HOUSE JOINT LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the annual report of the Republican Senate and House joint leadership.

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

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and also as a Senate document the annual report of the majority leader.

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

PATRICK J. OWENS—WINNER OF JOURNALISTIC AWARDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, perhaps the most coveted award in the field of journalism is the Nieman Fellowship. The winner gets $10,000 and spends a year of independent study at Harvard University.

Another top journalistic prize is the Sidney Hillman Foundation Award given for editorial excellence.

Yet another mark of recognition is the citation for excellence in reporting by the American Political Science Association.

A winner of any one of these can be proud of his achievement. But anyone who can claim a clean sweep can indeed be proud. I am pleased to point out to my colleagues in the Senate that an ex-Montanan, Patrick J. Owens, accomplished this extraordinary feat in a single year.

Owens, who is only 34, is presently editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial newspaper in Pine Bluff, Ark. Prior to joining that paper in 1961—the year in which he won the awards—he had a varied journalistic career in Montana, in the Army and elsewhere. He was born in Libby and grew up in Kalispell, Mont. He worked in western Montana on a variety of jobs, including construction work at the Hungry Horse Dam,

reporting on the Kalispell Daily Inter-Lake and announcing on a Libby radio station. He also worked in journalism in Panama, in the State of Washington and in Chicago. In 1959, he moved to Arkansas where he covered the school integration crisis in Little Rock for the Arkansas Gazette.

Pat Owens is to be commended for the versatility and excellence of his journalistic career, and for the way in which he has brought honor upon himself and his profession—and, I might add, honor to his home State of Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Pine Bluff Commercial of November 24, 1963, describing Mr. Owens' career in more detail.

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

PAT OWENS, EXECUTIVE EDITOR, IS AWARD-WINNING JOURNALIST

Patrick J. Owens, 34, executive editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial, came to the newspaper in January of 1961 and his work that year won three major awards.

The awards were the American Political Science Association citation for excellence in reporting; the Sidney Hillman Foundation $500 prize award; and a Nieman Foundation fellowship, one of the highest awards journalism has to offer.

He was born August 5, 1929, at Libby, Mont. His father died when he was 5, and his mother moved to Kalispell, Mont., where Owens grew up.

After graduating in 1947 from Flathead County High School at Kalispell, Owens attended Montana State University for 3 months. While he was in high school, he worked for the Flathead Monitor and the Times-Monitor, both weeklies.

In July of 1948, Owens enlisted in the Army. He was editor of the weekly Caribbean Army News for several months while stationed in Panama.

During his stay in Panama, Owens worked on the cable desk of the Star and Herald of Panama City. He was released from active duty with the Army in 1950.

He then worked on the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, where he also had worked before entering the Army. He was a form stripper and then an oiler at a rock crusher and at a concrete mixing plant.

In September 1951, he was recalled into the Army and spent a year at Oakland Naval Hospital in the Army Liaison Section, doing public relations and clerical work. He was discharged a corporal.

He went to Chicago and became assistant editor of Grain and Feed Journals, a trade magazine. He then worked in Chicago and New York for Radio Reports, a "clipping service of the air," as he describes it. His job was to listen to the radio and make notes and transcriptions of broadcasts for clients of the firm.

Owens returned to Libby to radio station KLCB, a 250-watt station, whose transmitter was located on a smokestack.

"I had every job in the place before I was through," Owens said.

In February 1954, Owens went to work for the Daily Inter-Lake of Kalispell, where he stayed a year and 3 months. Next he went to the Columbia Basin News at Tri-Cities (Pasco-Kennewick-Richland), Wash. He was successively regional editor, city editor, and news editor. His boss was Melvin B. Voorhees, who had created quite a stir during the Korean war when he published a book "Korean Tales," that had not undergone Army censorship. Voorhees, a lieutenant colonel, was the 8th Army censor.

It was here that Owens hired a reporter, Ruth Marvin, who was later to become Mrs. Patrick J. Owens.

Owens was a political columnist for the paper and wrote many of its editorials. He also conducted a program on which public issues were debated and discussed on KTRX-TV.

When Columbia Basin News changed ownership in January of 1959, Owens quit. He went to the Arkansas Gazette the same month. He helped cover the later phases of the integration crisis, including the Labor Day dynamitings of 1959 and the reopening of the Little Rock high schools that year.

He became interested in the Pine Bluff Commercial because of Edmond Wroe Freeman III and Armistead Council Freeman and their aspirations for the newspaper, he said. "I wanted to be part of what they were trying to do."

He was editor of the editorial page before he went to Harvard to study for a year, in the fall of 1962, on his Nieman award. When he returned, he was named executive editor.

As executive editor, he supervises the editorial department of the newspaper and continues to oversee the editorial page.

He says of the Commercial: "The direction in which we're trying to evolve is toward a newspaper more immediate, more interesting in things people are interested in. Mostly, newspapers are deadly dull. They need better writing, and to be more concerned."

TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Mr. Talmage S. Wilcher, chairman of the Americanism Committee of the Virginia State Elks Association, delivered a tribute to the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in connection with the Know Your America Week. The ceremonies were held at the Arlington-Fairfax Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks on November 30 and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilcher's tribute be made a part of my remarks.

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

SPEECH OF TALMAGE S. WILCHER, GENERAL CHAIRMAN FOR NORTHERN VIRGINIA, KNOW YOUR AMERICA WEEK COMMITTEE, AND VIRGINIA STATE CHAIRMAN, ELKS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA (AMERICANISM COMMITTEE), DELIVERED AT A SPECIAL MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR BROTHER JOHN F. KENNEDY, AT THE END OF KNOW YOUR AMERICA WEEK PROGRAM AT NEW ELKS HOME, ARLINGTON-FAIRFAX LODGE, NOVEMBER 30, 1963

Chairman Herman C. Anderson, distinguished guests, Monsignor Heller, Reverend Smith, Rabbi Golinken, it is with a sad heart that I attempt to address you all on this most solemn occasion, the martyrdom of our great leader and President. First I must say that I am a Republican. But John F. Kennedy was my President too. Now I have another President. He is a Democrat, but he is my President also.

We in America stand as a unit, that is why America is great; as Americans, we stand as a whole, regardless of creed, color, religion, or political preference. Our State Elks association, our great lodge, the All American Conference To Combat Communism, the National Council of Citizenship, are fighting a battle for all of us, to save our country from the specter of communism, hate, greed, selfness, ignorance, and fanaticism. We are fighting to save our children from hate, ignorance, and the little-thinking people who would destroy us. If we give them the chance, there is no future for any one of us.

The Elks is not a one-man organization, it is not an exclusive club for the benefit of a few, it is not an organization to satisfy the egomaniacal expression of ignorant, selfish men. It is not an organization that caters to a few to the detriment of the whole. We have a mission. That mission is positive Americanism. The inculcation and exemplification of American manhood, with brotherly love, of justice, charity, and fidelity.

Without a mission, little men fail. While on the other hand men with a vision can and will prevail over ignorance. Let's get it straight: we, the people of the United States, can truthfully say: I am proud to take those ringing words for my own, proud to be a part of a great hope, a great confidence that man is and of right, ought to be free.

I am an American, free to work, free to build, free to speak, free to worship. I have faith in America because I know that America is right, because I believe in freedom, because I accept and enjoy the tremendous responsibility and great blessings of America for myself, my family, and my nine precious grandchildren, and their offspring to come. I am proud of America. Millions have lived for it. Millions have sacrificed for it. Millions have died for it, including our beloved brother, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States. In the light of those very sacrifices, I am proud to say that for me and my family we are dedicated Americans. In conclusion let me say and repeat the great poet who is unnamed:

"God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, ready hands, men whom the lust of office cannot buy, men who have honor and men who will not lie. Tall men, sun-crowned men who live above the public fog in private duty and in public thinking, for while the rabble with their thumbworn creeds, their large possessions and little deeds. Lo freedom weeps, while wrong rules the lands and waiting justice sleeps. God give us men. Men of dependable character, men of sterling worth, then all the wrongs of men shall be redressed and right over might shall rule the earth. God give us men."

In these final hours, of a great planned celebration, when all the world seemed to turn upside down, in minds of men, in the hearts of the young, in the schools, in the churches, in the business places, the frustrations, the tears, the sorrow, let us not forget there is a lonely, widowed mother, with her two young and beautiful children. Because a maniac, with hate in his heart, killed a man, her husband, a President, a father.

AUTOMATION AND EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT: A VITAL LINK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, none of our country's major domestic problems stands alone. There is a vital interrelationship among the problems of automation, unemployment, job training, and civil rights, for instance. Any step which relieves one of these problems relieves the other three at the same time.

Admittedly there is no easy answer to these complex problems. But education of one sort or another is certainly involved in dealing with all of them.

I have been particularly concerned with the need for education in the fields of job training and automation and have introduced legislation during this session dealing with both these problems.

Although the bill providing for expanding vocational education which was passed by the Senate was not the one which I introduced, nevertheless it provided essentially for the increased em-

phasis which I advocated, and I was happy to support it.

I might say at this point that I use the term "vocational education" with some reluctance, because I am afraid it has acquired an unwarranted stigma in some quarters. I prefer to call it "education for employment," or simply job training. In today's economy this field must be thought of as including not only individuals preparing for their first jobs but those who are being retrained for new jobs.

We are doing something more in this field none too soon. It is my hope that what we have done will spur the country as a whole to move forward vigorously in preparing our youth and adults for jobs.

I am sorry that we have not shown similar energy in meeting the automation problem. It is one which will continue to grow. The White House Conference on Automation which is provided for in my bill, S. 185, would do a great deal to spread information and generate ideas. I would hope that early in the new year we may see something done on this bill.

In connection with these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a column by Sylvia Porter which appeared in yesterday's Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. It is entitled "Coming—Cradle-to-Grave Schooling."

COMING—CRADLE-TO-GRAVE SCHOOLING

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Picture the event in 1994: The doorbell rings—no—the electronic impulse arbitron in the leisure room vibrates and flashes on the all-purpose screen the bulky image of the third degree robot officer. Third degree Robotoffs call in person for two kinds of violators only: scofflaws who hang their hovercraft too close to TV aerials (difficult to avoid because they are invisible); or for those who, ignoring the hourly subliminal warnings, have not pressed their TV school buttons for 3 days running.

"Secunda, gum-chewing 12-year-old daughter of the house, goes to the door to argue—'and I've done all my homework for the next year, too.'

"Metallically but clearly, the truant officer (for it is none other than he) says, 'But I am here for your mother.'"

With this imaginative introduction, Milton R. Stern, an assistant dean at New York University, submits his solution to the growing problem of leisure time in the United States—cradle-to-grave classes.

As certain as automation, says he, is adult education for everybody and he even suggests seriously that cradle-to-grave classes "may soon become compulsory."

That automation is creating an explosive problem of nonwork in this country is undeniable. The U.S. Government estimates rising output per man-hour, due to automation, is now eliminating a minimum of 200,000 factory jobs a year. A leading manufacturer of automation equipment, John L. Snyder, Jr., of U.S. Industries, Inc., says flatly this is "a gross underestimate of the real situation."

Snyder declares automation is eliminating 2 million jobs a year not only through direct displacement of workers but also through the "silent firings" of workers who would have been employed had their jobs not been wiped out.

This, of course, is the great force behind the accelerated drive for a shorter workweek—and union leaders openly admit they are fighting for shorter hours than their members really want.

This is the key reason for the development of the extended vacation—dramatized by the 13-week sabbatical recently initiated in the steel and can industries and certain to spread in coming years.

This always has been the factor behind featherbedding which is work in name only.

At the same time, as reported yesterday, nonwork is one of the fastest growing "occupations" in the United States. Our nonwork population is up to 7.3 million, triple the total in 1949, and this group receives $100 billion a year, or one-fifth of our entire personal income.

In the past only the wealthy have had the burden of too much leisure and too few interests to enjoy the leisure. Now it's becoming the curse of millions who have been accustomed to filling most of their days with time-consuming tasks and who are utterly unprepared for nonwork.

Since extended leisure time is inevitable, what's the answer? It's not more golf, more gardening, more fishing, bowling or TV-watching. These pleasures can become tortures if there is little else.

The answer is a step-up in education of the American adult, as well as the young, to prepare all of us to reach a higher plateau of literacy in every sphere—economic, political, social, cultural.

The stage already is being set for this. Closed-circuit TV in the classroom suggests what is to come. The voluntary return to classes of adults across the Nation to learn new aptitudes and hobbies indicates how far we have moved from the popular image of night school. The campaigns launched by farsighted union, business and community leaders to spur adult education during vacation and off hours telegraph what is on the way.

The dimensions of our future adult education cannot even be guessed, but this is sure: we are a remarkably ignorant people and we have a long, long way to go before we can claim otherwise.

One reason Stern's seemingly eccentric prophecy impresses me is that subconsciously I came to it for myself long ago. Whenever I've been asked what I'll do when I get off this rat race of a daily column, my immediate answer has been:

"I'm going back to school to learn and to teach." I've already arrived where Stern says our country is heading.

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have been deeply moved by the messages I have received on the death of our late President. So many of them express our feelings poignantly and eloquently. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a poem of beautiful simplicity which came to me from Bloomfield, Conn.

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

ONE MAN ONE G-D

One man is dead.
I did not know him; I never saw him.
His death has hurt me.

One shot has killed him.
I did not see it or even hear it.
His death has frightened me.

One man has killed him.
I do not hate him.
His deed has stunned me.

One woman has no husband.
I do not know her.
Her tragedy is mine.

One girl and boy have lost a father.
I need no pity.
My pity is with them.

One country has lost a President.
I love this country—it is mine.
Its loss is my loss.

One tear turned into many.
I cried for him.
His death perplexed me.

One man will be remembered.
I see the flag at half-mast.
His memory lives.

One belief is not ruined.
I know our faith will save us.
His G-d is my G-d.

—JUDITH ANNE WRIGHT.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.

PROSPECTIVE CLOSING OF MILITARY BASES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the attention of the Senate has been directed to the impact on the local economies of 16 States as a result of the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense that 33 military bases are scheduled for closing during the next 3 years. This word is accompanied by the announcement of the Studebaker Corp. that it would move its production facilities for cars from South Bend to a Canadian city.

Those directly affected are understandably concerned. Yet, I would stress that these decisions need not be fatal to the communities involved and, in fact, may in some respects be blessings in disguise.

For those communities which must face the problem of readjustment I would like to point to the experience of the city of Wichita. For many years Boeing has been the major employer in south central Kansas and specifically in the city of Wichita. In early 1958, Boeing employed 35,000 people at its Wichita plant. As a result of the decision of the Department of Defense to discontinue the purchase of B-47's and B-52's which were assembled at that location, the work force has been reduced by 17,000. This represents 15 percent of the labor force of the city of Wichita.

Naturally, this reduction in force created innumerable difficulties for individuals and for the community as a whole. The immediate effect was to cause the unemployment rate to exceed 6 percent and steps were taken by the Federal Government to declare the area a "distressed area" since, by definition, it was an "area of substantial labor surplus." Interestingly enough, the city balked at this effort and contended that it did not want to be defined as a distressed area, preferred to seek contracts and business on a competitive basis and only wanted assurance that it would not be denied contracts simply because it was not a distressed area.

The community then set about organizing itself to meet its problems. Business leaders formed a metropolitan area council composed of 40 to 50 executives of the major industries in the area. This group worked with the city and other governmental units to assure that

local governmental policies complemented business policies aimed at expansion of existing industries and the attraction of new ones. The city of Wichita, for example, modified its annexation and tax policies to strengthen existing industries and encourage new ones.

A nonprofit organization called the Wichita Area Development, Inc., was organized to assemble risk capital for existing and new industries.

The city has issued over $1 million in bonds to assist in the development of industrial facilities which has resulted in the attraction of at least one major employer.

As a result of these efforts, the unemployment rate in Sedgwick County which includes metropolitan Wichita was down to 3.5 percent of the labor force in September. It averaged 4 percent for all of 1962 while the nationwide unemployment rate was running very close to 6 percent. Other indicators such as bank clearings and issuance of building permits are climbing to near record level.

I point out this effort of a local community in my State because I am certain that as we press for tighter budgets and more restricted Federal spending, more and more communities are going to face problems similar to those which will result from the anonuncements this week. Wichita is an example of what can be done when a community is determined to face the problem and make the best use of its own resources.

I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article in the Wall Street Journal of December 13 describing the Wichita program.

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

SOUTH BEND, FACING PULLOUT BY STUDEBAKER, URGED TO TAKE HEART FROM WICHITA LESSON

(By Michael G. Gartner)

WICHITA, KANS.—Here's some local advice for civic leaders in South Bend, Ind.:

"Sit back, regroup your forces and take stock of the situation. You may discover Studebaker's huge layoffs to be a blessing in disguise."

This advice comes from a city hit with substantial layoffs in the past 6 years yet now booming as never before. In fact, Wichita was hit harder than South Bend. Between 1958 and 1960, about 15 percent of the labor force was laid off in this city of 265,000, a higher rate than the 6 to 7 percent slated to be laid off in South Bend, a city of 150,000.

Earlier this week, Studebaker Corp. announced that it would end production of cars in the United States and that it probably would lay off more than 6,000 employees at its South Bend works.

"People thought we were going to fold up and die" when Boeing Co., Wichita's largest employer, began substantial employment cuts as defense work dwindled in 1958, says one Wichita businessman. "It was anything but that. The people were shocked for a short while but then everyone cooperated and pretty much ever since then we've never had it so good," even though Boeing's Wichita employment now is down to 18,200 from more than 35,000 at the end of 1957.

FACE UP TO PROBLEMS

"Those people in South Bend shouldn't get discouraged," says Gordon Evans, president and chief executive officer of Kansas Gas & Electric Co. "They should admit they have problems, face up to them and go from there. That's what we did."

South Bend officials already have begun to act. Mayor Frank J. Bruggner appointed a 42-man special committee of businessmen and community leaders to help bring in new industry to offset the $50 million annual payroll loss. One hope of the community is that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will locate its proposed $50 million research center in South Bend. However, eight other cities also are fighting for the Government installation.

South Bend's quick action to soften the impact of Studebaker's decision is reminiscent of several steps taken by this booming city since the first Boeing employment cuts were made in 1958.

Local citizens last winter formed Wichita Area Development, Inc., a nonprofit affiliate of the chamber of commerce, organized to create venture risk capital and make it available to existing and new industry. The organization has a $350,000 capital base and hopes to expand this. It is considering several applications and expects to approve some shortly.

BONDS ISSUED

Last year, the city issued $1.2 million in industrial revenue bonds to finance a 96,000-square-foot factory for Lear Jet Corp., a new company employing 450 people and expected to employ 1,200 by midsummer. Lear Jet has started construction of a 100,000-square-foot addition, which will be financed by a $750,000 bond issue expected to be issued shortly. Under such financing, the city issues the bonds to private investors and the interest and retirement costs are paid through rental income from the factory. Lear considered 35 cities for its plant before choosing Wichita.

In 1960, business leaders formed a metropolitan council, which consists of 40 or 50 chief executives of Wichita industry and which, according to Mr. Evans, "keeps everybody working together." Among other things, the council has helped solve a longstanding tax and annexation feud between the city and about a dozen industries north of here; a compromise was reached when the industries agreed to annexation and the city agreed to a reduced tax rate for them.

In addition, civic leaders stepped up their work with existing companies. They began keeping in closer touch on city and company matters, and even helped bring in new sales, which created jobs. One executive says Beech Aircraft Corp. and Cessna Aircraft Co. have sold several airplanes as a result of leads from local businessmen.

Wichita also benefited from what one businessman calls the healthy and helpful attitudes of Boeing and the International Association of Machinists. Both cooperated in helping the unemployed find jobs elsewhere, and "there were no strikes or strike threats," one local resident adds.

The United Auto Workers Union Wednesday added its efforts to the South Bend situation by urging Chrysler Corp. to build a car assembly plant there. Chrysler, which plans a plant in the area of Belvidere, Ill., had no immediate comment.

Although civic leaders here urge South Bend to follow Wichita's example in coping with the sudden employment curtailment, they concede that hard times can be expected in the immediate future. In Wichita, the unemployment rate shot up above 6 percent in the first quarter of 1961 and the Federal Government attempted to officially declare the city a distressed area since it was, by Government definition, an "area of substantial labor surplus."

But city officials fought off the attempt, asking only that local industry not be denied defense contracts when its bids were competitive simply because it wasn't a distressed area.

Other economic indicators were off briefly, but the city recovered quickly. The unemployment rate in Sedgwick County, which is mainly Metropolitan Wichita, was 3.5 percent of the labor force in September, down from the average of 4 percent throughout 1962 and 5.4 percent in 1961. In contrast, the nationwide unemployment rate in November was 5.9 percent.

Also in September, the county issued 1,030 building permits for structures valued at $1,858,828, up from 443 permits issued a year earlier for $1,206,904 of facilities. Bank clearings in the month climbed to $153,462,023 from $130,249,336 the year before and retail sales in August—the latest month for which figures are available—rose to $41,712,070 from $36,343,744 a year earlier. These figures are all records or near records and are continuing to climb, officials say.

The gains are coming despite continued drops in Boeing employment. The current force of 18,200 is more than 3,500 below average employment at Boeing for 1962.

LINE PLANS FARE CUT TO AID DISPLACED STUDEBAKER STAFF

CHICAGO.—The Chicago South Shore & South Bend Railroad plans to introduce cut-rate fares for points between South Bend, Ind., and Chicago to aid displaced Studebaker Corp. employes, Will C. Coliton, South Shore president, said.

The railroad will establish three new commuter-ticket classifications at reduced rates to help the workers find jobs and commute to them in other communities, Mr. Coliton said. Earlier this week Studebaker announced it will close its South Bend automobile manufacturing plant, which employs about 6,000 people.

The new classifications will be tickets good for 44 or 54 rides in 1 calendar month and a 10-ride ticket good for 1 year from the date of purchase. Rates on the current 25-ride tickets good for 1 year and straight one-way fares won't be changed, the railroad said.

Mr. Coliton said the line expects to receive approval from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Public Service Commission of Indiana by December 27 so the monthly tickets can be sold for January.

The average rate reduction can't be calculated, he said, because reductions are based on a formula that varies with the number of rides, time limit and mileage.

As one example, the rate for a 54-ride monthly ticket between South Bend and Chicago, a distance of roughly 90 miles, will be $74.42, or $1.38 a ride. This compares with the present year-long, 25-ride ticket rate of $72.03, or $2.88 a trip. The straight one-way fare is $3.96.

THE ENEMY ON THE LEFT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Williamson, W. Va., Daily News, in a recent editorial, reminds us that the real danger in America today is the danger of forgetting who the real enemy is that has been attacking this Nation and its basic principles over the past 15 years: communism. The man who dared to murder our President and the man who planted rockets in Cuba aimed at our shores were inspired by the

same leftist fanaticism which aims at our total destruction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Williamson Daily News be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE REAL ENEMY

So much attention has been focused on the far-right extremist groups and their activities in the United States over the last couple of years that at times we have all but lost sight of the ever-present danger caused by the militant subversive far left.

Almost in an instant after President Kennedy's assassination there arose national suspicions wanting to link the crime with the radical right wing. This, in our way of thinking, is the most revealing aspect to come out of the tragedy which upset the entire Nation. Unknowingly, we as a people in these United States had become blinded to the greatest enemy our way of life has ever known. We are referring to communism and all its leftist affiliates, the cause for worldwide insecurity for so many years.

Isn't it so that it was communism which divided the world into the free and the slave nations?

Isn't it true that there would be no cold war if it were not for communism?

Isn't it a fact that communism murdered thousands of persons in Hungary because they wanted to live as free men?

Did we not fight a strange war in Korea costing thousands of American lives because of communism?

Did we not hear the leader of Communist Russia boastfully state that he would "bury us"?

Is our memory so short as to forget the conspiracy between Soviet Russia and Castro's Cuba which placed threatening weapons of destruction only 90 miles off the shores of the United States?

Repeatedly have we not found enemy agents working in our very midst attempting to undermine this country's security?

Is it not so that millions and millions of dollars are being drained from the American people in order to provide a deterrent against aggression threatened by the Red forces?

The list could be continued almost endlessly. However, the most compelling reason why we should come back to our senses can be found in the most shocking recent event which has caused this national concern. The man who was charged with the slaying of President Kennedy had his sympathies not with the rightwing extremists but instead with communism, according to the evidence revealed to date. He had gone so far as to write in 1959: "I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

We hold no brief whatsoever for the rightwing fanatics and their stirring up of hatreds, but at the same time our most serious cause for alarm is found in the way the American people have become lulled into a false sense of security by their diminishing alertness to the threat of communism.

These are among us in this country, even in communities the size of Williamson, those dangerous elements who sympathize with the Communist conspiracy. At all times they are scheming and plotting ways of extending their sphere of influence. They have had an easier time of late because their devious movements have all but been overshadowed by the indignation against the activities of the rightwingers.

The real harm done by the rightist extremists now can be seen. Their fanatical ravings against the left, instead of spotlighting the menace of communism, only did the reverse. It is high time that we got our feet back on the ground in this country, both in high and low places, and recognize once more the true enemies of our great Republic.

CURING THE CAPITAL DRAIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times in support of a capital issues committee.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times Dec. 13, 1963]

CURING THE CAPITAL DRAIN

In defending the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign securities, Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa observes that buying of foreign stocks and bonds during the first 6 months of 1963 involved so big an outflow that it threatened the status of the dollar. A continuation of this drain, he implies, would have brought a crisis.

But Mr. Roosa's treatment, which involves a tariff on capital, does not seem to us to be the most effective cure. It will encourage a new drain through loopholes especially designed to avoid paying the tax. It may invite an outflow of funds by corporations making direct investments in foreign countries, which would not be subject to any new levies. It could injure traditional trading relationships. Worst of all, there is a real risk that the proposed temporary tax will remain permanently on the books, which might undermine Wall Street's position as the leading international capital market.

We continue to hold that a governmental capital-issues committee to pass on foreign issues would be a far better means of stemming the outflow than the thinly disguised form of control provided by the proposed tax. Under a committee system, a distinction can be made between issues that are in the national interest (where the bulk of funds is spent in the United States, for example, or where the proceeds will contribute to the development of a foreign economy) and those that are not. By permitting the marketplace to set the cost and terms on approved issues, it would avoid the setting up of an artificial pricing system.

A committee would not be a painless remedy. No form of control can be. But while a committee is as repugnant as the proposed tax, it is not likely to create as many new drains and distortions. Furthermore, experience with controls over consumer and mortgage credit suggests that a committee to control the capital outflow would be abolished as soon as its job is done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly on this problem during the past few months. I want to reiterate my firm belief that the interest equalization tax is not in our own best interest. A capital issues committee, a measure that I support, even though it represents a measure of control over capital flows, is necessitated by the seriousness of the situation confronting the United States as a result of our continued balance-of-payments deficit. It is a measure which would be effective, flexible and truly temporary.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of December 10 entitled, "Roosa Defends Foreign Securities Tax Plan and Assails Wall Street Executives Who Oppose It" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 10, 1963]

ROOSA DEFENDS FOREIGN SECURITIES TAX PLAN AND ASSAILS WALL STREET EXECUTIVES WHO OPPOSE IT: TREASURY OFFICIAL AND OTHER SPEAKERS WARN THAT DRAIN ON DOLLAR IS NOT ENDED

(By Edward Cowan)

Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury, vigorously defended yesterday the administration's proposed tax on the purchase of foreign securities and rebuked Wall Street critics of the proposal.

Mr. Roosa, normally mild-mannered, spoke with flashes of feeling before some 200 leading businessmen and financiers. The occasion was a panel discussion of the United States' international payments deficit sponsored by the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The meeting was held in the Americana Hotel, as was a banquet addressed by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

In a direct slap at critics of the tax, some of whom sat in the audience, Mr. Roosa said financial executives "whose main job has been to wear the hair shirt for those who want to do more than their resources allow" have been unwilling to "wear the hair shirt when necessary;" that is, to accept the proposed tax and its expected restrictive impact on foreign financing in the New York money market.

DRASTIC CHANGE REJECTED

The problem of finding the best way to curb the flow of investment dollars to foreign countries "can't be picked off in an hour in an armchair at the club," Mr. Roosa asserted.

"This tax will become law," he declared. It is time, he said, "for the investment community to accept it in the spirit in which it was proposed, the need to preserve the dollar itself." The proposal was advanced last July by President Kennedy, Mr. Roosa said, "in a situation that was tumbling out of control" because of a "cascading increase" in foreign borrowing in this country.

Mr. Roosa, Mr. Martin, and Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York all cautioned that the sharp reversal in the net outflow of dollars in the third quarter of the year should not be construed as signaling an end to the dollar drain problem. "It remains to be seen whether we are continuing to do as well," said Mr. Hayes.

A fourth panelist, Edward M. Bernstein, a consultant to central banks, said there was "no need for a revolutionary change in the world monetary system."

But, he said, there should be evolutionary change in two directions: integration of national currency reserves with those of the International Monetary Fund and greater use of currencies such as the French franc, the German mark, the Italian lira and the Dutch guilder as foreign exchange reserves of other countries.

Mr. Martin disclosed that within a few hours of the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22 the Federal Reserve increased by 50 percent two of its standby agreements for reciprocal exchanges of currency.

It was understood that the increases were with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements, with whom the Federal Reserve had "swap" arrangements, as they are called, of $100 million each.

Swiss francs were one of the currencies offered for sale by the Federal Reserve within minutes of the assassination in a move to head off any panic or speculative sale of dollars for other currencies. The Bank for International Settlements is a quasi-official international institution in Basel, Switzerland.

Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., another panelist, expressed concern that the tax on foreign securities would lead to other interferences with free market forces. "Too seldom is any form of control lightened or eliminated," he said. "The diagnosis is usually that the medicine is all right, you just need more of it."

SUGGESTION BY BLOUGH

Mr. Blough suggested that the remedy for the dollar drain lay in domestic policies, especially tax reduction and a freeze or cutback in Government spending. Both in his formal presentation and in reply to a reporter's question afterward, Mr. Blough hedged on whether he favored passage or defeat of the tax proposal.

It appeared that, having clashed with the Kennedy administration over steel prices in 1962, he wanted to avoid head-on opposition to one of its major legislative proposals.

The proposed tax would fall on Americans who lend money to foreigners for more than 3 years except banks, and on purchases of foreign stocks.

It would be graduated on debt, depending on its term, up to 15 percent. That would be the rate on all foreign stock purchases. The Treasury has said that the result would be to increase the effective rate of interest paid by foreign borrowers by one percentage point, for example, from 5½ to 6½ percent. The bill was approved last week by the House Ways and Means Committee.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of Communist infiltration, subversion, and other tactics presents a continuing challenge to the United States and other free nations. It exists in Latin America and it is present also in southeast Asia. The Middle East and Africa are other regions in which international communism is actively seeking to establish itself. For us to play a vital role in preventing the growth and expansion of communism, all Americans must have a real understanding of the ways in which communism operates.

Because of the great importance I place upon a proper understanding of Communist tactics and methods, and the ways in which they can be combated, I am calling attention to an unusual book entitled "The Strategy of Deception," published by Farrar, Straus & Co. This is a collection of essays which exposes the strategy of communism not only in the United States but also in India, Italy, Spain, Great Britain, Burma, and other countries. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the publisher's description of "The Strategy of Deception: A Study in Worldwide Communist Tactics."

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

THE STRATEGY OF DECEPTION: A STUDY IN WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST TACTICS

(Edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick)

In this book distinguished scholars and political leaders from seven nations show how Communist parties attempt to capture power in countries outside of the U.S.S.R. The subject is a familiar one, but it is not well understood by those unprepared for the deception, obfuscation and other methods of Communist infighting.

The chapters in this book describe Communist parties on the operational level; communism in action. The authors demonstrate how Communists, acting in the name of amorphous, sweeping, economic and historical forces, ignore these "laws" whenever convenient. They show the way in which Communists have redefined for practical purposes the class struggle so as to make it mean the struggle of Communists and non-Communists. They show how Communists bill themselves as the vanguard of the proletariat in nations with no proletariat, no capitalists, and no industry. (In Africa, a Communist party will exploit a tribal conflict as a struggle against the "bourgeoisie.") They show that communism grows not by an intrinsic "revolutionary" appeal, but by its ability to obscure its aims and identify itself with other groups, goals and popular symbols. The French Communists, Mrs. Kirkpatrick points out, have attempted to capture Victor Hugo, and the American Communists have staked a claim to Tom Paine and Abraham Lincoln. The Communists, it is demonstrated, are masters of realpolitik, and should be the enemy and the adversary, rather than the bogeyman, of freedom-loving people and their political leaders.

The editor, Mrs. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, is presently a member of the political science faculty at Trinity College, senior analyst in Operations and Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., and a consultant for various Government agencies.

DANGER TO THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—EEC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, press reports during the past several days indicate grave tensions within the European Common Market, some even suggesting that the European Common Market is in danger.

The breakup of the European Common Market would be a major setback to the free world's foreign policy even though we too have had our problems with the EEC. It would possibly kill for the time the "Kennedy round" of the worldwide trade talks under the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade now scheduled for next year. The implications for our business community would be vast.

The creation of the European Economic Community represents a culmination of a highly successful postwar effort of the Atlantic Community to rebuild Western Europe and to support forces pressing for European economic integration. The success of this effort has made Western Europe a new and major force in the world struggle for freedom, both in economic and political terms. Any breakdown in the EEC over the question of a common farm policy would represent a major weakening of free Europe and weaken our common endeavor to expand world trade and to provide maximum economic assistance to the developing countries of the free world. U.S. trade and political partnership with a unified Europe built around the Common Market must remain a keystone of our policy.

I urge the administration to leave no stone unturned in an effort to settle differences between the United States and the EEC in the best long-term interests of both, and to use all its available resources, diplomatic, political, as well as economic to impress on all concerned that the necessity for Western unity and economic strength overrides any differences they may have over farm policy.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal dealing with this subject be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

COMMON MARKET FIGHTS FOR LIFE—PARIS WON'T CONCEDE GERMAN APPROACH

(By Henry Giniger)

PARIS, December 12.—France will hold West Germany responsible for a breakup of the European Common Market if there is no agreement on outstanding farm questions by the end of the year.

According to qualified French sources, there can be no link or synchronization between settlement of the Common Market's farm problems and the settlement of a unified Common Market position toward the forthcoming tariff cutting negotiations with the United States.

The outright rejection of the West German thesis that the two questions be settled together was made clear at the same time as French insistence that the commitments made by the six nations be respected.

This commitment, in the French view, is that by the end of the year, give or take a few days, regulations governing the production and sale of rice, beef, and dairy products will be drawn up together with financial regulations concerning imports of these products from countries outside the Economic Community.

If the deadline is not respected, then France with the four partners supporting her—Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—will note that West Germany has not respected its commitments, according to informed sources.

As far as France is concerned, the Common Market will therefore be unable to continue. The farm question, in the opinion of the French Government, is of fundamental importance.

Although only three products are concerned in the negotiation now underway in Brussels, a settlement on them will mean the first concrete step toward a common agricultural policy, 6 years after the Treaty of Rome, setting up the Community, was signed.

It is explained here that France accepted a Common Market in industrial products at considerable sacrifice since she felt her industry was not really competitive with West Germany's.

France made the sacrifice, according to official thinking, because of the prospect that the six nations would extend the market to farm products, as provided for in the treaty. In this field France is in a strong position to export to and to compete with her partners.

What President de Gaulle will say at a news conference he will hold in January will depend on what happens in Brussels—headquarters of the Common Market—between now and the end of the year. It was recalled that last January he took the initiative of breaking up the talks with Britain on her entry into the community.

BLAME IS SHIFTED

This time the eventual blame on a breakup of the community is being placed in advance on West German heads. Officials here pro-

fessed to be confident that finally the West Germans would cooperate.

Puzzlement as well as irritation continued to be expressed about Bonn's insistence on a detailed discussion of the tariff bargaining talks with the United States—the Kennedy Round. French sources said the Government was not opposed to such talks, or even to drawing up a declaration of principles concerning the Common Market's position on the matter.

But the question was asked here as to why there was a need to draw up a detailed position now when the United States had not one of its own, and had not even begun prescribed tariff hearings with U.S. industry.

Moreover, doubt is being expressed here on whether the scheduled date for the formal opening of the negotiations within the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in Geneva now can be respected by the United States.

The various comments in Paris betrayed a continued lack of enthusiasm by France for the trade talks or for any substantial concessions to the United States. The crisis that has developed appeared to resolve itself into a test of wills between Bonn and Paris.

The issue concerning the Kennedy Round that has to be settled concerns disparities between European tariffs and U.S. tariffs.

The United States has sought equal reductions in tariffs by both sides but has accepted the European thesis that in some cases U.S. tariffs are so much higher than European ones that an equal reduction would leave a disparity to Europe's disadvantage.

The question that the Common Market countries has to decide is how much disparity there is and how many products it concerns.

The West Germans are pushing for as liberal an attitude toward tariff-cutting as possible while the French have been decidedly more cautious on the ground that the Common Market exists first of all for the benefit of its own members and secondarily for the benefit of outsiders.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

BONN SAYS DISPUTE IS BARGAINING

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, December 12.—Chancellor Ludwig Erhard said today that West Germany's clash with France over Common Market agricultural policy was not a quarrel but only hard bargaining between friends.

Speaking before students at Heidelberg University, the Chancellor conceded that present negotiations in Brussels on common farm prices for the six-nation community were hard.

"But there is no question of a quarrel," he said. "There will be no quarrels between friends."

Dr. Erhard's remarks appeared calculated to ease the atmosphere of crisis prevailing in Bonn over a French demand that the ruling Council of Ministers of the Common Market agree by December 31 on price regulations for meat, rice, and dairy products.

The regulations could mean price cuts for West German producers, particularly in the dairy industry.

An overnight redrafting of the proposed dairy products regulation, to take cognizance of German insistence on maintaining a subsidized dairy industry, also was favorably received here. Officials said the amendment would not solve all problems but it represented a spirit of reasonable negotiation.

The Bonn Government, hard pressed by its high-cost farming industry, has been playing for time. It insists that France commit herself to a liberal policy on next year's tariff negotiations with the United States simultaneously with the introduction of unified meat, rice, and dairy prices.

A government spokesman asserted yesterday that West Germany would not submit to unacceptable demands by December 31, a deadline insisted upon by Edgard Pisani, the French Minister of Agriculture.

FRENCH EXPLAIN VIEWPOINT

While that statement was being issued, the French Ambassador, Roland de Margerie, was conferring with Dr. Erhard. The French envoy reportedly honed some of the rough edges off Mr. Pisani's remarks in Brussels.

In political quarters here, nevertheless, there is earnest debate whether President de Gaulle is prepared to see the 6-year-old Common Market—West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—break up if his demands are not met.

Christian Democratic Parliamentary leaders emerged from a closed discussion of the situation with optimistic comments. Informants said their hopes were based on the judgment that France would have too much to lose in wrecking the economic community.

But it was privately conceded that in view of President de Gaulle's ruthless veto of Britain's bid for membership in the community last January, such a resolute decision by President de Gaulle was not beyond question.

FARM INTERESTS IRKED

Spokesmen for West German farming interests were in a fighting mood.

Minister of Agriculture Werner Schwarz said in an interview that "the way to a Common Market must not be paved with unilateral German sacrifices."

Mr. Schwarz, whose absence at this week's ministerial meeting in Brussels gave Mr. Pisani the opportunity to charge that Bonn was not taking the problem seriously, said that West Germany had and would continue to fulfill treaty commitments. But that could not mean that it would dance to the tune of individual treaty partners, he said.

Detlev Struve, a Christian Democratic farm expert in Parliament, demanded that the Government base its position in Brussels on maintenance of present prices and subsidies for West German dairy products.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

WASHINGTON REJECTS IDEA OF A BREAKUP

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—In a situation remarkably similar to that of exactly a year ago, this Capital instinctively refuses to accept the position that a cornerstone of its foreign policy and international economic policy could be about to crumble.

Last year the "impossibility" was the rejection of British entry into the European Common Market. Washington was no doubt genuine in its optimism, but it was wrong.

This year what is deemed equally unthinkable and impossible is the end of the Common Market itself, as a result of the crisis that now is developing in Brussels.

Officials were saying today that the administration is relaxed, that the dispute in Brussels between France and West Germany is a war of nerves, and that in the end the crisis will be resolved.

Once again, there is no doubt that this view is genuine, and it purports to be based on reports from embassies abroad. But once again it could be wrong. Some intelligent observers here and elsewhere are not ruling out at all the possibility that the Common Market could be finished inside of a few months.

The view is based on the seriousness of the opposing views of France and Germany. On the surface the issue is mainly agriculture, and that issue is real enough. But at bottom the trouble is over the whole concept of the political organization of Western Europe. It is the sort of showdown in which French President de Gaulle could very well go to the brink.

The pessimistic view is also based in part on the unpredictability of President de Gaulle.

This element in the situation is admitted by U.S. officials, even those who are optimistic. General de Gaulle is so unpredictable on some occasions and so much a personal maker of policy, that last year at this time his own ministers did not know what he would do about the question of British entry into the economic bloc.

If the Common Market crumbles, it is widely felt here, the result will not be anything so drastic as war or even serious economic disruption of the West. But some major strands of American idealism and of American policy will become unraveled, certainly for a while to come—"Atlantic partnership," the objective of European union and, possibly, the Kennedy round of sweeping tariff reductions in the Atlantic world.

Official Washington is unwilling to contemplate these possibilities, as it was unwilling to contemplate British rejection a year ago.

For example, a meeting yesterday of officials most concerned with the "Kennedy Round," it is reliably reported, did not even discuss the internal Common Market crisis.

Those with long memories recalled that a year ago American officials refused even to discuss what could or should be done if British entry into the Common Market were rejected.

Running through the official assessment here and through that of many Americans who are not officials but who are interested, is the belief that the Common Market is so economically useful, if not essential, to France and to the other member nations that none would dare to go over the brink and break it up.

There is a parallel theme that European union is "historically inevitable."

These have been accepted truths here for so long that they are almost impossible to give up. To some extent they are shared in Western Europe, but by no means universally. They may not be true at all.

It is at least open to question, for example, how much the existence of the Common Market has contributed to the remarkable economic performance of the Western European countries in the last decade. A number of Frenchmen, including some in authority, are persuaded that France could get along very well without the Common Market, and that it could also continue to pursue a fairly liberal foreign trade policy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 13, 1963]

BREAKUP IN EUROPE? DIPLOMATS FEAR FRANCE MEANS THREAT TO QUIT THE COMMON MARKET: THEY SEE OTHER FIVE JOINING BRITISH-LED BLOC, A FRANCE ISOLATED IN TRADE, POLITICS

(By Ray Vicker)

BRUSSELS.—What happens if the European Common Market breaks up?

Diplomats here still insist the odds are they won't have to answer that question. But a new crisis in the Common Market's crisis-ridden life is forcing them to ask it, in all seriousness. Briefly, the six nations of the European Economic Community, as the Common Market is formally named, are hung up in a French-German deadlock over farm policy. French President de Gaulle, with the support of his Cabinet, is threatening to take France out of EEC if a common farm policy isn't wrapped up by December 31. And worried diplomats suspect he isn't kidding.

Collapse of EEC, say sources here, would change the economic and diplomatic map of Europe. The seven-country European Free Trade Association, now led by Britain, would pick up five ex-Common Market nations as new members, they think. France,

they say, would be isolated politically and in trade relations.

Such changes would force American statesmen to draw up a new "grand design" with a Johnson rather than a Kennedy flavor for United States-European relations. The Kennedy "grand design," of U.S. trade and political partnership with a unified Europe built around the Common Market, had already been dealt a heavy blow by General de Gaulle's January veto of Britain's bid to join EEC, but it was not quite dead.

DEATH OF "KENNEDY ROUND"?

The implications for U.S. business would be vast, too. Breakup of the Common Market would kill the "Kennedy round" of worldwide tariff-cutting talks under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), now scheduled for next year. Some other tariff-cutting plan might be launched as soon as the European nations sorted themselves out into a new pattern of economic alliances, but this would take time.

The 1,000-odd U.S. companies with European operations would experience widely different effects. Those with plants in England would gain almost the same advantage they would have if Britain had succeeded in joining EEC—namely, low-tariff access to the five continental nations that might join EFTA. But U.S. companies operating in France would find themselves isolated in a market of 46.5 million people rather than one of 175 million—the population of today's Common Market.

It's this threat of French isolation that leads most diplomats to hope some way will be found to keep the Common Market together. They insist that France, beset by inflationary troubles at home, is in no position to cut itself adrift from an economic bloc whose operations have benefited it as much as any of the other members (Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg).

Since the Common Market was founded on January 1, 1958, gross national product of its members has risen 24 percent, industrial production 37 percent, and trade between members 100 percent, with France sharing fully in the gains. EEC has accomplished this by leveling trade barriers among its members and taking various steps to integrate their economies. Tariffs within the bloc are only 40 percent as high as they were at its formation, and the EEC has gone two-thirds of the way toward erecting a common tariff wall against the rest of the world. It also has done various things to create a unified capital and labor market.

FARM TROUBLES

But while progress has been rapid on the industrial front, EEC has encountered nothing but difficulty trying to unify the farm economies of its members. And it's this trouble that now threatens to break up the bloc.

All Common Market countries have been protecting their farmers in various ways; throughout EEC some $400 million a year now goes into subsidies, price supports and other payments to milk and dairy farmers alone.

But Germany's farmers are the most protected and least efficient. So Germany has opposed creation of an agricultural Common Market—which would mean free movement of farm products across national borders under a single price system—except in stages too slow to please its EEC partners. France, in contrast, has been pressing insistently for a Common Market in farm goods, largely because it wants a sales outlet in Germany for the food surpluses produced by its more efficient farmers.

EXTREME CONSEQUENCES

Things now have come to a head at a marathon Brussels meeting of the Common Market's Council of Ministers. French Agriculture Minister Edgard Pisani walked out of the meeting early this week, threatening "extreme consequences" if a common farm policy isn't agreed on by December 31. He's coming back now, under "very firm instructions" from General de Gaulle to see that this deadline is met. General de Gaulle himself had threatened earlier to break up the Common Market if farm problems aren't solved, and Wednesday he got the backing of his Cabinet.

On the same day, however, the West German Cabinet, meeting in Bonn, defiantly declared it won't accept December 31 as a deadline for a common farm policy. Indeed, it said Germany will sign no agreement calling for common prices for beef, dairy products and rice until the EEC countries agree on their policy for the "Kennedy round" of tariff-slashing talks (largely involving industrial products); these talks with the United States and the rest of the world are scheduled to begin in Geneva next May.

The deadlock reflects a trend that may continue to bother the Common Market even if it somehow surmounts the present crisis. Since France's veto of Britain's bid for EEC membership, each country has tended to push its pet policies rather than compromising on a common policy benefiting all.

Thus France is pressing particularly hard for a common farm policy. But Germany—now the world's second largest exporting nation behind the United States—is most interested in freer industrial trade with the rest of the world, and thus in preparations for the GATT tariff-cutting talks. France, more protectionist in the industrial area, is lukewarm toward those talks, though officials pay lipservice to the idea of worldwide tariff cuts; Germany retorts, in effect, that as long as France drags its feet on formation of a policy toward those talks that would benefit Germany, France can't have the common farm policy it wants.

In this, Germany has some support from other EEC members, who are bitter about the French ultimatum on farm policy, since they too feel France has been obstructing Common Market unification in other fields. "When France vetoed British entry into the Common Market, the community spirit received a critical blow," says one official of the EEC Commission, the Common Market's administrative body. "Ever since, each member has been unwilling to surrender any national interests for the good of the group."

It's still possible, of course, that some way will be found around this deadlock, or that France will back down on its ultimatum. Within France, worried voices are predicting disaster if the Common Market breaks up.

Enterprise, a weekly Paris business magazine, recently featured interviews with eight prominent French industrialists on what would happen if EEC collapses. Their conclusion: Such an event would set French industry back several years, result in production declines, and would "inevitably provoke an economic crisis."

Maurice Jordan, vice president of S.A. des Automobiles Peugeot, French automaker, says that only the Common Market has made it possible for French firms to "resist the dangers" of having American companies take over Europe's economy. He adds: "Disappearance of the Community would give the Americans a free hand in Europe of the Six."

But diplomats here aren't betting General de Gaulle won't carry through on his ultimatum. They note gloomily that he has scheduled an important press conference for January—just as he did a year ago when he was preparing to break the news of his veto of Britain's EEC membership bid.

"We are worried," admits one EEC Commission official in a crowded hall of Brussels' Palais du Congres, where the EEC Council of Ministers is now meeting. "This threat of French Agriculture Minister Pisani certainly doesn't sound like a tactical debating maneuver."

If General de Gaulle breaks up the Common Market, reports already are circulating in Paris that he will immediately put forth a proposal for creation of a European free trade area embracing EFTA and the ex-Common Market countries.

France's EEC partners, however, show no interest in this idea. Says a Dutch official in The Hague: "Europe already has a free trade area in EFTA. If we must surrender EEC, why accept some de Gaulle creation when we already have a going concern which is free of his disruptive influence?"

Another Dutch Government official in Brussels says he is sure EEC will survive the present threat, but adds that "if it doesn't, I predict we will be the first Common Market country to join EFTA." He adds that Belgium and Luxembourg probably would come along, and that if they did it would be difficult for Germany and Italy to remain out.

EFTA currently consists of Britain, Portugal, Switzerland, Norway, Austria, Denmark, and Sweden. Like EEC, it is cutting tariffs among its members on industrial goods, with the aim of abolishing them in a few more years, and has made about as much progress in this regard as the Common Market.

EFTA, however, is not seeking to establish a unified market in agriculture, a fact that might make it easy for any disgruntled Common Market countries—France excepted—to seek admission. It also leaves each nation free to set its own tariff against the rest of the world, and has no schemes for economic integration like EEC's proposed common transport and fuel policies.

Ironically, when Britain was negotiating to join EEC, it once seemed that EFTA would dissolve and in effect be swallowed by the Common Market, with its other members also joining EEC or becoming associate members. If EFTA should now instead swallow EEC, this would achieve some of the same aims of European economic unity and creation of a giant market—with, of course, two major exceptions; the 12 nations would be united in a much looser framework, and France would be left out.

American officials see some benefits to U.S. trade in this possibility. The Common Market, they say, has been growing increasingly protectionist in agricultural trade with the United States, which now sells the EEC more than $1 billion worth of food and fiber a year. The last step toward establishment of a common EEC tariff wall against other countries' farm goods shut U.S. poultry out of a thriving market in Germany, touching off the celebrated transatlantic "chicken war," which has now ended in U.S. tariff increases on German trucks and French brandy. Since EFTA has no common agricultural tariff wall against other countries, say Americans, the United States might be able to preserve markets for American farmers in Germany and other countries, or open new ones, dealing individually with those countries as EFTA members.

The Common Market's Council of Ministers will stay in session the rest of the year, trying to keep EEC together and do something on farm policy. But EEC officials say it will be simply impossible for them to come up with a common farm policy by December 31, as France wants, even if they stay in 24-hour session. The number of technical details to be worked out, even if an agreement in principle is reached, is far too great, they say.

France could, of course, delay carrying out its ultimatum if an agreement seems imminent by December 31. But EEC officials say the number of technical details is too great to make an agreement in early 1964 certain, either. So, barring some shift in positions, the crisis seems heading toward a test of how seriously France means its ultimatum.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

A FARM DEADLOCK GRIPS TRADE BLOC—AGRICULTURE CHIEFS CONCLUDE 4 DAYS OF TUGGING WITHOUT FINDING BASIC SOLUTION

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, December 12.—European Common Market agricultural ministers concluded 4 days of pulling and tugging over price regulations and farm products tonight without reaching any basic agreement on a common agricultural policy.

"Next week will be decisive," France's Agriculture Minister Edgard Pisani said as he left for Paris late this afternoon to participate in a legislative debate in the French Assembly tonight.

Mr. Pisani had been the storm center of controversy here earlier this week between the delegations from France and West Germany.

But today the atmosphere was peaceful if not genial. Most of the ministers tended to play down the French-German exchange Tuesday, which provoked policy pronouncements from Paris and Bonn on Wednesday.

EXAGGERATION CHARGED

Rudolf Huttebrauker, West Germany's State Secretary for Agricultural Affairs, said today most reports had tended to exaggerate the significance of this week's arguments over Common Market agricultural and trade policies.

"The atmosphere here has not been as bad as it has been represented," he said.

Barend W. Bieshuvel, the Netherlands Minister of Agriculture, who was chairman of the work sessions this week, expressed similar sentiments during a press conference tonight.

"You must remember," he said, "that these discussions affect the lives of millions of farmers and consumers in Europe. In matters so important, it is not unusual if emotions occasionally get out of hand."

The Dutch farm chief said the agriculture experts would continue their sessions next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday mornings in preparation for the meeting of the full Council of Ministers of the member states that begins December 18.

PRESENT SYSTEMS DIFFER

"It will be a miracle if we can finish our negotiations by yearend," he said.

The farm ministers this week have been attempting to reach an area of agreement on the organization of uniform market and pricing systems for beef and veal, for rice, and for dairy produce.

At present there are separate and largely different systems in use by the Common Market Six—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

West Germany, for example, supports farm prices at the community's highest level, while France's prices are the lowest. The other four member states have price-support programs in between.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 11, 1963]

COMMON MARKET FARM PARLEY DISRUPTED BY FRENCH WALKOUT—AGRICULTURE CHIEF EDGARD PISANI CHARGES BONN WITH DELAYING AN AGREEMENT ON PRICES

BRUSSELS, December 10 (Reuters).—French Agricultural Minister Edgard Pisani walked out on a European Common Market meeting here tonight after accusing West Germany of blocking progress toward agreement on common prices for farm products.

The dramatic walkout climaxed the internal crisis that has been brewing ever since French President de Gaulle vetoed Britain's application to join the Common Market last January.

Mr. Pisani delivered a "serious and solemn warning" to the market's agricultural ministers, and said he was leaving to consult his Government about the West German position.

In Paris, United Press International reported President de Gaulle with Premier Georges Pompidou on the deadlock. President de Gaulle was in telephone contact with Mr. Pisani.

Mr. Pisani's warning to the Common Market ministers came on the second day of a marathon session due to end December 21, when the six nations are scheduled to adopt their common agricultural policies and a joint policy for next year's "Kennedy Round" of tariff-cutting negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

But Mr. Pisani gave instructions authorizing lower ranking members of the French delegation to continue negotiations. He expressed the hope "everyone will be able to negotiate from now on, so that extreme risks will be avoided," a French spokesman said.

"Unless given other instructions," Mr. Pisani would probably return to the Belgian capital tomorrow afternoon, the French spokesman said.

Mr. Pisani warned recently that France would revise its policy on the Common Market and European political integration unless the yearend deadline was achieved. His use of the words "extreme risks" to be avoided this evening was viewed in that context.

GERMANY SEES NO HASTE

The French Minister was reportedly particularly annoyed because West Germany's Secretary of State for Economic Affairs told newsmen this afternoon some "myths and legends" about the yearned deadline and introduction of a common cereal grains price next year should be dispelled.

[Rudolf Huettebraeucker, German Secretary of State for Agriculture and Bonn's chief delegate, said there was a sharp exchange of views in which Mr. Pisani accused Bonn of not taking the December 31 deadline seriously.]

Sources close to the Council of Ministers said tomorrow's meeting would take place as scheduled, since Mr. Pisani had authorized a substitute to negotiate for him.

The French delegation was obviously dissatisfied because no German Minister or even State Secretary was present at the first meeting yesterday.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 10, 1963]

COMMON MARKET PLANS TWO PARLEYS—FARM INTEGRATION IS PUSHED—PARTY LEADERS TO MEET

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, December 9.—Two important meetings will be held this week in this unofficial capital of the "new" Europe, which is getting to look more like the "old" Europe every day.

Today the agriculture ministers of the European Economic Community began a marathon series of conferences in an attempt to meet yearend deadlines that have been set by the European Common Market's integration timetable.

Tomorrow Premier Theo Lefevre will be host at a conference of Christian Democrat Party leaders of the European Community six—West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

REASON FOR TALKS

The party leaders are getting together to see what, if anything, they can do in concert behind their own frontiers to get the political and economic integration of Europe moving again.

Many political leaders in Europe believe that if the present Community standstill continues, the six member states eventually will pack up and go home.

The agriculture ministers will be meeting through Thursday in an attempt to break the deadlock over farm policy that has persisted since the demoralizing De Gaulle veto last January.

The timetable of the Common Market calls for agreements to be reached on beef, rice, and dairy produce regulations by yearend 1963.

COMMON CEREAL PRICE

The member states also are supposed to set a common cereal price for the 1964 harvest year which begins July 1. The Mansholt plan, which was proposed last month, calls for moving in one jump to common grain prices by July 1, 1964.

The original schedule called for gradual progress from one year to the next to a common price level by December 21, 1969.

When the full Council of Ministers meets next Monday, the cabinet ministers are scheduled to give their official views of the Mansholt plan. It is expected that the plan, in its present form, will be rejected. The reason: too much, too soon.

FRENCH TO FILE PROTEST

PARIS, December 9 (Reuters).—The French Wine and Spirits Export Syndicate will protest against an American decision to raise import tariffs on cognac in retaliation against Common Market protectionism in the "chicken war." Syndicate President Pierre Jeannenau said the protest would be lodged both with the French and international authorities. He called the American decision "discriminatory" and hoped that a solution would be found before the January 7 deadline when the new tariffs would go into effect.

MEETING THE COTTON TEXTILE CRISIS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a few days ago the House passed a bill H.R. 6196, known as the Cooley bill, designed to abolish the so-called two-price system for cotton in this country and thereby to relieve American cotton textile mills from unfair foreign competition.

I am wholeheartedly in accord with the purpose of this legislation, Mr. President, and I hope the Senate will soon have an opportunity to perfect and adopt such a bill.

However, I also am of the opinion that there is a better way to deal with the cotton problem than the method called for in the House bill.

A far more sensible approach—indeed, a fresh, a new approach—to the cotton problem is provided in a bill introduced in the Senate last March by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY.] This bill, S. 1190, entitled the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act," makes a lot of sense. I urge my colleagues of the Senate, who have not already done so, to get a copy of this bill and study it carefully. To me, the Talmadge-Humphrey proposals appear to offer the most sensible solutions to our present problems in the cotton and cotton textile industries suggested to date.

I hope, Mr. President, that soon the Senate can consider H.R. 6196, the House bill, amend it so as to include the basic provisions of the Talmadge bill, and then go on to pass it. With this approach we can save our textile industry from destruction, insure a fair return to cotton farmers, and cut the costs of our agricultural programs.

The cotton textile industry is threatened today because, under the two-price system, American mills must pay 8½ cents a pound—or $42.50 a bale—more for American cotton than the foreign mills have to pay.

For too long now, we in the Congress have failed to reach a real solution to the cotton problem. While we have postponed and delayed and temporized and quarreled, hundreds of American textile mills have shut down, throwing tens of thousands of workers out of jobs.

Textile jobs in this country have fallen from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to less than 840,000 last year. This has created economic hardship in the textile manufacturing areas of New England and of the South.

In my own home State of Maine, there has been a 50-percent decline in the number of cotton mills in the last 5 years. Employment in the textile industry in Maine has dropped more than 50 percent in the past 12 years, from 25,900 in 1950 to 12,000 in 1962.

Domestic cotton textile producers are being displaced not only by manmade fiber substitutes, but also by foreign grown cotton and by increased imports of cotton textiles. Cotton exports during the 1962–63 marketing year were down sharply—a total of only 3.4 million bales. Domestic mill consumption this past season was 8.4 million bales—about one-half million bales less than the previous year. It cannot be said, under these conditions that this industry is a growing and prosperous segment of our economy.

We cannot be satisfied with less than around 5 million bales as our share of the export market for cotton. Neither can we be satisfied unless our biggest and best customers—our own mills—use more cotton as population rises and buying power is at favorable levels.

At present, it is an ailing segment that is being forced into an even worse position. This is a segment too closely tied to our economy and national welfare to permit it to wither on the vine for lack of legislative action. If inaction continues to preclude this industry from competing we simply give carte blanche to foreign competitors to capture world markets, and to dominate domestic markets. Also, we open the floodgates wider for use of manmade fibers. And everyone will suffer—the grower, the mills, the consumer.

There also has been a sharp increase in imports of cotton textiles. For the first 8 months of calendar year 1963, cotton textile imports were up about 2 percent above the comparable 1962 period. Total imports of cotton textiles on a raw fiber equivalent basis were at a record level of 457,000 bales in the first 8 months of this year.

There has been increasing evidence of the loss of cotton markets to competing manmade fibers. We hear of more and more instances where rayon and other synthetic fibers are being substituted for cotton. The production of manmade fibers for the first half of 1963 was about 7 percent above the same period a year earlier. Mill consumption of cotton for the first 3 months of the current crop year is slightly below the same period a year earlier.

Cotton suffered a total competitive loss, as estimated by reliable economists, of 1,150,000 bales between December 1960 and March 1963. Over this period, consumption of rayon in cotton-type spinning mills rose 74 percent. Consumption of dacron and similar-type fibers rose 147 percent. Cotton's share of the fiber used in the cotton industry spinning operations has declined almost monthly.

There is another important factor which should be neither overlooked nor dismissed. This is that the cotton situation has sharply increased Government costs. As of August 31, 1961, Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in upland cotton amounted to approximately $300 million. By August 31, 1963, it had risen to approximately $1.2 billion. The carryover on August 1, 1963, was 11.2 million bales, up more than 3 million bales over last year.

Mr. President, the cotton bill passed by the House would eliminate the unfair two-price system, but it would go about it in the wrong way, by piling one 8½-cent-a-pound subsidy on another.

The House bill would do nothing about solving the problems of mounting cotton surpluses. It does not provide the answer to the decline in cash income to the cotton farmers. And, while it may help the mills and the workers, it does not help the taxpayers.

The Talmadge-Humphrey approach would do all of these things. It would end the two-price system and enable our domestic textile mills to compete once again with foreign mills. Costs to the mills would be lower under the Talmadge bill than under the House bill. It would protect the jobs of American workers. It would protect the income of the American cotton producers. Small family farmers would receive greater protection under the Talmadge bill than under the House bill. It would encourage the exportation of American cotton. And, by taking the Federal Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton, it would effect great savings to the taxpayers—savings not possible under the House bill.

Although no cotton is produced in my State of Maine or in the New England region, I recognize the importance of cotton to the agricultural economy of this Nation. When we enact legislation designed to help the cotton mill worker in New England or the Southeast, I think we also should try to help the cotton producer of the South and the Southwest and the Far West, especially the small farmers, wherever they are.

The Talmadge bill would do this by providing for adequate price supports and compensatory payments to farmers on cotton they produce within their domestic allotment quota. At the same time, the Talmadge bill would allow the producers to grow and sell as much cotton as they please at the lower world market price.

This would eliminate the necessity for the export subsidy. It would restore American cotton to a competitive position in the world markets. It would improve cotton's competitive position with synthetic fibers. It would lower cotton textile prices and savings to the consumer.

Another great advantage to the Talmadge-Humphrey plan, Mr. President, is that it would free the cotton farmer from acreage controls.

I would suggest one amendment to the Talmadge bill, Mr. President, to give the Secretary of Agriculture standby authority to impose controls on cotton production or marketing when and if the world price drops below 50 percent of parity. This would provide added insurance against runaway production.

My distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Georgia and the Senior Senator from Minnesota are experts in the field of agriculture legislation, and, Mr. President, they have combined their knowledge and talents to propose a program that I think needs to be enacted by this Congress.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will soon take up H.R. 6196, amend it to include the basic provisions of the Talmadge bill and send it to the floor of the Senate so that we may be permitted to vote our approval of it.

In this manner, Mr. President, we will be able to accomplish the avowed purposes of S. 1190:

> To maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

We have an opportunity here to benefit the farmer, the millworker, the mill operator, the consumer, and the taxpayer. And I hope we can seize this opportunity at the earliest possible moment.

CHRISTENING OF U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS"

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on November 30, 1963, the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels*, named for that great American and that great Secretary of the Navy, the late Honorable Josephus Daniels, was christened on the Kennebec River, at Bath, Maine. The naming of the ship for Secretary Daniels was indeed a richly deserved honor to his memory and an expression of appreciation of his wonderful services to our country. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks at the christening, together with a copy of the telegram which I sent expressing Mrs. Hill's and my deep regret that we could not be present on the occasion, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

A PRAYER—CHRISTENING OF U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS" (DLG–27) NOVEMBER 30, 1963

(Invocation given by Chaplain Bey G. Grunder, U.S. Navy, at the Bath Iron Works on Saturday, November 30, 1963)

Eternal God, who art robed in majesty and girded with strength, we beseech Thee to look with favor and compassion upon our Nation. Through the grievous death of our President John F. Kennedy we are again shocked into awareness that the heart of man can so easily be a hotbed of hate, where the trigger is given precedence over truth and tolerance. Assuage our grief and comfort the sorrow of Mr. Kennedy's wife and

family. In these critical days we pray for our President Lyndon B. Johnson, that Thou wilt be to him a tower of strength, a fountain of wisdom, and a shield of safety.

We look unto Thee, O Lord of hosts, as our refuge and our fortress, that Thou wilt guard us in all our ways and grant unto us Thy salvation. And now we are about to christen this ship, this product of ingenuity and workmanship, as a powerful symbol of our determination to preserve the freedom Thou hast given us.

In humility and in faith, we invoke Thy blessings upon U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels*; upon her commanding officer and all her crew. May the employment of this ship worthily reflect the genius and patriotism of her illustrious namesake. In every course upon every sea, let the *Josephus Daniels* steam with Thee who dost plant Thy footsteps in the sea and who dost ride upon the storm.

In the name of Thy divine Son our Saviour. Amen.

REMARKS OF JOHN R. NEWELL, PRESIDENT OF THE BATH IRON WORKS

Mrs. Woronoff, Senator MUSKIE, distinguished guests, fellow employees of the Bath Iron Works, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you here today to the banks of the Kennebec River to witness the christening of the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels* (DLG-27). Unfortunately, we were unable to get towboats here today due to the heavy seas outside, and so we are unable to put the ship in the water this morning. And since the weather is still a little gusty, I am glad that we decided not to launch even with towboats. We hope to launch tomorrow about 12:37 but we won't be able to make that decision until later when we find out what the weather is going to do.

The *Josephus Daniels* is the second of her class—the *Belknap* was launched last July—she is a big ship, 547 feet long, 55-foot beam, and will displace almost 8,000 tons when fully loaded. In fact, she is the longest ship ever launched at this yard or at Bath, Maine. She will be completed in about 13 months.

The *Daniels* is named for the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, under President Wilson, the Honorable Josephus Daniels. He was the editor of the Raleigh News & Observer for many years and built the paper up from scratch to a newspaper of national significance. He was Ambassador to Mexico under President Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1933 to 1942. The *Josephus Daniels* will be christened by a granddaughter of Mr. Daniels, Mrs. Robert Woronoff. We had expected another granddaughter to be present here today as cosponsor, Mrs. Clyde Rich, Jr., but she was unable to be present.

We also have with us today several other members of the Daniels family and many other distinguished guests, a few of whom I will mention:

Mr. and Mrs. Josephus Daniels, Jr.

Mr. Jonathan Daniels.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Daniels, Jr.

Mr. and Mrs. Derick Daniels.

Dr. and Mrs. Worth B. Daniels.

Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Squire.

Mr. Herbert W. Jackson.

The Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senator from Maine.

Adm. Robert B. Carney, U.S. Navy (retired), chairman of the board, Bath Iron Works.

Rear Adm. J. A. Brown, U.S. Navy, Design, Shipbuilding, and Maintenance Division, representing the Chief of the Bureau of Ships.

Air Vice Marshall R. Stanley Aitken, RAF (retired).

Rear Adm. and Mrs. William F. Royall, U.S. Navy (retired).

Rear Adm. and Mrs. J. P. Canty, U.S. Navy (retired).

Air Commodore J. C. Young, U.S. Navy, Fleet Air Wing 3, U.S. Naval Air Station, and Mrs. Young.

Capt. Walter E. Baranowski, U.S. Navy, supervisor of shipbuilding, Bath, representing the commandant of the 1st Naval District.

Capt. Ernest J. Knoche, U.S. Navy, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Brunswick, and Mrs. Knoche.

Col. Edward A. Herbes, U.S. Air Force, commanding officer, Bangor Air Defense Sector, and Mrs. Herbes.

Capt. Vincent Deitchman, U.S. Navy, chief of staff, Fleet Air Wing 3, U.S. Naval Air Station, Brunswick, and Mrs. Deitchman.

Capt. Charles W. Ward, U.S. Navy, administration officer, 1st Naval District, and Mrs. Ward.

Capt. and Mrs. Terry T. McGillicuddy, planning officer, Boston Naval Shipyard.

Capt. Russell S. Hitchcock, U.S. Navy (retired), former supervisor of shipbuilding, Bath, and Mrs. Hitchcock.

Capt. Edson H. Whitehurst, U.S. Navy (retired), and Mrs. Whitehurst.

Capt. David M. Burns, U.S. Navy (retired), and Mrs. Burns.

Hon. Carleton Day Reed, Jr. State senator, and Mrs. Reed.

Hon. Frederick E. Drake, Jr., State representative, and Mrs. Drake.

Hon. Ralph W. Brewer, State representative, and Mrs. Brewer.

REMARKS MADE BY REAR ADM. J. A. BROWN, REPRESENTING THE BUREAU OF SHIPS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE "JOSEPHUS DANIELS" (DLG-27) AT THE BATH IRON WORKS ON NOVEMBER 30, 1963

Launching traditionally marks the birth of a ship, the moment when it takes to its natural element and begins its vibrant, restless life.

This launching will be the start of a life dedicated to preserving peace and freedom. Such a life calls for power and versatility, both of which this ship has in abundance. It has the size, speed, endurance, and seakeeping qualities to operate effectively with fast aircraft carrier task forces. Its long-range radar and Terrier missile battery will enable it to shoot down attacking aircraft. A powerful sonar and the latest antisubmarine warfare weapons will make it effective against marauding submarines. This ship will have 3-inch and 5-inch guns for closein firepower—for local shore bombardment in support of amphibious operations.

Building such a ship takes great skill, and that we find in abundance here at the Bath Iron Works Corp. This shipyard has demonstrated particular competence in constructing destroyer types and has built many of the Navy's prototype destroyers. Just since World War II, Bath has built the prototypes *Mitscher* (DL-2), *Forrest Sherman* (DD-931), *Dealey* (DE-1006), *Charles F. Adams* (DDG-2), and *Leahy* (DLG-16), and is now building the prototype *Belknap* (DLG-26), a sister of this fine new ship. In addition, Bath is now building the experimental destroyer escort, *Glover* (AGDE-1). Such an array accurately reflects the enterprise of the management of the company, as well as the Navy's confidence in the skill and ingenuity of personnel. I know they have used all this ability in readying this ship for launching.

As this ship is launched, it will be named after World War I Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, by a charming lady who is his granddaughter. I am sure that as she christens the ship she will infuse it with some of her grandfather's greatness of character and intellect. This ship will need these qualities in the life she now begins.

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, DEMOCRAT, OF MAINE, AT THE LAUNCHING CEREMONIES OF THE U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS," IN BATH, MAINE, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1963

Mrs. Woronoff and other members of the Daniels family, Admiral Carney, Admiral Brown, President Newell, and distinguished guests, we meet here today to christen a fighting ship, and to honor a great Secretary of the Navy.

Tragic coincidence finds us doing so as the Nation mourns the death of a naval hero, whose personal courage served us gallantly in war, and whose inner strength was used to lead us wisely and firmly through the uncertain perils of our time.

Fighting ships are a Maine tradition. Maine craftsmen have built them; and have built into them the rock-ribbed strength, the sturdy reliability, and the stouthearted qualities which are bred into our people. Maine men have manned them and fought them, and the tales of their deeds of courage and patriotism are woven into the fabric of our country's history. And so, it is fitting that the launching of a Maine fighting ship should be an occasion for paying tribute to Josephus Daniels and John F. Kennedy. Stouthearted men and stouthearted ships have always felt a kinship for each other.

The ship we christen today, and the men who will man her, are the products of the modern Navy which Josephus Daniels did so much to create. They will be used to implement the national policy of using military strength as a force for peace, which John F. Kennedy did so much to shape.

When Josephus Daniels became Secretary of the Navy, in 1913, the world was dominated by Europe, a gigantic chessboard of power politics, and America was a disinterested spectator, comfortable in the isolationism which seemed such a perfect shield.

In such circumstances, it took vision to see that the oceans, of themselves, were not a perfect shield. Josephus Daniels had such vision, and worked for a two-ocean Navy.

This modest, North Carolina newspaper editor was not a specialist. He was not a skilled tactician. But he understood his country, sensed that America stood at the threshold of world leadership, and believed that she must equip herself to assert her strength upon the seas.

And so, Josephus Daniels labored at making the Navy a better shield, a more effective instrument for world leadership.

Such a Navy required a stepped-up program of ship construction.

Such a Navy required the mobilization of scientific resources for its full development.

Such a Navy required training programs to equip its personnel to use increasingly intricate and complex equipment.

Josephus Daniels foresaw these requirements and acted to meet them. Under his leadership, the Navy grew in physical resources. He organized the Naval Consulting Board for Naval Research. He established schools at sea to train men for their duties and opened to all enlisted men the possibility of becoming naval officers.

This missile frigate is a memorial to him and his work.

It is an instrument of the world leadership which he foresaw and which has become ours to exercise in a far different world than that of 1913.

As such, it has and must have a far different use than did the Navy of a half century ago. Our military strength is infinitely greater, but the consequences of its use can be so infinitely disastrous, that we must be infinitely wiser in that use.

Unless we learn to use it effectively as an instrument for peace, we can derive little comfort from its utility as an instrument for war.

To John F. Kennedy, military strength and power were essential elements of our national influence in the world, but he understood the need for wisdom and restraint in their use. He recognized their limitations as well as their awesome potential.

He saw that military power can only restrain or destroy: That only intellectual and spiritual power can create the good will and understanding essential to peace and justice in the world.

As we christen this ship, let us pray that it may always serve a wise, strong, and compassionate nation.

Let us rededicate ourselves, as President Johnson has asked us, to the task of continuing the work which President Kennedy began.

Let us take up this task in the spirit of a moving tribute which was paid to President Kennedy this week: "It can be said of him, as of few men in a like position, that he did not fear the weather, and did not trim his sails, but instead challenged the wind itself, to improve its direction and to cause it to blow more softly and more kindly over the world and its people."

(At this point, the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels* was christened by Mrs. Robert M. Woronoff of Larchmont, N.Y., formerly Miss Patricia Daniels, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Daniels of Raleigh, N.C., and the granddaughter of the late Honorable and Mrs. Josephus Daniels.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 26, 1963.

Capt. WALTER E. BARANOWSKI,
Supervisor of Shipbuilding,
U.S. Navy, Bath Iron Works Corp.,
Bath, Maine

Mrs. Hill and I deeply regret that due to longstanding engagements in Alabama it is not possible for us to be with you for the launching of the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels.*

Secretary Daniels was our dear and cherished friend and we rejoice to see honor done his memory. He was the father of our two-ocean navy that contributed so mightily to our winning of World War I. The late great Admiral Dewey declared that he had served in the Navy 62 years and had served under many Secretaries of the Navy but that Secretary Daniels was the best Secretary we had ever had and had done more for the Navy than any other. Secretary Daniels who served our Nation with such brilliance and dedication was more than a great American; he was a great American institution. Again may Mrs. Hill and I express our regret that we cannot be with you.

LISTER HILL,
U.S. Senator.

IMPORTATION OF MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the foundation stones in Wyoming's economy is the raising of cattle and sheep. Our stock growers are a hardy breed of individualists who pride themselves on their self-reliance. They are quite capable of meeting the many challenges that come their way in the risky business of stock raising.

However, in recent months, Mr. President, our stock growers are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the competition of foreign imports. These imports have increased greatly and constitute a definite threat to a vital industry in Wyoming and the West.

Because of my concern over these imports I made an appearance before the U.S. Tariff Commission to request action in behalf of these hard pressed industries. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GALE MCGEE BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION HEARINGS ON IMPORTATION OF MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS, INVESTIGATION NO. TEA-221(b)-1 UNDER SECTION 221 OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, WITH RESPECT TO THE PRESIDENT'S LIST OF ARTICLES FOR POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION IN TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing here today both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association. Mr. Dean T. Prosser, Jr., of Cheyenne, Wyo., secretary of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, has prepared an excellent brief for submission to the Commission. A conflict in his schedule has prevented his being here today and I am privileged to present the brief to the Commission on his behalf.

The Wyoming Stock Growers Association takes the position, and rightly so, that the great increase in the importation of beef and beef products is a substantial factor in the desperate situation the cattle industry finds itself in today. As Mr. Prosser points out, nearly one-fourth of the basic gross income in my State, Wyoming, is derived from agriculture and 79 percent of this amount is attributable to livestock and livestock products. The importance and the health of the livestock industry in Wyoming cannot be overstated.

The association contends that the rise in the import level of beef and beef products to nearly 11 percent of our domestic consumption is contributing substantially to the depressed livestock market and, in conjunction with increased production costs and low profit margins, is damaging a most vital domestic industry.

To correct this situation it is recommended that no further reductions in tariff rates be negotiated and that an import quota system be instituted for these products. I heartily endorse these recommendations and urge the Commission to consider the arguments in the brief most carefully and act favorably on these recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I request that the brief of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association be incorporated into the record at this point. I shall now proceed with my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to urge the Commission to take specific action to treat the ills of the livestock and woolgrowing industries, which have been aggravated in large part by inequitable import levels.

As late as September of this year, the Secretary of Agriculture recognized that compared to most nations the agricultural import policies of the United States are among the most liberal to be found. The agricultural industries of most other nations are much more highly protected by high tariff and nontariff barriers than our own. Our import protections on agricultural products have been steadily reduced over the past 30 years to such an extent that today our farm and ranch product tariffs are among the lowest in the world trade community. Agricultural imports have been rising steadily during this period. For instance, imports of live cattle, beef and veal have risen from 3.9 percent of our domestic consumption in 1957 to nearly 11 percent in 1962. From January to August of this year, these imports were running 22 percent above the same months of 1962. The importation of lambs and lamb and mutton in 1957 was 0.7 percent of our domestic production whereas this percentage rose to 17.8 percent in 1962. From January to August of this year, the figure rose to 22.9 percent.

It is plainly evident to me, Mr. Chairman, that our present tariffs are no deterrent and afford our agricultural industries an insignificant degree of protection. It is equally evident that positive steps must be taken to halt this trend and to place these basic industries in a more equitable position.

The production of cattle, sheep, and wool is among the most basic and important industries in Wyoming and the other Western States. These industries have struggled against an endless chain of adversities, both economic and environmental, to provide the American people with meat and wool. These industries have shown themselves to be capable of meeting the demand for increased quantities of meat products and wool. They have admirably kept pace with our growing population despite the many adverse circumstances encountered. It is manifestly unfair to retard the health and well-being of these industries by a continuation of the present inequitable trade policies. A further reduction of the tariff rates would deal a staggering blow.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to recognize the severe effects of the rising imports on the meat and wool industries as well as the resultant effects on the economy of Wyoming and other States similarly situated. I would urge the Commission to recommend that present tariff rates on these commodities not be the subject of negotiation, that they not run the risk of further reduction. I would urge the Commission, on the contrary, to take steps to establish import quotas for these commodities. The high import pressures on the domestic market must be relieved; the trade position of these industries must be made more equitable.

INITIATION OF INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA, AT INTERLOCHEN, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, picture, if you would, teenage music students from 50 countries gathered on the shore of a little inland lake, the rustle of the pines and the splashing of the waves the only background noise as these students perform one of the world's musical masterpieces.

After their musical session the teenagers of the world are off for a swim, an art class or some other shared activity.

Admittedly, it sounds a bit like a dream. And for years it has been just that—a dream of Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, founder of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich.

But I come here today to report that the dream is about to be clothed in reality.

Mr. President, now in its incubation period and expected to be born on June 28, 1964, is the International Youth Symphony Orchestra. It is planned that 100 to 120 highly qualified young musicians between the ages of 14 and 18 from as many as 50 countries will on that date move into the National Music Camp for 8 weeks of intensive training in symphonic musical performance.

This training period, under the camp's superior instructors and conductors, is expected to culminate in several performances in New York City—certainly at the World's Fair and possibly in Lincoln Center and the United Nations.

The purpose of the International Youth Symphony is to promote world friendship through music, a language that for centuries has needed no translator.

An addenda to the gathering of these young musicians from all over the world will be the first international competi-

tion in the United States for players of all orchestral instruments. This will be held August 26–30, with members of the Philadelphia Orchestra serving as members of the jury.

Mr. President, as I say, the plan is well along the way—with full cooperation promised by the State Department and by foundations, industries, organizations, and individuals in the United States who will contribute the estimated $1,200 cost per student.

All that remains for us here to do is to pledge our full support and to add our words of praise for Dr. Maddy and the staff of the National Music Camp for bringing such a worthwhile and praiseworthy project to our country.

Certainly such sentiments are heartfelt on my part. Dr. Maddy and the camp have long been a source of great pride to Michigan. It is inspiring to see Dr. Maddy—at the age of 71—still pursuing with vigor the ideas and ideals of his youth.

I salute him for it, pledge my support, and ask of my colleagues that they do the same.

IDAHO EDITORS COMMEND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, much deserved praise has been heaped upon the television industry for its complete but sensitive reporting of the somber series of events which began in Dallas at midday on November 22. The visual drama of those first days was so overwhelming that the press was, for a time, eclipsed as a medium for communicating facts and opinion to the American people. I think it is noteworthy, however, that the Nation's newspapers have set a very high standard of constructive comment and appraisal in connection with their reporting of the first days of the Johnson administration. This has been true, so far as I have observed, almost without exception, and without regard to the partisan affiliation which would normally color the contents of the editorial columns. In a crisis, we expect this of a responsible press, but I think it should not be taken for granted. Praise is due. As examples of the kind of editorial writing to which I have referred, and with my commendation to the editors concerned, I ask that several recent editorials from Idaho newspapers be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Statesman, Nov. 27, 1963]

THE NATION RALLIES

Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, catapulted into the Presidency of the United States by the tragic death of the late President John F. Kennedy, is busily assuring everybody that the basic policies of the Kennedy administration will not be changed in the Johnson administration.

That is entirely as it should be. This country, and the world, need and welcome reassurance that this is a transition, but not a crisis. It is a somber occasion but it is, unhappily, by no means a new experience. Such lamentable things have occurred before, but always this Nation has weathered through, and it will again. Actually there is good reason to suppose that this transition will be much less abrupt and far-reaching in its effects than would be the transfer of authority and responsibility from the leadership of one political party to those of an opposing philosophy of government as has frequently been effected in accordance with the provisions of our Constitution.

It is a matter of good fortune that the Kennedy obsequies have brought to this country an unprecedented assemblage of the executives of the world's great powers, both East and West. Thus it has presented an extraordinary opportunity, of which President Johnson is taking full advantage, to deliver his assurances personally, and for him to get better acquainted with the leaders of these other countries, and they with him. It is a development which cannot work out other than to the benefit of all concerned.

Some changes of policy, or tactics, there will be inevitably, because it will be Lyndon Johnson now, and not John F. Kennedy who will bear the responsibility for the final decision. And no policy or tactic can be so inflexible that it must be adhered to at whatever cost in an inexorably changing world.

Mr. Johnson brings to his high office qualifications which are perhaps not completely understood or appreciated.

An outstanding Member of the Congress with many years' experience in the legislative branch of the Government, he has aspired to election to the Presidency and 3 years ago he was a rival for his party's nomination. He didn't make it, but, on Mr. Kennedy's request, he did accept the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, and, in that position, he acquired a good deal of familiarity with the workings of the executive office. At the same time he advocated loyally the policies of the Kennedy administration.

Yet no man is precisely identical with another, and Lyndon Johnson is by no means a rubber stamp. It would seem to be altogether likely that he has his own ideas about the Presidential office and how it should function.

Indubitably Mr. Johnson is already an odds-on favorite for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in next year's general election. He will be running on his own record which he has only a few short months to fashion. He need incorporate in his own record such portions of the Kennedy record as he may choose, and he may make such modifications as his personal judgment and political acumen may dictate.

In the forthcoming political campaign he will be confronted by the Republican opposition which, of necessity and in decency, must now adhere to the political moratorium it has declared to continue until Mr. Johnson's record takes shape and is defined.

The time is one that calls upon the Nation to rally behind the figure in the White House, as it always has rallied at every crisis or emergency.

[From the (Idaho) Post-Register, Dec. 2, 1963]

"MUST MOVE FORWARD"—JOHNSON

President Lyndon B. Johnson, standing before the Nation and the Congress a bare 5 days after John F. Kennedy's death, showed in word and humble, deeply sober mood that he understood the awesomeness of the burdens he has assumed.

Ringing in his ears as he spoke was one of the most heartfelt, long-sustained greetings Congress has ever given a new President.

Inevitably this must have been greatly reassuring to him, though he would know it could not be meant wholly for him as a man.

This was America's way of celebrating the continuity and durability of its free system of government. Violence broke the pattern of power that centered on John Kennedy. But the shift of power to Johnson was swift, peaceful, decisive in drawing together the shattered threads.

All the drama in the great Chamber of the House of Representatives was infused with this irrepressible spirit of renewal which does still and must always invest our democracy.

The lawmakers assembled in the Chamber heard Johnson dedicate himself with some urgency to pressing for Kennedy's key domestic programs.

The foreign diplomats—and a listening world outside—heard him reassert in clear words America's unbroken adherence to the existing foundations of its foreign policy.

This reassurance from him to the nations beyond our shores is almost as vital as are our words and acts of support for Johnson in this difficult hour of transition. For few of our friends—or adversaries—abroad truly understand how a system of government so flexible can produce policies so generally stable.

Thus, the President said firmly that the United States will stand by its commitments of aid—from South Vietnam to Berlin. We will not flag in the quest for peace, nor in loyalty to our friends, nor in the search for any areas of agreement possible "with those with whom we differ."

Johnson's words were almost one with Kennedy's when he talked of the balance between national strength and national restraint, and readiness to "defend the national interest and negotiate the common interest." What the President said amounted to declaring a posture of great strength, prudently employed.

Nowhere in this context did he mention Communist Cuba, the small but troublesome thorn in America's side. Nor did he speak of disarmament, even to taking note of the existing partial test ban treaty.

But this was not an exhaustive foreign policy review, and the omissions may be without significance.

The new President said, in sum, that America stands as it stood at that tragic moment when a bullet cut down John F. Kennedy. But he made it plain that the Nation must move to far higher ground—if that terrible event is to have any lasting lesson for us as freemen.

"John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward."

With words such as these, Lyndon Johnson summoned the American people to a new, loftier effort at human betterment—a goal too often dimly seen by some in recent years.

No American of good will, sensing the best in the national spirit, could wish not to respond to the President's deeply felt appeal.

[From the Gooding (Idaho) Leader, Nov. 28, 1963]

OUR NATION GOES ON

(Editorial by Herb Love)

There is an old expression in the English language—"the king is dead, long live the king." And it has meant that leaders can come and leaders can go but a nation goes on.

Since last Friday, we in America have gone through the agony and sorrow caused by the assassination of our President. But we knew that our national life would continue much as usual. It is important that we believe this and even more important that the peoples of all other countries believe it. We are fortunate that a man experienced in government and known to the world has been the Vice President and is now our Chief Executive, President Lyndon Johnson.

He has served in Washington since 1931, as a secretary in Congress, as a U.S. Representative and as a U.S. Senator—and, for almost 3 years, as Vice President. During his service as Senator, he was known as one of

the strongest and most powerful men in the United States.

In 1960 he lost his party's nomination to Kennedy. Loyalty to his party, no doubt, caused him to accept the second place on the Democratic ticket and he swung much of the vote of the South that helped elect Kennedy.

It is accepted that a man can give orders only after he has learned to obey them. And that he can earn loyalty only by being loyal. President Johnson has demonstrated both.

It is important that the world knows that President Johnson is perhaps best prepared of all Vice Presidents who have taken office after the death of a President. He brings his long period of experience, his many travels into foreign lands as Vice President and his own compelling personality to his new duties. Known so far as a "politician's politician," he will undoubtedly evolve as a "statesman's statesman."

The burdens of the Presidency, no doubt, will make a change in President Johnson's personality. He will become more sober in mien. His words will be fewer since he knows that many contradicting misinterpretations can be made from a thoughtless sentence. His firmness will become more pronounced. Let us hope that his smile will not be diminished and that he can retain his natural good humor through severest trials.

The Democratic Party could not have produced a more capable man to succeed to the Presidency.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Nov. 29, 1963]

THE WORLD APPRAISES MR. JOHNSON

President Lyndon B. Johnson's swift, sure assumption of ultimate responsibility, which has transferred national leadership so quickly to a new President, has transferred international leadership also to the new chief spokesman for the free world.

With aching heart and a tremor in his voice, Mr. Johnson stepped forward to meet the demands of destiny. His sincerity, his high sense of purpose and the rightness of his direction already have won for him the confidence of the citizens of his own Nation and of other nations whose survival is linked inseparably with that of the United States.

Editorial comment from British newspapers is revealing in this time of transition. Sometimes, in fact, the British have enough perspective to see Americans more clearly than we see ourselves.

The conservative London Times had this comment:

"The task of succeeding an obviously great President is an exceedingly difficult one. Yet, President Johnson starts with a record much more substantial than was President Truman's when he succeeded President Roosevelt. President Johnson was the strongest majority leader in the Senate in memory. He was indeed much more important a figure in the Senate than President Kennedy himself. President Johnson's record on civil rights is an excellent one.

"The British sense of judgment was attuned to President Kennedy's judgment; his desire to move forward in social and economic affairs mirrored our own almost obsessive needs. Yet, after all, we share our loss with other countries: with Germany, where the threat of the East is so much more immediate; with France, where the political future is so hard to see; with Italy, politically uncertain and feeling a special dependence on the American connection. Most of all, the other allies share the loss with the United States which now so keenly needs great, strong and prudent leadership to solve such grave problems. In the late President, the combination of judgment and courage was unique. The United States will no more find another Kennedy than Britain will find another Churchill. Yet, it was a wonderful life, and the example of courage is never wasted."

The conservative London Telegraph offers this assessment:

"President Lyndon Johnson has been a Vice President of a very special kind; that is President Kennedy's political legacy. As Vice President, he was drawn by President Kennedy into his inner councils, as few if any Vice Presidents have been before. If very different from President Kennedy in personality and method, he has appeared to differ little in his political beliefs. On the supreme issues of foreign policy, he was in the President's confidence, not only at the moments when decisions were taken, but during the stages of deliberation on which those decisions were based. To bear the responsibility of making the decisions himself is indeed altogether another matter. But, as far as President Kennedy could insure that the trust reposed in him could be passed on to another, he did so."

Other British newspapers reflect such views in varying degrees. There are none of the flippant questions so recently asked by certain silly columnists and editorial writers in the United States about "what ever happened to Lyndon Johnson?" The British papers uniformly recognize that the greatest handicap the United States suffers in its leadership of the Western World is its record of racial discrimination at home. Some British papers, notably the Financial Times, express doubts that Mr. Johnson or any other man can achieve quickly the respect of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev which President Kennedy won in the Cuban confrontation and elsewhere. But almost all of Britain's newspapers reflect the gratitude apparent in the United States that a man of Mr. Johnson's caliber is the new President of this country and the new leader of the Western Alliance.

President Johnson's perception in conferring immediately with the leaders of allied nations who came to this country for Mr. Kennedy's funeral also has given him a great advantage in meeting his awesome international responsibilities.

A West German Government spokesman said Chancellor Ludwig Erhard had valued highly his talk with President Johnson and the President's assurance that this Nation's foreign policies will continue.

The French reportedly were most favorably impressed by Mr. Johnson's call for civil rights legislation and his promise that this country will keep its promises to its allies. Even French President Charles de Gaulle, the least cooperative of all Western chiefs of state in advancing Western policies in concert with the United States, seemed gratified by his conference with the new President.

Except for Khrushchev's emotional and apparently sincere expressions of grief upon President Kennedy's death, the spokesmen for the Communist bloc nations of Europe naturally were somewhat skeptical about the American crisis. Yet, the Soviet news agency, Tass, quoted at unusual length Mr. Johnson's promises to carry on the policies of his predecessor. The East Berlin radio said "there are various indications he supports a relatively sensible and, for American conditions, progressive line."

The first reactions abroad to the new American President, in short, were most encouraging. If nothing else, they reminded the citizens of this country—who sometimes tend to forget in periods of extreme partisanship or overemphasis upon provincial concerns—that the whole world has a crucial stake in the thoughts and performance of the President of the United States.

Nobody should ignore the London Times' reminder: "The United States will no more find another Kennedy than Britain will find another Churchill." But the citizens of this Nation and of the world are prepared to believe that the United States has found a fine and well-trained President who could become a great one.—B. J.

HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this country is currently marking Human Rights Week, and this fact makes it especially appropriate to pause for reflection about the efforts we are making to insure human rights both at the international and domestic levels.

In his remarks at the Human Rights Day luncheon, here in Washington on December 10, the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, noted the role played by President Kennedy in breaking the silence about human rights in this country.

His deputy, Richard N. Gardner, also delivered a fine address to the World Jewish Congress on December 8, outlining the programs in the field of human rights which are being implemented through the United Nations.

I commend both of these addresses to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

HE BROKE THE SILENCE

(Remarks by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the Human Rights Day luncheon, at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963)

"We meet here today in deep sorrow to honor the memory of a great and noble man." These were the words of Madame Pandit of India, spoken at the General Assembly of the United Nations. She went on: "Three shots fired in Dallas, Tex., on November 22, 1963, took one's mind back to three other shots fired on a January afternoon in India 15 years ago, when Mahatma Gandhi became a victim of the assassin's bullet. Though the time and place were different, the deed in both cases represented the ascendancy, for the moment, of the powers of hatred and violence which both Mahatma Gandhi and John Fitzgerald Kennedy fought against all through their lives."

And from Mr. Balaunde of Peru came a simple and eloquent tribute on the same occasion: "A mysterious crime has cut him down and snatched him away from us. And so his life at its highest point has the infinite beauty of the broken plinths and of the shattered columns. The shadow of Lincoln seems to float over this memory."

"The shadow of Lincoln * * *." In a thousand tributes here and there throughout the world, Lincoln's shadow has been evoked to honor President Kennedy in death. Combined with the shadow of Gandhi, the analogy is exact: more than any other, this President was identified with the issue of human rights, as Lincoln was. As much as any other, he insisted that even massive social change shall be carried off without violence, as Gandhi had taught.

Here among us in America, the Kennedy administration will be remembered as the time when the silence about racial discrimination was broken—for good. The silence, of course, was almost worse than the discrimination.

An American Rabbi, spoke of it when he told at the march on Washington what he observed in Hitler's Germany: "The most im-

portant thing that I learned in my life * * * is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most sinful, and the most tragic problem is silence."

But the silence is broken now—the lights are on, it is all out in the open. Partly this was done by Negroes demonstrating and police dogs barking and TV cameras whirring. But mostly it was done by the political leadership of the President of the United States.

If President Kennedy stood for human rights in domestic affairs, what did he stand for in foreign affairs? The historians will note his firm response to missiles in Cuba, to incidents in Berlin, to war by infiltration in Vietnam. They will celebrate his perception that thermonuclear power required fundamental changes in the techniques of peacemaking. They will record his conviction that our national purpose is to make the world safe for diversity.

But I think a strong case could be made that President Kennedy's greatest contribution to international politics was his active promotion of human rights for all Americans.

Thomas Jefferson predicted long ago that the sacred fire of freedom in this continent would someday light the earth. What we do here among ourselves is still—as it has always been—the most contagious and revolutionary part of our foreign policy. Barbara Ward, daughter of a long line of Britons, reminded us about it when she spoke in the Virginia Hall of Burgesses last summer: "With breathtaking audacity, they stood up in this little room and dared to legislate for mankind. For—make no mistake—that is what they were doing. They do not say 'We Virginians', they do not say 'We Americans', they say 'All men'. There is nothing restricted or parochial here. The rights they claim are universal rights, inherent in the human condition; everything is in terms of the generality of human experience."

The impact on our external relations, of the Federal Government's efforts to give every American a fair shake, give the lie to those who say a great power always gets credit for being powerful but never gets credit for being good.

I happened to be traveling in Asia in the fall of 1957 when the unpleasantness at Little Rock was splashed on the front pages of every foreign newspaper. I well remember how hard it was then to convince even my best friends in Asia that we were having trouble because we were making progress, because the silence had been broken by the Supreme Court decision in the Brown case.

Now, 6 years and 100 incidents later, we have just been through a General Assembly in which, so far as our records reveal, no single delegate has criticized our Federal Government for not doing its best to promote—as every member of the U.N. is committed by the charter to promote—the "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Many delegates have commented on the race issue in America, but most of them have complimented the American national administration for working hard on an admittedly most difficult problem.

We stand in world history at the beginning of the time when the nonwhite peoples of the world are successfully insisting on equality. Most of the world's national societies, even those loudest in their denunciation of racial discrimination, are still, at best, in the "separate but equal" phase of thinking about racial equality. James Baldwin in his bittersweet prose, can see the irony, "People are not," he says, "terribly anxious to be equal (equal, after all, to what and to whom?) but they love the idea of being superior."

In a world where most national leaders are not yet sure that it pays for everyone to be equal, no nation—let's face it, no nation at all—is doing enough about the promotion and protection of human rights for individuals. But during the brief but intensive Presidency of John F. Kennedy, the American Government, by working hard on its own race problem, has helped move to the top of the world's action agenda the issue of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

It is not only for domestic politics, but for international politics as well, that President Kennedy gave us the keynote in a television address at the critical moment of one of our own bloodiest incidents: "Those who do nothing [about civil rights] are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality."

Because President Kennedy acted boldly, the shots that struck him down were heard with powerful clarity around the world. For this reason above all, as Madame Pandit said in the General Assembly, "Mankind will cherish his luminous and fragrant memory."

THE INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

(Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, to the World Jewish Congress, at Stephen Wise House, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y., December 8, 1963)

This week marks the 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On this occasion it is fitting and proper that we review past efforts to strengthen the observance of human rights around the world and consider how these efforts may be strengthened in the future.

One of the several ways in which the Charter of the United Nations marked an important advance over the League of Nations Covenant was in its emphasis on human rights. The charter makes the promotion of human rights one of the main purposes of the Organization. In articles 55 and 56 members assume the responsibility to take action to promote universal respect for and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The legitimacy of international concern for human rights everywhere was thereby acknowledged in an international instrument ratified by every important independent country at the time. In securing the adoption of these revolutionary changes the United States played a leading part, and in doing so had the undivided support and encouragement of the non-governmental organizations represented at San Francisco.

The United States also took the initiative in the formulation and adoption of article 71, under which international non-governmental organizations subsequently received consultative status, among them this organization, the World Jewish Congress. Cooperation between governments and voluntary bodies is an old American practice, and is perhaps more highly developed in this country than anywhere else. It is one of the distinctive manifestations of our democratic way of life and may fairly be described as an American contribution to the charter.

The nongovernmental organizations made an outstanding contribution at San Francisco, and ever since, as an examination of the record will show, have played an important part in focusing attention on the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States has sought consistently, and under the guidance of its own history and traditions, to give form and substance to the promise implicit in the charter. It pressed for the adoption of an international bill of rights, the first element of which was to be the universal declaration, the 15th anniversary of which we are now celebrating. The draft of this declaration, which was the basis for the action of the General Assembly in 1948, was prepared and formulated by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

On this 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to this historic effort under the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In his address to the General Assembly on September 20, President Kennedy declared: "New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning."

The U.S. Government in the months ahead will continue to take a leading role in the United Nations and elsewhere in the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men—and to support practical proposals in the pursuit of this objective.

I need hardly emphasize before this audience the importance of continued U.S. leadership in the worldwide promotion of human rights. Since the Declaration of Independence our country has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and fundamental freedoms, not just for Americans, but for all men everywhere. Our power in the world derives not just from our position as an arsenal of weapons or as a storehouse of commodities but as a base from which to seek the universal realization of the dignity of man.

The principles and ideals embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are the same principles and ideals embodied in our Constitution and basic laws. They represent an essential and irreversible element in the policy of our country.

This applies to our policy at home as well as abroad. It is no accident that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his first address to Congress, put special emphasis on the speedy passage of the civil rights bill.

There are practical and urgent reasons for our concern with the realization of human rights on a worldwide basis. The experience of recent years has demonstrated not only the interdependence of nations in their pursuit of basic values but also the interdependence between human rights and national security.

We have seen how the destruction of freedom at home in totalitarian societies of the right and the left can lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Conversely, we know that worldwide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all will also be progress toward creating a peaceful and stable world order.

During most of the U.N.'s 18 years, the drive for freedom has tended to be defined as the drive for national independence. But we know that history is studded with examples of unholy alliances between nationalism and tyranny.

Now that freedom has been achieved for so many new nations, we are still faced with the previous question: What about freedom for individual men and women and children, the individual human persons whose dignity and worth we reaffirmed on the opening page of the U.N. Charter?

We all know how far the world is today from a satisfactory answer to this question.

In some nations, fundamental freedoms are denied by governments as a matter of principle—by racial separation, by political oppression, by religious persecution.

In other nations, many freedoms are deliberately postponed, by government action, to concentrate on what are thought to be more urgent items of public business.

In all nations in greater or less degree, freedoms are infringed by lust for unchallenged political power—by the animosities of tribe or class or caste or sect or party—by prejudice and bigotry and other evils which still divide the branches of humanity.

There is no doubt that these matters are of international concern. They can and should be exposed to the awakened and articulate conscience of mankind in the United Nations and other international forums.

I

What specific measures is the United States now prepared to support in the international effort for the promotion of human rights? The answer falls in two main parts:

In the first place, the U.S. Government has embarked on a new policy of considering United Nations human rights conventions on their merits.

In July of this year President Kennedy submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification three United Nations Conventions dealing with forced labor, practices akin to slavery, and the political rights of women. Each of these deals with an important human right already guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and by existing Federal law. We believe their ratification can play a significant part in cultivating an international environment congenial to American interests.

Beyond pressing for the speedy ratification of these three conventions, we have been actively participating in the consideration of other human rights conventions—including the two human rights covenants. We do not underrate the difficulty and complexity of the problems which must arise when an attempt is made to formulate a single rule of law affecting human rights which can apply to more than 100 nations with varied social and political systems and traditions. But we are resolved to make every contribution we can toward the development of international standards for the protection of human rights which take account of the legal systems and social structures of participating states.

In the second place, apart from the process of drafting conventions, we are considering ways in which the United Nations can deal with human rights questions on a more objective and professional basis.

In the 17 years of its existence the United Nations has developed effective procedures for dealing with two of its principal concerns—the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic development. It has been less successful in developing adequate procedures with respect to its third concern—the promotion of human rights.

At the present time, for example, the United Nations does not provide its members with an up-to-date, comprehensive and professional analysis of the measures taken by member states in fulfillment of their charter obligations to promote human rights for all their citizens. The Human Rights Commission regularly bypasses discussions of current problems in specific countries. In the vacuum thus created the General Assembly is tending to involve itself in politicized and emotional discussions of a few human rights problems without the benefit of a broad and analytical review of the entire subject.

We continue to believe, as President Kennedy told the Assembly, that "new efforts are needed" if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is to have full meaning.

We should consider the role the United Nations might play in defining standards, in clarifying experience, in reviewing government performance against charter principles, and in exposing to the conscience of the world the denial of those rights which should be the heritage of all human beings.

If this process of international discussion is to bear fruit, however, it must be genuinely devoted to the national pursuit of human rights—not the national pursuit of self-righteousness. In this field we might well benefit from the application of the familiar legal doctrine of "clean hands": those who would call in question the practices of others should at least be making every effort to put their own house in order.

The real test of a nation's commitment to human rights is not what it says for all the world to hear but what it does in practice for all the world to see.

II

This leads me inevitably to some specific comments about the human rights practices of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union in recent years has sought to assert its leadership in human rights issues before the United Nations. There is a certain irony in this effort—an irony of which the United Nations is frequently reminded not only by ourselves but by other members. For the Soviet Union has adopted as government policy a widespread disregard for those fundamental human rights which are embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We cannot and should not forget for an instant the violations of basic political liberties which have affected all religious and national elements of the Soviet population.

In this gathering today, it is fitting to make some reference to the specific disabilities, religious and cultural, of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. These are a matter of anxious interest not only to other Jewish communities but to all who seek to build a better world on the basis of the principles embodied in the universal declaration:

There has been a marked decline within the last 3 years in the number of synagogues in the Soviet Union. No Jewish schools are allowed to be established. A majority of the students at the one rabbinical seminary permitted to exist in the entire Soviet Union were denied residence permits in 1962 for the city of Moscow on the grounds of a housing shortage.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor has even a Russian translation of the Jewish Old Testament been allowed. Six, no more than six, books in the Yiddish language have been published since 1953.

Even the baking of matzos for Passover has been prohibited and the last kosher meat market in Moscow has been closed.

A person of Jewish descent, who may have broken completely with his religious tradition, must still carry the nationality designation "Jew" in his identity card.

Our disquiet about the situation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is not the result of any diplomatic conflict or the so-called cold war. We are equally opposed to any kind of discrimination, and have made that repeatedly clear, in any other country, irrespective of its social or political structure. Our disquiet flows from the deep conviction, which is as old as our Declaration of Independence, that human rights are inalienable, and that the business of government is to recognize and protect them.

Let me express the hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will seek to correct a situation in accordance with their own often-proclaimed principle of equality for all the peoples and religions under their jurisdiction. Let me add that any amelioration of this situation would itself be a positive contribution to the development of better mutual understanding, which is the indispensable foundation for a common effort to overcome the dangers and difficulties which stand in the way of the fulfillment of mankind's hope for a better world founded on freedom and justice.

THE CO-OP WAY—ABROAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the speakers again this year at the annual meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., was Mr. Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources at the Agency for International Development. As my administrative assistant from 1953 through 1960, Mr. Waters made countless friends in Minnesota. He is recognized throughout the country as an authority on agriculture. He is respected by farm leaders, businessmen, and Government officials:

One of the areas in which Mr. Waters has particularly concentrated his efforts is cooperatives. His address before the Grain Terminal Association was entitled, "The Co-op Way—Abroad."

In discussing the AID program and the role cooperatives can play in it, Mr. Waters said, and I quote:

> We believe in all of our economic assistance programs we should first seek to achieve our objectives through the private enterprise system before undertaking direct governmental action—and cooperatives are an integral part of our free enterprise system. We want to work through such nongovernmental private organizations wherever possible. In fact, in my opinion, we'd be better off keeping Government out of any services cooperatives can perform through the private sector—in our food programs as well as in our technical assistance programs, domestically as well as internationally. I've always felt that cooperatives should occupy a more significant role in our entire food-for-peace program, as nongovernmental grain merchandisers who can help build future markets for the private sector rather than favoring a growing pattern of state trading.

Mr. President, one of the great cooperatives in the country—in the world—is the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. It and other cooperatives are well equipped to provide many of the necessary services under our programs of foreign assistance, including *food for* peace. After many years of urging by myself, many of my colleagues, and responsible public servants and private citizens, co-ops are beginning to get the recognition they so richly deserve. But much more needs to be done in this area. As Mr. Waters told Grain Terminal Association:

> The cooperative movement in the United States, which has contributed so much to the well-being of American agriculture, can and must help meet this newer challenge of bringing new hope to millions of people in other lands seeking to achieve a better life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Waters address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE CO-OP WAY—ABROAD

(By Herbert J. Waters)

It's always good to be back with my friends in GTA. This makes the 11th annual meeting which I have been privileged to attend.

We've seen a great many changes in those years—but GTA continues to grow stronger and more effective, as an outstanding example of a great American cooperative institution serving its thousands of farmer-owners.

Last year, from this same platform, I talked to you about the tremendous contribution your farm abundance was making to our economic assistance programs, in developing

countries, through the food-for-peace program you helped to create. Today, I can assure you of the vital importance of your abundant production with even more conviction, as the result of personal observations in the 27 other countries of the world I have visited in the past year.

Where once food surpluses were thought to be threatening our national economy, the fruits of your industry and technology are accepted today as important weapons in the arsenal guarding freedom.

Our agricultural abundance has provided us with a spear—a weapon to prod the enemies of democracy and freedom—but more importantly—a spear to penetrate into the heart of the greatest problem facing one-third of humanity: hunger.

The spearhead of our agricultural abundance is today—as it has been since the inception of the food-for-peace program—penetrating areas where other forms of assistance—and even diplomatic efforts—have previously failed.

During the past fiscal year over 100 million undernourished people have shared in our agricultural abundance. They included refugees fleeing persecution, and disaster victims uprooted by flood, earthquake, and drought. They included 585,000 laborers earning food as part payment of wages in 19 countries, idle hands given gainful employment in a constructive economic development effort having a dramatic impact on the people in their own villages. They included 40 million schoolchildren, many of whom were too hungry previously to attend classes, who last year consumed approximately 1.5 million tons of American food in classrooms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

School construction, roadbuilding, land reclamation, rural resettlement, housing, establishment of farmers' cooperatives—an almost endless variety of economic development projects are being carried on—using food instead of dollars to pay labor component costs.

But it isn't about food that I want to talk with you today, as important as food is to our total international effort toward wiping out poverty and disease, and raising living standards. You will hear plenty from others during this convention on the significance of your food production to our national security—including, I am sure, from a man in perhaps the best position of all to know—the distinguished Secretary of State who will address you tonight.

Instead of talking again about food for peace, I want to talk about another topic that should be close to your hearts—the co-op way, and what we are doing about it in developing countries of the world.

Promotion of cooperatives as a tool of foreign aid is now a significant part of your Government's activities in developing areas of the world—and the great cooperative institutions of the United States are assisting in that effort by sharing their know-how, experience, and, yes, even capital resources.

The late President Kennedy who we still mourn had once declared: "Our unfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions."

Let me emphasize that: "Freemen, working within a framework of democratic institutions"—working for "economic progress and social justice."

Can you offer a better definition of the cooperative solution to economic and social problems?

Don't those words describe what you and I aspire to when we join together as freemen in a cooperative to help ourselves to provide essential goods and services?

This is why we feel that cooperatives, and cooperative techniques, can make a significant contribution to the attainment of our objectives in the developing countries—just as they have in America.

Perhaps no other American institution is so well suited for export to other countries, to provide a technique whereby economic growth and political democracy can develop hand in hand.

To the farmer, to the worker in an underdeveloped land, a cooperative can offer the first exhilarating experience in self-determination, of participating in the shaping of one's own destiny, of ownership of property or land, of local self-government. The cooperative can be—and is proving to be—the community center of training and experience in social and political as well as economic democracy.

Understanding this from his own observations, both in this country and abroad, our mutual friend Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY instigated a historymaking step forward in U.S. foreign policy just 2 years ago when he proposed, and the Congress enacted, an amendment to our foreign assistance legislation setting forth that goal.

In the 1961 Act for International Development, Congress declared that it is "the policy of the United States * * * to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations."

That has been our mandate in the Agency for International Development—and we have welcomed it.

Under the guidance of a Cooperative Advisory Committee composed of distinguished American cooperative leaders—including, of course, your own M. W. "Bill" Thatcher—we have moved rapidly ahead toward implementing that objective.

Today, we have 93 major cooperative technical assistance programs underway in 48 countries. That is almost a fourfold increase over the 25 major operating programs in 36 countries reported for fiscal year 1962.

In the past year, we have spent $8,479,438 of AID's development grant funds for this cooperative technical assistance purpose. This represents an increase of approximately 300 percent over the $2,794,400 which was contributed for cooperative purposes in fiscal year 1962—the first year in which we launched our intensive effort to emphasize cooperatives in our foreign aid program.

But, even more significant, is the fact that nearly $100 million in capital has been made available to housing cooperatives, savings and loan institutions, credit unions, cooperative farm lending institutions, and production, processing, and marketing cooperatives in developing areas—primarily in Latin America—by development loans, either directly from the Agency for International Development, or from Social Progress Trust Funds of the Inter-American Development Bank, which also come out of our foreign assistance appropriations—or from private groups such as the AFL-CIO, backed up by our AID investment guarantees.

And, at the same time, cooperative institutions of the United States have spent approximately $700,000 of their own resources on additional technical assistance and services to cooperatives in developing countries during the past year to further this combined effort.

Under review now, with action expected soon, are applications for AID rural electrification loans of $1,500,000 for Colombia and $420,000 for Nicaragua, and a $2 million AID loan for financing of rural cooperatives in trouble-wracked northeast Brazil.

Such a stimulus to the cooperative movement in Latin America, Africa, and Asia has naturally required a vastly stepped up training program for competent cooperative management. The number of foreign participants selected for training in cooperatives from the countries where these programs were in effect increased from 203 persons for year 1962 to 1,675 persons for year 1963.

All of these participants were trained either in the United States or in third countries—many in Puerto Rico. Many more people were trained in their own home countries through the assistance of AID programs.

It has required experienced manpower to direct these programs—and we've turned to the cooperative movement to find the qualified specialists we needed. One hundred and thirty-three cooperative specialists of one kind or another were employed directly by AID during the year 1963, an increase of 49 over the previous year. But most of our work has been channeled through U.S. cooperatives themselves, under contract with AID. And these contracting organizations employed an additional 213 cooperative specialists on our projects during the last year.

The major effort of AID in the cooperative field has been to find ways to bring into active play the resources and experience of cooperative organizations in the United States to help carry out the AID program in developing countries.

Organizations actively participating in AID programs for year 1963 included Credit Union National Association, National Farmers Union, Cooperative League of the USA, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as well as the International Cooperative Training Center at the University of Wisconsin.

Worldwide service contracts have been signed with these organizations during the past year, placing the experience and operating know-how of key cooperative leaders in the United States at the disposal of cooperative planning officials in the developing countries. Each project, therefore, becomes a part of economic planning, and the cooperative a means for helping achieve overall economic and social goals for the country concerned.

We expect to make even greater use of such nongovernmental organizations during the year ahead in furthering this program of cooperative development abroad, and hope to encourage "partnership" ties between cooperatives of other countries and those in the United States—ties of business and trade, as well as ties of friendship and assistance.

We believe in all of our economic assistance programs we should first seek to achieve our objectives through the private enterprise system before undertaking direct governmental action—and cooperatives are an integral part of our free enterprise system. We want to work through such nongovernmental private organizations whenever possible. In fact, in my opinion, we'd be better off keeping Government out of any services cooperatives can perform through the private sector—in our food programs as well as in our technical assistance programs, domestically as well as internationally. I've always felt that cooperatives should occupy a more significant role in our entire food-for-peace program, as nongovernmental grain merchandisers who can help build future markets for the private sector rather than favoring a growing pattern of State trading.

One of the key points of any serious reappraisal and reassessment of our farm programs should be a serious look at what services our private cooperatives can perform, instead of Government, in achieving our objectives.

We're doing that, as a matter of national policy, in seeking to improve agricultural credit, production, processing, and marketing systems in developing countries. We're doing it as part of our dedication to the free enterprise system we are trying to export to others. Perhaps we also need to take a closer look at what is happening right here at home, in regard to the relationship of Government to the private sector in agriculture.

Each of our oversea cooperative projects has a dramatic story of its own buried in

the statistics and official reports. Let me give you just briefly a few examples typical of the cooperative programs contributing to a more stable security and political situation by improving the economic position of the people and their own organizations:

While the jungle war in Vietnam goes on, our U.S. aid mission is starting its 3-year program to put 200,000 peasant families on a better economic footing through cooperative effort. Surplus American corn, eight sacks of cement, and three pigs for each family project may turn out to be effective counterinsurgency strategy. The cement is to build sanitary pigsties, the corn is to feed the pigs, and cooperatives are being organized to furnish the necessary farm services to help the farm families move up the economic ladder.

In Peru, the poor people in the isolated jungle town of Iquitos at the headquarters of the Amazon River showed in less than 4 years how a credit union can influence a whole community. Organized in the poorest section of the town, the credit union is now the largest in Peru. It has 3,500 members, deposits of approximately $750,000, and has started to finance a building boom by helping low-cost housing projects among its members.

In Nigeria, the native fishermen of the Western Nigerian Cooperative Fishermen's Association are confidently expecting that their daily catch of fish will increase by 150 percent. Thirty-five fishing boats outfitted with outboard motors and modern fishing gear, will take them out to sea. The fishermen have expanded their cooperative to include transportation, marketing, and a boat repair shop.

These examples of how AID seeks to utilize cooperatives in self-help programs extend to agriculture, fish, livestock marketing, dairy, rural electricity, low-cost housing, credit, health insurance, and even taxi and bus cooperatives. In every project of a community nature, the people are encouraged to raise at least a part of their own capital.

An increasing number of cooperative leaders in the developing countries are learning that many of their problems and requirements are much the same as those which confront other cooperatives. This awareness has helped to bring cooperatives together into regional associations.

In Latin America, for example, the establishment of an Inter-American Cooperative Finance Institute has been recommended by a group of cooperatives. In Central America plans already have been made to form a Central American Credit Union Federation. Plans are also proceeding with the organization of the Cooperatives of America—bridging both North and South America. And AID has contracted for a survey of Latin American cooperatives as a basis for stepping up the program for bringing all Latin American cooperatives into a single federation.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers, IFAP, which has farm organizations and cooperative members in 32 countries of the free world, has encouraged its members to involve more of their people in these cooperative programs. The northern European countries are proving highly receptive to the idea of developing international teams of technicians and specialists for the developing countries.

U.S. cooperative experts working overseas demonstrate to people of the underdeveloped nations how the United States mobilizes not only the institutional forces of government, but the Nation's human resources as well.

The challenge facing us throughout the world is such that we need the combined effort of public and private resources, if we are going to succeed—and succeed we must.

We in Government can't carry the load alone. It's your challenge as well as ours. We need your help—the help of every individual, every farm organization, every cooperative, every church group, every community. We need your understanding and support.

At a time when we as a nation are engaged in a gigantic struggle for freedom's survival in the world, you should welcome the opportunity to let others know that cooperative enterprises are a significant part of our capitalistic free enterprise system.

As cooperative leaders, as farmers, as individual U.S. citizens—and, even more, as fathers and mothers—you have a vital and continuing stake in the success or failure of U.S. foreign policy—and our foreign assistance program that is used to implement that policy.

We are in a race—a desperate race—against time.

We are competing hourly against the forces of world communism dedicated to destruction of our way of life.

There are threats to the freedom of the peoples in many countries. Governments in the nearly emerging countries face insistent demands for socio-economic progress—demands they are unable to meet without outside assistance.

These governments face persistent pressure by the Communists to exploit them.

Without outside help—food, funds, technical know-how—they face economic stagnation—with its resultant chaos, confusion, and revolution—a fertile field for dictatorship, a sterile field for self-help and self-determination.

We cannot ignore this challenge.

The cooperative movement in the United States, which has contributed so much to the well-being of American agriculture, can and must help meet this newer challenge of bringing new hope to millions of people in other lands seeking to achieve a better life.

PERCY H. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY OFFICER, HONORED BY JAMES J. HOEY AWARD FOR INTERRACIAL JUSTICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Mr. Percy H. Williams, now assistant executive director for contract compliance of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, was recently honored by receiving the James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice.

The James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice was established in 1942 by the family of the late James J. Hoey, one-time collector of internal revenue for New York and one of the organizers and first president of the Catholic Interracial Council. Each year on the Feast of Christ the King, the Catholic Interracial Council of New York confers a silver medal upon a white and a Negro layman who, in the judgment of the council, have made outstanding contributions to interracial justice. This year's recipients at ceremonies held in New York City on October 27, were Mr. James T. Carey, founder of the Catholic Interracial Council of San Francisco, and Mr. Williams. Former recipients include CIO President Philip Murray in 1943, the former U.S. Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath, in 1950, RCA President Frank M. Folsom in 1956, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., in 1958, Percy H. Steele, Jr., executive director of the San Diego Urban League, in 1959, and Dr. Eugene T. Reed, president of the NAACP Conference of New York State, in 1961.

I am particularly pleased to learn that Mr. Williams' work has been recognized because I have known Mr. Williams since he was a boy when he played baseball on a boys' team I sponsored in Chicago. Since that time he has secured a good education in Chicago universities, has been an outstanding worker for equal justice in human relations, and has held positions as research assistant for the mayor's committee on community welfare in Chicago, director of job opportunities of the American Friends Service Committee, and Midwest regional director of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. In addition to his present position with the President's Committee, he is a member of the Catholic Archdiocesan School Board of Washington, D.C., and a member of the executive committee of the archbishop's committee on human relations.

Mr. Williams is a fine and public-spirited citizen and the recognition paid to him and to the President's Committee by this award is well deserved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation of this award and an article which appeared in the Catholic Standard for October 11, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITATION

Percy H. Williams, of Washington, D.C., assistant executive director, contract compliance for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and member of the archdiocesan school board and the archbishops' committee on human relations of Washington, D.C., has a long record of expert and devoted activity in the crucial area of equal employment opportunity.

The Catholic Interracial Council of New York therefore, is happy to propose the name of Percy H. Williams, as a recipient of the 22d annual James J. Hoey Award for interracial justice.

SAMUEL J. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JOHN LAFARGE, Jr.,
Chaplain Emeritus.
LAWRENCE PIERCE,
President.
PHILIP S. HURLEY, Jr.,
Chaplain.

[From the Catholic Standard, Oct. 11, 1963]

ANTIDISCRIMINATION OFFICIAL NAMED FOR 1963 HOEY AWARD

Percy H. Williams, a member of the Archbishop's Human Relations Committee and an official of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, has been named by the Catholic Interracial Council of New York as recipient of one of its 1963 James J. Hoey Interracial Justice Awards.

The council, which annually presents two such awards, has named James T. Carey, a University of California criminology instructor who helped found CIC units in San Francisco and Oakland, as the other recipient.

The men will be presented the awards, given annually since 1942 "for outstanding contributions to interracial justice," on October 27, the Feast of Christ the King.

A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters Union and organizer of the August 28 march on Washington, will speak at the presentation luncheon in New York's Americana Hotel.

Mr. Williams, a member of Sacred Heart parish, is assistant executive director of contract compliance for the President's Committee. Established in 1961, the Committee is charged with seeing that the executive branch of the Federal Government implements a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment practices.

Before joining the Committee, Williams was a member of the industrial relations staff of the International Harvester Co.

In April of 1963, he was appointed to the archbishop's committee on human relations. He is also a member of the archdiocesan school board.

A member of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, Mr. Williams has served as a member of the board of directors of the National Social Action Conference. He formerly was regional director of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. A graduate of De Paul University, he did graduate study at Loyola University, Chicago.

A native of Chicago, Mr. Williams has served as a member of the board of the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago. Also in Chicago, he had served as president of his parish Holy Name Society.

He is married to the former Jeanne Watson and has three children, Timothy, a freshman at St. John's High School; Anne, in the 8th grade at Immaculata-Dunblane School and Peter, in the 7th grade at Sacred Heart School.

Dr. Carey, who teaches at the Berkeley campus at the University of California, was founder and first president of the CIC of San Francisco and when the Oakland diocese was established last year, was founder of the first CIC there. He is a member of Ste. Mary Magdalein Parish, Berkeley.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced an amendment to the Constitution which would provide for the selection of a new Vice President in the event of a vacancy in that office. My proposed amendment also deals with the closely related questions of Presidential disability and the line of succession.

The recent accession of Vice President Johnson to the Presidency has once again focused public attention on these problems. Yesterday, I inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann in which he suggested modification of existing provisions. Today, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, editorials from the New Republic, the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, as well as a column by the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston.

None of these articles are committed to any one solution; but they are alike in emphasizing the need for new legislation on this vital question. I commend them to my colleagues.

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

[From the New Republic, Dec. 14, 1963]

THE SUCCESSION LAW

The Constitution provides that in case of removal of the President from office, by death or otherwise, the office shall devolve on the Vice President. That is the end of the self-executing provision. For the rest, the Constitution says that the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal of both the President and Vice President, "declaring what officer shall then act as President."

When the Presidency devolved on Vice President Truman, the statute then on the books ran the line of succession through the Cabinet, in the usual order of seniority, which is the order in which the offices were first established, namely, State, Treasury, War (Defense), and so on. In 1947, at Mr. Truman's instance, the new statute changed the succession, so that now the Speaker of the House is first in line, followed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. These officers are, respectively, JOHN MCCORMACK and CARL HAYDEN. Accordingly, President Johnson has taken steps to keep Speaker MCCORMACK current on certain security affairs. It is not known whether the President has also made with Mr. MCCORMACK the sort of arrangements that were made both with him and with Vice President Nixon for assuming Presidential duties temporarily in the event of Presidential disability. These latter arrangements are not governed by statutes, but are subject to Presidential discretion.

Speaker MCCORMACK is 71. Senator HAYDEN is 86. It signifies no disrespect to either man to say that not in the wildest dreams of anyone—including themselves—would they be deemed Presidential timber. Their age alone precludes. Clearly, therefore, until a new Vice President qualifies in January 1965, the country finds itself in a precarious position. The problem is delicate, and there is no sure-fire solution to it—the constitutional provision has itself proved imperfect, as some tenants of the Vice-Presidential office have demonstrated. We have been lucky, but in this most solemn matter, it is not prudent to push one's luck too far.

The line of succession that was abandoned in 1947 was no better than what we have now. Actually, on paper, the present system is an improvement. Cabinet officers often are and often ought to be technicians, specialists, rather than national political personalities They hold office by appointment and relatively automatic confirmation in the Senate. They are not as Cabinet members subjected to the electoral process, and many of them (Secretaries Rusk, Dillon, and McNamara, for example) have never faced an election or been familiar with the inside of a political clubhouse. They may come from foundations, universities, banks, and places like the Ford Motor Co., and be as innocent of political experience and a wide range of domestic and foreign problems as it is possible for a high officer to be. The President carries all of that for them. It would be too fundamental a contradiction of democratic theory and practice to elevate such a man to the Presidency, and it would be a contradiction that would seriously weaken such an incumbent.

The Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, by contrast, are elected in their own constituencies, of course, and what is more important, they are the choices of their colleagues, expressed in formal votes, for the headship of each of the two Houses. Indirectly, but realistically enough, they represent in their own persons national constituencies. Unfortunately, however, that is a paper reality only. Memory cannot recall a time when the President pro tempore of the Senate was elected on any basis other than that he was simply the senior Senator in point of service on the majority side. The speakership is not always the automatic reward of longevity; but all too often it is, or comes near to being, and in the case of Speaker MCCORMACK, it rather was. The upshot then is that Congress disables itself by its sluggish, self-regarding, in a word, irresponsible reliance on seniority from performing a high function of state, that of filling from its rank a place in the line of Presidential succession.

Thus, the dilemma. The Cabinet succession won't do on principle. And Congress, ideally suited on principle, will not do in practice. Perhaps there is some slight ground for hoping that this grave demonstration of the inexcusable deficiencies in Congress' way of organizing itself will serve to spur congressional reform, which is overdue for a thousand additional reasons as well. But we are talking about the moving of mountains. In the meantime, the Nation faces a clear and present danger, and we dare not fail to consider alternatives.

One possibility would be a statute requiring Congress, within a specified time following the succession of a Vice President as Chief Executive or the death in office of a Vice President, to elect a new Vice President. Members of the Congress should not be disqualified as candidates, even though the risk here is that the Legislature might simply paint itself back into the same seniority corner. One must assume that in the sober circumstances of such an election, Congress would be less clubby and irresponsible than when it makes Speakers and Presidents pro tempore without much thought to the Presidential succession. In any event, the man elected should resign whatever public office he might be holding, and be ineligible for any other, since obviously difficulties of precedence and the like would be faced if he remained, say, in the Senate or the Cabinet. Rather, he should assume the duties of Vice President. The election ought to be by Congress as a whole, and it ought not to be by the antiquated and haphazard method of voting by States, each State casting an equal single vote. Perhaps the election might be by the concurrent vote of both Chambers, each voting separately, as they do when they enact legislation. And perhaps the sitting President might be given a veto, which presidential nominees, after all, have in the selection of a vice presidential candidate.

Other suggestions are conceivable, and this solution is itself not addressed to the risk of a catastrophe that disables both President and Vice President. It is essential only that the process of selection be such as to result in a successor to the Presidency from whom the line runs, albeit indirectly, to a national constituency; otherwise he would lack adequate, self-reliant, and self-starting strength to act in that most awesome of all offices. And it is essential that the selection be deliberate and have regard for the quality of the man, rather than being the kind of relatively automatic method by which Congress selects its own officers.

It is finally to be noted that the office of President is made to devolve on the constitutional Vice President. As to a successor to a former Vice President, Congress is empowered only to declare that he shall "act as President * * * until the disability (of the President) be removed, or a President shall be elected." It would seem open to Congress, therefore, to provide for a special presidential election at some time after the succession, although it is not open to the Congress to so provide in the case of the succession of a constitutional Vice President.

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

PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 5.—A few minutes after President Kennedy was assassinated the defense forces of the United States all over the world were informed and instructed to be on the alert.

No "emergency defense condition" was ordered. No additional atomic bombers were flushed, as during the Cuban crisis, but in this day of instantaneous attack nobody could be quite sure whether the assassination was the end or merely the beginning of the agony.

The Nation has had too much of death lately to want any ghoulish speculation now, but this urgent signal to the troops even before Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as President indicates just how critical the problem of Presidential succession can be.

Has the Congress prepared the Presidency adequately for the possibilities of a violent age? Is the rule of Presidential succession satisfactory for these days of human madness and scientific destruction? Or do not the men in line for the Presidency—all of them, not just one or two—have to be selected and instructed much more carefully than in the past?

JOHNSON AND M'CORMACK

Lyndon Johnson, of course, was no problem. He had been schooled for years in the mysteries and complexities of emergency defense action. Also, the powers and duties of the President transferred to him automatically on the death of President Kennedy, even before the new chief was sworn in.

But after what happened in Dallas, it is not too difficult to imagine that the assassin might have taken Johnson too, in which case the Presidency would have passed to Speaker McCORMACK, a man 71, who was not prepared for the normal pressures of the Presidency, let alone the emergencies, and who still isn't.

The Congress has been remarkably casual about this succession problem from the start of the Republic. From the beginning of the Nation until now, it has never really dealt effectively with the problem of serious incapacitating illness in the Presidency, and—as we now see—it has consistently put men into the line of succession for the Presidency without ever considering whether they had the capacity to do the job.

The Second Congress of the United States voted in 1792 to make the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House heirs apparent after the Vice President in that order.

This act remained in force for almost 100 years, despite the fact that on several occasions several Vice Presidents died when there was neither a President pro tempore of the Senate nor a Speaker of the House.

Finally, in 1886, the Congress voted to make members of the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State, next in line for the Presidency, and this was changed again, in 1947, to make the Speaker next in line after the Vice President, to be followed by the President pro tempore, and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in that order.

The Speaker of the House was moved up in the order in 1947 at least partly, and perhaps even mainly, because a remarkable and highly qualified man, Mr. Sam Rayburn, sat in that chair at the time. But Mr. Sam is gone now, and while there were many who felt Mr. McCORMACK was not the best man to succeed him as Speaker, certainly nobody even considered the possibility that he would, for almost 13 months be first in line after President Johnson.

The tendency now, of course, is to do nothing but pray for the President's health. Johnson has enough problems ahead in Congress without instigating a battle to unseat the Speaker, but there is perhaps another way.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

The Speaker himself could propose a solution. If he will not resign as Speaker, he could propose legislation that would name another person first in line for the presidency. This could be done in several ways. For example, he could propose a bill which stated that, in the event of the Vice President succeeding to the presidency, both Houses of Congress should then by majority vote select someone from the President's party to be next in line.

This is not intended as a personal unkindness. Mr. McCORMACK is an industrious and in many ways a competent congressional servant. But he would be the first to concede that it was not the judgment or intent of the Congress that he should ever be first in line for the Presidency of the United States.

He was chosen by seniority for one job and thrust by an appalling accident into line for a totally different job. This raises not a legal or political, but a moral problem—namely, whether a man wishes to remain in line for a job the Congress never intended him to have.

In normal times (whatever they were) maybe it would have been all right to count on luck and avoid raising embarrasing personal questions, but these are not normal times, and lately our luck has not been very good.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 7, 1963]

ACTION NEEDED ON SUCCESSION

The accession of a Vice President to the Presidency has once more called attention to the inadequacy of the Nation's constitutional arrangements for such a situation.

The last time this happened was on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1945, scarcely 3 months after he had begun his fourth term. Almost immediately President Truman pointed out to Congress that the succession law as it then stood would permit him, in effect, to have appointed his own successor should he die in office.

Since 1886, the statute had provided that Cabinet officers in order of seniority, beginning with the Secretary of State, should assume the highest office in the event that both the President and Vice President should die, resign, or become unable to discharge their duties. Truman recommended that the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, as elective officials, be placed ahead of Cabinet officers in the line of succession.

Not until a Republican became Speaker of the House did Congress act on Truman's suggestion. Then, in 1947, the succession law was changed in accordance with his proposal. And so it stands today.

Certainly the present law is an improvement on the former one. But it suffers from a serious defect in that neither the Speaker nor the highest officer of the Senate is elected by all the American people, as the Chief Executive indisputably should be. To provide that the Presidency can devolve upon a man elected by a small constituency in one State, or by that constituency of only one State, is surely out of line with the intent of the Constitution. The present Speaker was elected by 105,000 voters in one district of Massachusetts; the present President pro tempore of the Senate was elected by 199,000 voters in one of our smallest States, Arizona.

The simple and logical way to improve the present arrangement would be to give all the people of the Nation the earliest chance to choose a new President when a Vice President has succeeded to the office. When a Senator dies, the Governor usually appoints a temporary successor, but most States hold an early election to fill out the term. The same principle could be applied to the Presidency. The Constitution could be amended to provide that when a President dies, the Vice President shall hold the office until the voters, at the next general election, choose a new President (with a new Vice President) to fill out the term.

Practically, such a provision would make no difference in situations like the present one. President Johnson will be required to face the voters at the next general election in 1964; and that is as it should be. But if a Vice President takes over early in the term for which his predecessor was elected, he can serve for 3 years or more without going to the people; and during that period if anything happens to him the Presidency descends to a man elected by only a tiny fraction of all the voters. That is not as it should be.

Congress ought to give serious study to this question, and while about it might well consider a related one. Has not the time come to review the 22d amendment, which limits a President to two terms? That, too, was proposed by the Republican Congress of 1947, as a kind of posthumous reproach to Franklin D. Roosevelt. It has no place in a democracy, which is willing to trust the people, and which strives to place the Presidency as close to all the people as it can.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Sun-Telegram, Dec. 8, 1963]

WHAT ABOUT DISABLED PRESIDENT?

The assassination of President Kennedy automatically brought Vice President Johnson into the Presidency, and the chain of Presidential succession is clearly defined.

However, except for personal agreements in recent years between Presidents and Vice Presidents, nothing specific has been arranged to handle the emergency which would exist if a President were incapacitated, but still alive.

Under the current Presidential succession law, established in 1947, should President Johnson die, the office of President would go to the Speaker of the House. He is Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, who at 72 years of age, has had 36 years of service in the Congress.

Representative McCORMACK's potential successor as President would be Senator CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate. He is 86 years old, and has had 51 years of service.

From those two posts the line of succession runs down through the Cabinet, with the exception of Secretary of Health and Welfare, a post created after the succession law was established.

Except for the advanced age of Representative McCORMACK and Senator HAYDEN, admittedly a potential handicap, no real problem would arise over a succession of Presidents.

Unsolved, though, would be the problem of what to do if a President would become unable to serve, but still remain alive. Up to now there have been only informal agreements.

Suppose, for example, that President Kennedy would have been wounded seriously. Vice President Johnson would not have become President. He and Kennedy may have reached an understanding but it could not have any official or legal status.

During President Eisenhower's physical difficulties he leaned heavily upon Vice President Nixon but Nixon was never President. He could not have acted in that capacity should an emergency have arisen.

The Congress is aware of the problem. A constitutional amendment giving the Congress power to enact a plan of succession in the eventuality of a disabled, but living President has been awaiting action by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The plan should be examined and, if feasible, put before the public.

As one writer said a few days ago, the country right now is only one heartbeat away from a 72-year-old President, and another heartbeat away from a President who would be at least 86.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LYNDON JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our country's First Lady has long been held in the highest esteem by people throughout this Nation and the world for her

warmth and compassion for the needs of mankind. Lady Bird Johnson has a deep personal interest in both human and governmental problems. She is an extremely busy person, yet her thoughtfulness in making others feel more comfortable and welcome never ceases to inspire me and increase my admiration of her.

A recent article by Victor Riesel emphasizes these qualities. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

LADY BIRD'S SONG SWEET TO UNIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 3.—The new First Lady is an old friend of some policy-making, vote-getting labor people. Lady Bird Johnson has done right well by the President on this front, as the following untold stories will reveal.

In January 1962, labor strategists called a national meeting of its Women's Activities Division. Some 50 WAD women arrived from 24 pivotal States. It was an important session, yet no particular effort was made to publicize it.

But when Mrs. Johnson learned of the gathering, the labor ladies received invitations to tea at The Elms, the Johnson home. The WAD women were delighted. They were even more impressed when, on the day of the tea, the Johnson limousine rescued them when their chartered bus stalled in the snow.

THEY DIDN'T FEEL STRANGE

So when they got to The Elms, they did not feel themselves strangers. There was no dead air, no awkwardness. Mrs. Johnson had asked Mrs. Arthur Goldberg to help receive them. They separated into groups and were shown every inch of the then Vice President's home except the kitchen.

A young man from Texas sang; a young lady played the piano. Mrs. Goldberg told "how it felt to be a labor wife in the Cabinet." Then Mrs. Johnson asked them to wait for the Vice President.

Lyndon had had a tough day at the office. But he fascinated them with tales of his foreign trips, of working people abroad, of slums and poverty, of his joy at seeing the American flag on his return.

The frosting on this visit came 3 weeks later, when each of the women received two or three photos of themselves with Lady Bird, or with the Vice President or Mrs. Goldberg. Each name had been carefully checked; there were no errors.

Some of the WAD women talked of this the other day. They never forgot her astuteness and graciousness.

AN ELECTION SCENE

More politically sophisticated labor leaders also have reason to know of her. There was the early morning hour gathering in a New York Hotel Commodore suite the night after the 1960 election.

A group of labor men who had spent considerable time, money, and energy in behalf of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson now were certain they had carried New York State for the ticket. The phone rang. It was Lady Bird. She was phoning long distance to thank them. Then she put Lyndon Johnson on.

Never before had this happened—no First Lady or Second Lady ever had called in this fashion. The union men still talk of it.

REA AND THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of my testimony before the Federal Power Commission concerning the relationship between the Rural Electric Cooperatives and the Federal Power Commission to be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY OF MINNESOTA

Question. Please state your name and address.

Answer. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Waverly, Minn.

Question. What is your occupation?

Answer. I am the senior U.S. Senator for the State of Minnesota. I have served in the Senate continuously since January 1949.

Question. Will you please state your views on the matter of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives?

Answer. The entire legislative history dealing with the relationship between the Federal Power Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration is very clear. It shows conclusively that Congress never intended to give to Federal Power Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration coextensive responsibilities and powers. The authors of the Federal Power Act, in appearing before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, testified that the act only gave the Commission authority to regulate "public utilities," defining these as bodies who had dedicated their property to a "public use" and to the performance of a "public service." Rural Electrification Administration financed systems serve only their own members.

In 1936 it was proposed, by the Senate committee considering the REA bill, that the REA make studies and reports "in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission." The Senators were clear on that day in rejecting the proposition that the REA and FPC should have these overlapping functions.

Thus, the Federal Power Act speaks only of regulating "public utilities" which are traditionally defined in law as dedicated to public use and public service. The Rural Electrification Act, interpreted in the light of its legislative history, shows a clear congressional intent that the Federal Power Commission shall have no regulatory powers over rural electric cooperatives.

After the passage of the Rural Electrification Act, various attempts were made to add regulatory authority over electric co-ops to the FPC field of activity. One of these occasions was in 1946 when the second session of the 79th Congress was considering an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act. The amendment provided that REA loan funds for generating plants should not be available "unless the Federal Power Commission shall first certify that there is not sufficient electric current available in the area concerned at reasonable rates." This amendment induced considerable floor debate, all of which was most persuasive in showing the Senate's opposition to such a measure. The distinguished Senators MCCLELLAN and FULBRIGHT participated knowledgeably and forcefully in that debate and so did Senators AIKEN, HILL, and MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Alabama very ably pointed out:

"We must realize that in dealing with these cooperatives, we are not dealing with large corporations which have high-priced lawyers and lobbyists and representatives who come to Washington. The fact is that the adoption of this amendment (to give FPC certifying power over REA generation loans) would discourage the REA cooperatives and groups of farmers from going forward with their program throughout the country."

I can think of nothing more damaging to FPC's claim of jurisdiction over REA cooperatives than the fact that bills to give FPC this very authority have been repeatedly brought before the Congress and have repeatedly failed.

I know that Congress understands, if the FPC does not, that cooperatives are very special organizations. By their very nature they do not require regulation. In a cooperative there is a unity of interest, since the owners and the ratepayers are one and the same. As stated by the Supreme Court of Utah: "In a cooperative all sell to each. The owner is the seller and buyer."

There would be no advantage to a cooperative in setting an electric rate which is too high, because the overpayment would simply be returned to the consumer-owners. Nor is FPC needed to protect the interest of the public, whose funds provided the REA loans to borrowers, because after 26 years of rural electrification these cooperatives have clearly demonstrated, by meeting their payments on time and ahead of due dates, that the Government's loans will be repaid in full.

Thus, from the entire record of the REA program, and no one appreciates better than I what that record has meant to the country, there can be found no good policy reason for placing the REA's under FPC jurisdiction.

Nor is there a legal basis for this attempt by FPC to expand its jurisdiction. Cooperatives are not "public utilities" within the terms of the Federal Power Act, because they are membership organizations and do not hold themselves out to serve the public. They serve themselves. A cooperative is a group of people with a common interest working in concert.

There is no legislative reason, no policy reason, and no legal reason for FPC to exercise jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives.

I conclude with the hope that the Federal Power Commission will give up its efforts to encompass this already embattled cooperative minority and, instead, take the more fruitful path of governing the industries over which the Congress gave it its plenary powers.

A REPORT TO THE NATION'S FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is appropriate that the annual meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association should have had as one of its speakers the Secretary of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman, a former distinguished Governor of our own State, has worked diligently in behalf of the farmers of America. He has served in this difficult position with great responsibility and energy.

So that we may read carefully and understand the efforts and successes of the farm program these past 3 years, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in the RECORD the speech delivered by Secretary Freeman at the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's annual meeting.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., DECEMBER 10, 1963

It is good to be back home among good friends again. During the past 2 weeks—in many ways the most sorrowful 2 weeks of

my life—I felt the strong desire to seek the companionship of old and trusted friends. I suspect that the tragedy which befell the Nation on November 22 affected a great many people in this same way. It was too great a loss, too sudden a void, to bear alone. I had come to feel a deep personal affection as well as admiration for John F. Kennedy as a person and as a friend, and as a leader—the greatest leader of our time.

He was one of the best friends the American farmer has ever had. I recall that hardly more than 3 years ago he visited GTA headquarters on Snelling Avenue and pledged himself to the cause of the farmer—a pledge which he kept.

He said he would do his best, and as the record shows, that meant results. His background was neither rural nor agricultural, and he never pretended it was. He was not that kind of man. But he knew people. He knew their needs, their aspirations, and their interdependence.

"The interrelation between prosperity on the farm and economic health of the city has never been more apparent," he said.

He knew and appreciated the efficiency of American farmers, and the abundance they created for Americans and the people of the developing countries. He said "our farmers deserve praise, not condemnation; and their efficiency should be a cause for gratitude, not something for which they are penalized."

He recognized the farmer as an important consumer—a $40 billion a year consumer of the goods and services of nonfarm people, and potentially a better customer of business and industry.

And so President Kennedy established clearly defined goals for agriculture, goals which kept all Americans, as well as farmers, in mind. He said he would seek to "eliminate the hardship and suffering which inadequate returns force upon so many of our farm families; * * * reduce our surpluses to manageable proportions; * * * spur our Nation's economy; * * * assure the consumer of stable price levels," and expand "the use of abundance."

He was guided by a deep humanitarian spirit. His first Executive order increased the quantity and quality of food being distributed to needy American families. He expanded the food-for-peace program to reach additional millions of hungry people abroad.

He acted quickly when disaster threatened the family farm. The first major piece of legislation enacted in 1961 and signed by President Kennedy was the emergency feed grain program to strengthen farm income and to reduce surpluses and taxpayer costs.

Legislative and administrative action followed to pave the way for increased farm income, expanded credit to rural people including senior citizens, for financing rural water supply systems, for speeding up conservation and watershed development, for recreation and other improvements of the national forests, for a direct attack on rural poverty, and for the development of community facilities. The full resources of the Federal Government were placed behind the efforts of local people in a nationwide rural areas development program.

These are among the highlights of achievements under President Kennedy's leadership for the benefit of rural and urban people:

USE OF ABUNDANCE

USDA food distribution programs now provide 1 in 6 Americans with a better diet. Where 6 commodities were provided to needy families in 1960, there are now 11 commodities; where 3.7 million persons in 1960 participated in the program, there are now 5.2 million; where there was powdered milk and cornmeal, there is now meat and other high protein food.

A major innovation under President Kennedy was the pilot food stamp program. This program proved so successful in expanding food markets and in improving diets that it was expanded from 143,000 people to 350,000—from 8 areas to 40 counties and 3 large cities in 22 States. There is one project now in operation on the iron range.

Agricultural exports set a new record in 1962—$5.1 billion—compared with $3.5 billion in 1959, and may reach $6 billion this year. Exports sold for dollars represent about 70 percent of the total.

Hungry, needy people reached abroad set a record high—92 million, including 35 million school and 2 million preschool children. U.S. food is paying a part of the wages of 3.1 million people working on self-help economic development projects in 19 countries.

MANAGING SUPPLIES

The feed grain surplus, which had built up progressively for about 10 years, was reduced first in 1961, and in each succeeding year. By the end of the current marketing year, this carryover will have dropped from an alltime high of 85 million tons to about 59 million tons, a reduction of nearly one-third within 3 years. The wheat surplus, which had reached a record 1.4 billion bushels at the end of the 1960 crop marketing year, will by next July 1, assuming the Russian sales, have been slashed to about 725 million bushels, the lowest level since 1953.

EXPANDED CREDIT TO RURAL AMERICA

A record $795 million was loaned to farmers and other rural residents by the Department of Agriculture in fiscal 1963—more than double the amount loaned during fiscal 1960.

USDA credit was either extended for the first time or continued to more than 227,000 farmers or other rural people.

Rural housing was greatly expanded in fiscal 1963 when USDA made almost 20,000 loans valued at $187 million—nearly 20 times the volume handled in fiscal 1960.

USDA's senior citizens housing loan program was started during fiscal 1963, and almost 550 loans were made to farm and other rural residents 62 years or older to construct 305 new dwellings averaging $8,000 in value, to purchase 35 dwellings, and to repair 150 residences.

Indirect benefits of the rural housing program had a far-reaching effect on the economy. It is estimated that the $187 million advanced for various housing loans in 1963 had a total impact of nearly 15,000 man-years of employment and millions of dollars in cash as the "ripple effect" of these loans moved through the Nation's economy.

Nearly 40,000 farm and other rural residents will soon be served by modern water systems for the first time as the result of $15 million in loans during fiscal 1963 to finance community water systems in 135 rural communities in 28 States. The number of water system loans has been increased ninefold during the past 3 years.

For the first time in fiscal 1963, USDA made or insured loans to individual farmers and nonprofit rural associations to finance recreation enterprises to help meet the booming demand of millions of Americans for outdoor recreation.

MORE RURAL POWER

USDA approved 262 electric loans totaling $341 million in fiscal 1963, compared with $261 million in 1962, $275 million in 1961, and $220 million in 1960.

DEVELOPING RESOURCES AND PUTTING THEM TO WORK FOR PEOPLE

Funds made available for small watershed protection and development were increased 170 percent since 1960. The watershed program was expanded by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 to provide for additional storage of water for municipal and industrial use and for recreational development.

Over 224 watershed projects were approved for construction and 329 were approved for planning during the Kennedy years—almost as many as in the previous 6 years. Nearly 20 small watershed projects approved for operation include water storage for recreation. Public recreation areas are being planned in 35 other projects.

Nearly 10,000 landowners and operators established one or more income-producing recreation enterprises in 1963, to provide new outdoor recreation spots for the American family seeking open space and to provide new sources of income for the farm family.

To meet the increased demand for recreation in the national forests, the Department built 8,700 new family camp and picnic units in 1963 to accommodate 40,000 more people. In addition, 168 other recreation sites were developed.

On a pilot basis, about 140,000 acres of cropland moved into other uses during the first year of the cropland conversion program. This shift in land use enabled farmers to put their cropland into other uses, and also produce income for the farm family. And now the pilot land use program has progressed to the point where a nationwide program can be undertaken to aid farmers convert land now in crops to such other long-range, income-producing uses as forests, grasslands, water storage, wildlife habitat, or recreational development. This makes far more sense than a policy to make land lay idle.

FARM INCOME IMPROVED

Through new farm programs and the reshaping of older programs, net farm income in 1961 was $12.5 billion and in 1962 it was $12.6 billion, up around $900 million from 1960. Realized net income per farm rose from $2,961 in 1960 to $3,414 in 1962—up 15 percent. Hourly returns in agriculture rose from 90 cents to $1.04 an hour for all farm labor.

The record speaks clearly that John F. Kennedy kept his pledge to the farmers—he got rural America moving ahead. We see this more clearly now because we can look back to where we were when we began. And this, I believe, is a lesson for us all. The process of government is never neat and tidy, with one step of progress clearly following another. Only afterwards when the record is written does it appear neat. I believe President Kennedy understood this truth better than most, and this understanding sustained the calmness and determination which characterized his Presidency.

This is the mark of a pragmatic man who seeks answers to problems rather than arguments over slogans and dogmas. He recognized that there is no perfect solution, no neat and tidy answer, to the problems which science and technology have brought to agriculture. These are forces of great change, and he knew the farmer and the rural community would progress only if we could shape change in ways that benefit all the people.

President Kennedy thoroughly understood that rapid and irreversible changes were taking place in American agriculture. He had begun to outline a new agricultural policy for the 1960's—and in doing so he often frustrated his critics, especially those seeking neatly labeled bins in which to place this policy or that program.

The reason he so frustrated his critics is that the new agricultural policy is much broader than the commodity programs which have always been the conventional identification for farm policies. It is clear that today any agricultural policy must include not only commodities * * * but also communitywide programs, and policies of trade and aid. We are moving, therefore, toward an agricultural policy for rural America which rests on these 3 stabilizing forces, a three-legged seat for agriculture and rural America.

This triumvirate is the legacy of a pragmatist. It is passed on to another pragmatic man of action in President Johnson who, in his message to the joint session of the Con-

gress, spoke for all of us. He said, "No words are sad enough to express our loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began."

"It is," he said, "a time for action. * * * Let us continue."

Let us, then, take a closer look at the three legs.

COMMODITY PROGRAMS

First, there are the commodity programs—always the subject for much talk and more than a normal amount of confusion. Let me make it clear that commodity programs, as far as this administration is concerned, are absolutely necessary to the family farm. The open secret for America's world leadership in agriculture is the family farm system, and we intend to continue this leadership with the help of commodity programs.

Commodity programs are not welfare programs, or relief programs. They are the farmers' muscle in the marketplace—and the farmer doesn't need weaker muscles, he needs stronger muscles. As long as agriculture is forced to carry the heavy burden of change which rapid technological advances bring, commodity programs will be necessary for even the most efficient farmer.

It is only reasonable and fair that the farmer, who provides the American consumer with an abundance of food at the lowest real cost in history, be able to earn an income on a par with other Americans. Commodity programs will be essential to this goal of parity of income so long as the productive capacity of agriculture continues to exceed our ability to consume, sell, or share our food abundance at home and abroad.

And let me emphasize that I am speaking here of parity of income. This is different from parity of price, far different. The parity ratio of farm prices today is 77 percent. If the effects of the commodity programs are added in, the parity ratio of farm prices would be the equivalent of 82 percent. Our goal is 100 percent of parity of income, for the farmer is entitled to as good an income as other Americans. Full parity of income was the goal of President Kennedy, and it is the goal of President Johnson.

Don't be misled the next time the enemies of commodity programs try to undermine your confidence by talking only about parity prices. Commodity programs are the muscle builders for parity of income, they are essential. As long as the farmer has the ability to flood the marketplace, then he is always in danger of drowning in a sea of economic troubles. And commodity programs are the strongest muscle he has to protect himself.

The major commodity problem of immediate interest here is wheat. We estimate that net farm income next year will be down some $600 million, mostly because of lower wheat prices which result from the decision made in the referendum held last May. This is a problem which concerns me deeply, as it did President Kennedy and as it does President Johnson. I have discussed this problm with farmers in every section of the country, most recently in a series of report and review meetings. These meetings indicate to me that four out of five farmers want some kind of wheat program to replace the low price supports coming into effect next year.

I talked with President Johnson last week about the wheat situation, and he indicated then his strong feelings that a wheat program will be necessary. He said the program must be one the Congress will pass, that it must keep costs in line and bring surpluses down. It is clear that the Congress is more receptive to a wheat program than it would have been last spring—but it is also clear that unified farm support will be necessary in a Congress where urban representatives predominate.

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

The second leg of the policy seat are those programs which relate to the rural community—primarily those involved in the rural areas development program. This program is the first coherent recognition of the fact that no commodity program will provide all of the children now growing up in rural America with the opportunity for a job if they wish to stay in their home community. The fact that 70 percent of those who left rural America during the 1950's were 21 years old and younger is a stark reminder of the serious problem facing rural communities everywhere. RAD also recognizes that no commodity program will provide adequate incomes for farmers on less than adequate farms. Other means are needed to enable these farmers to acquire adequate size farms or to develop other and more profitable uses for their land and water resources in combination with a farming operation.

Here in the GTA area, RAD can be seen in recreation farms and farms combining recreation with crops, in new rural housing construction, in community water system loans, in new and expanded industries in rural areas and in expanded watershed developments.

Through RAD, we seek to encourage the use of land, and not to idle it. We seek to make use of rural resources to meet the needs of the city resident for outdoor recreation—for space and green lands—and to provide the rural community with new income opportunities. We oppose the philosophy which would drive people off the land when there is so much need for all the goods and services which land and people can provide.

TRADE AND AID

The third leg of agriculture's policy seat—trade and aid—holds the key to the problems which neither commodity nor community programs can reach—and that is to find the markets to match the productivity of the farmer.

You want to produce, and we want to sell. We know that the domestic market for food will grow only as fast as our population increases, and farm productivity is outrunning population today and will do so as far as we can see into the future.

This means we must reach out for new markets, and strengthen our position in present world markets. It means we are going out aggressively to sell. It means that the United States is no longer going to be a residual supplier, and we are developing a strong, hardhitting market development program to back up our promise. Currently we maintain two permanent food trade centers overseas, and we are cooperating with over 40 commodity groups and trade associations which are working to develop markets in over 50 nations. Earlier this month the Department sponsored the largest oversea food exhibition in history at Amsterdam, and the response was very enthusiastic from both American exporters and European consumers.

We chose Amsterdam because of its location within the Common Market, a $1.1 billion market for the food and fiber produced by the American farmer. We have seen our efficient poultry producers denied access to this market, and we are fearful of what could happen if the wheat and feed grain producers also are denied access.

President Kennedy was determined to fight hard for fair access to these markets, and President Johnson will be as tough and as determined. We intend to take every possible step to insure that export sales will continue and will increase. What we seek is a guarantee of fair access to our historic markets, and a fair share of the growth in these markets.

As we seek to encourage more liberal trade policies in agriculture—as we must if the wheat farmer is going to find the markets he needs—we must buy if we expect to sell. We must be willing to practice what we preach. I believe we have thus far, for we currently import farm products worth over $2 billion each year which compete with our own domestic producers.

But we do hear from time to time from those who want to raise barriers to outside competition. We cannot insist, however, that others lower trade barriers while we raise them here at home. Particularly in recent days we hear that beef imports are causing the current low market price level, and that we should protect the cattleman. There is conclusive evidence that a short-term overexpansion in feed beef—too many steers on the range, too many feed steers in feeder pens, too many overweight steers sent to slaughter—is responsible for most of the current market situation. Imports do have an effect, but it is far less significant than current overproduction.

We could, however, in this situation, demonstrate to the world that we are willing to give what we ask in return—and that is fair competitive access. We could, for example, seek to negotiate a guaranteed access to a share of the U.S. market—together with a share of its growth—for those nations exporting beef to us.

I am confident that if we bargain effectively and act fairly ourselves, we will continue to have fair access to world markets. If we do, then we must also be prepared to be competitive in those markets—competitive in both price and quality. In this regard, there is today a deep concern about our grade standards, particularly those for wheat. Farm leaders of great integrity and of deep devotion to the welfare of the farmer have strongly differing opinions as to the need to tighten our wheat standards. Public hearings have been held in four places around the country on this question, and opinion is sharply divided. As Secretary of Agriculture, I soon must make a decision. That decision will be carefully and thoughtfully made in the best interest of the American farmer and of the trade that serves him and the Nation so well.

These questions, and the concern over the direction of world trade policies, should not obscure the real accomplishments of the efforts to expand trade. We anticipate that 1963 will be a banner year for farm exports. If the Russian wheat sales materialize, farm exports could exceed $6 billion, and, in any event, exports are going to come close to that mark. Considering that the previous record was $5.1 billion, 1963 marks a decisive step forward.

But, important as this progress is, the real future export markets for America's growing agricultural production will be determined by how rapidly the developing nations can achieve full commercial status as trading partners. If India, for example, which now has a per capita income of hardly more than $60 a year, were to achieve a tenfold expansion in that figure, there would be 650 million new consumers to whom we could offer to sell our food. Two-thirds of the people of the world are not able to buy all the food they need today. One day they will be good customers if we are willing to help them improve their economy so they can buy from us.

It is critical that the American people, including the farmer, grasp the dynamic potential which a combined program of trade and aid in agriculture offers to our economic interests and to our dreams of a world of peaceful nations.

However, before the developing nations can become strong and stable trading partners, it will be necessary that the developed nations in the years ahead provide a volume of food aid which will be substantially greater than is generally realized.

We have, through the food-for-peace program, sought to fill the food deficit which exists today in the developing nations. This deficit is generally a nutritional gap, or the difference between what these nations can produce and the need of the people for an adequate diet. However, as these nations progress, a second type of food deficit arises—an economic, or growth, deficit. It results as income levels improve, and the demand for food exceeds the bare nutritional needs and it is far greater in volume than the amount needed for minimum diets.

The danger of this economic food deficit is in its inflationary impact as increased purchasing power flows against inadequate food supplies. And inflation can destroy economic growth and the promise of higher levels of living.

This economic deficit—which we estimate will reach $25.6 billion by 1980—can be met in part by increased commercial trade, but almost $15 billion will have to be met through a food aid program. Thus, only a combination of trade and aid will provide the answer, for if the developing nations are to trade they will need to grow economically, and this growth, in turn, will depend on the extent of food aid. The strategy of food aid, then, is the key to the future of the developing nations, and to the need for adequate markets for the highly developed nations.

We have set out to create new markets with a clear policy of trade and aid, just as we have set out to move the rural economy ahead with communitywide programs and to strengthen the marketing muscle of the farmer through better commodity programs.

The effectiveness of those policies, and the progress which can flow from them, will depend not only on how well they are carried out by the Government, but also on how well they are understood and how strongly they are supported by those who, like yourself, stand to gain most directly from them.

President Johnson, in these trying days, has called us all to action, not just the executive agencies, not just the Congress, but all of us "to continue the forward thrust of America."

With your help, and only with your help, can we continue to grow and prosper.

FOREIGN POLICY—THE BUSINESS OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the people of Minnesota were honored this week to have Secretary of State Dean Rusk as their guest. The Secretary spoke to 10,000 members of the largest farm organization in our area, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, who were gathered in St. Paul for their annual meeting.

The presence of Secretary Rusk at the GTA meeting indicates our Government's recognition that agriculture is important not simply for the food and fiber it produces for our own people, but also as a force in our international life for strength and peace.

Secretary Rusk said to his farmer audience:

The abundance of food and fiber you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world.

While the Soviet world strains under agricultural crop failure and new emphasis on chemical and fertilizer needs for agriculture, the American farmer continues to produce an abundance of food and fiber representing real wealth and real power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in the RECORD the speech delivered by Secretary Rusk at the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's annual meeting.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK BEFORE THE FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, AUDITORIUM, ST. PAUL, MINN., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1963

I

It is a high personal privilege for me to meet with the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and, through you, with more than 300,000 farm families of our upper Midwest. I come in a period of national mourning because the Nation lives and must get on with its appointed tasks. President Kennedy would have had it no other way.

I shall not try to put into words the personal grief shared with us here by hundreds of millions of ordinary men and women throughout the world. We have been diminished by the loss of so much gallantry, so much energy and vision, so much dedication and commonsense. We are benumbed and shamed by the cost of senseless violence, but lifted up and inspired by the rediscovery, in the midst of our sorrow, of the power of the hopes and aspirations of man and the strength of decency and moderation in our relations with others.

In these days of sadness and shock, we have found new sources of confidence. We have found them in the resilience of our constitutional system, in the capacity of our country to unite behind the man who now carries the awesome and lonely burden, in the sure hand and clear head with which he has taken up his task, in the confidence which those beyond our borders have given us in these critical days. I should like to ask you to recall once more the words of President Johnson to the Congress, words which expressed the deepest conviction of one who is intimately in touch with the world about us and the policies which guide our foreign relations:

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

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

II

As your Secretary of State I wish to talk to you about our foreign relations. Let me start with a remark which I hope you will never forget: Foreign policy is about you. It is about your home, your community, your safety, your well-being, your chance to live a decent life and prepare a better world for your children. Foreign policy is not a game played by "those people in Washington" with other players from far-off, distant places. It is as close to you as the member of your family, or the neighbor's boy, in uniform, as close as the taxes you pay to sustain the struggle for freedom, as close as the prices and markets for what you produce. Even more personal, it is as close as your highest hopes, your puzzled concern that man can be both so good and yet so evil, your own impulse to do something to build a better world, your own private search for the answer to the ageless question "what is the chief end of man?"

There are those who say that the Department of State has no constituency, but I know better. How we dispose of our affairs at home can decide elections; but how we dispose of our relations with the rest of the world can decide the survival of mankind. So we have our constituency—every man, woman, and child across our great Nation.

III

Our time has seen breathtaking changes. Technology has advanced on a thousand fronts and at accelerating speeds. The atom has been unlocked, and man has begun to reach out from his earthly home toward the moon and the planets. But to me, one of the most wondrous miracles of all is the rise in farm productivity.

I was born on a small farm in Cherokee County, Ga. It wasn't much of a farm by your standards—just a few acres of red clay. Today, when I read the statistics on increased yield per acre and output per man-hour, I can hardly believe them. And the miracle of rising agricultural production continues to unfold.

The abundance of food and fiber that you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world.

The miracle of American agriculture has not merely produced more and more food for a still hungry world. It has turned men's hopes toward science and technology and their appetites away from plunder and conquest. It has opened the historical possibility of meeting by peaceful means the elementary daily needs of the whole human race.

Our agricultural exports of approximately $6 billion a year—more than 4 billion for hard currency—are crucial to our balance of payments. Without them, we would be hard pressed to meet the costs of guarding the ramparts of freedom and of helping other peoples to preserve their independence and raise their living standards.

Our food-for-peace programs are a mighty instrument of security, good will, and peace. They are saving human lives every day. Under one of them, more than 40 million children in 91 countries get a square meal once a day—at school. Tens of millions of other people are getting supplemental feedings.

Food-for-peace programs are not only saving lives. They are serving economic development. They have had a growing role in our programs of assistance to the less developed nations of the world. Our interest in helping these nations to move forward into the modern world is not humanitarian alone. We want them to move forward because we want a peaceful world. Communism feeds on hunger and frustration; it encourages disruption and exploits chaos. We want orderly progress in freedom—not for ourselves alone but for all men.

Food for peace also serves to develop future markets for American farm products.

As Secretary of State, I find it very reassuring to have in support the great resources of American farm production. From my viewpoint, our agricultural abundance may be regarded as strategic reserves. In certain crises it can be as valuable as our military reserve forces.

Not the least of the contributions which you farmers make to freedom and peace is to demonstrate so dramatically that a revolution in agricultural abundance has taken place in a free society. No Communist country has made a success of food produc-

tion. Communist China has sunk into misery.

East Germany has been converted from an area with a food surplus to one with a food deficit. The smaller Eastern European Communist states have been plagued by difficulties in farm production. It is significant that Poland and Yugoslavia, where most of the farming is done by families on small farms, have generally fared better than the countries which have enforced collectivization. Shortfalls in farm production in the Soviet Union have been aggravated by climatic handicaps and vagaries of the weather. And by applying more fertilizer and up-to-date methods, the Communists states doubtless could increase their agricultural output. But I am convinced that a large part of their trouble in agricultural production in inherent in the Communist system.

IV

The central purpose of our foreign policy, as of our military forces, is to maintain an environment in which we can "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." When I was a child we felt safe in our continental home behind ocean barriers. Today we cannot find security apart from the rest of our planet. In these days of international missiles and thermonuclear warheads, we can be safe only if our total environment is safe. By total environment we now mean not only the land, waters, and air of the earth, but the adjoining areas of space as far out as man can project himself and his instruments.

In political terms, we seek a peaceful world of independent nations, each free to choose its own institutions so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others, and all free to cooperate in their common interests and in the welfare of mankind. That is the kind of world described in the Charter of the United Nations.

In working toward our goals we have five basic policies. First—and indispensably—we seek to protect the free world against aggression. We possess a nuclear deterrent of unimaginable power. We maintain large conventional forces, and these are modernized and increasingly mobile. And we have been increasing our capacity, and that of our allies, to deal with guerrilla warfare, the form of aggression to which South Vietnam is presently being subjected. We have demonstrated our will and capacity to make resort to force by our adversaries unprofitable and dangerous—and, at the higher levels, prohibitively destructive.

While, with our allies, we check aggression, we seek to build the strength of the free world.

We seek to enlarge and improve our partnerships with the other economically advanced nations of the free world—with Western Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and others. Our partnerships with these nations embrace defense. They embrace political problems. They embrace trade and economics. We seek the most intimate cooperation in lowering the barriers of world trade, in managing the international balance of payments, and in assisting the less-developed nations.

A third cardinal element in our policy is assistance to the less-developed nations in advancing economically, socially, and politically. We have welcomed with open arms the nearly 50 nations which have emerged in Asia and Africa since the Second World War. National independence does not automatically lead to economic progress. Yet the peoples of all the less-developed countries—new and old—know that man need not live on the edge of starvation, that modern technology makes possible a decent life for all.

I would emphasize that the phrase "modern technology" includes modern methods of producing food and fiber. And, in passing, I would note that the Peace Corps needs more people who can teach modern farm methods. You don't have to be young to join the Peace Corps. Some of our volunteers are 60 and 70 years of age.

Helping the less developed countries to move into the modern world will be a continuing task, for a decade or, in some cases, perhaps longer. But many of them are making genuine progress. And as each moves forward to self-sustaining growth and political stability, it adds to the total strength of the free world. Our aid to the less developed countries is helping to create new markets. And, most important, it is helping to build the kind of world in which we and our children will want to live.

And let me point out that our very able AID Administrator, David E. Bell, was born in North Dakota.

A fourth element in our policy is to improve and strengthen the organizations and institutions which enable the nations of the world to work together more effectively. Some of these are regional, some are specialized. Others are of broader scope. Above them all stands the United Nations. We strive unceasingly to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for making and keeping peace and serving the welfare of mankind.

Let us note that this is Human Rights Day—the 15th anniversary of the approval of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly. We in the United States have special reasons to rejoice in this anniversary.

A century and a half ago, Thomas Jefferson sumed up this Nation's position in the world in these memorable words:

"The station we occupy among the regions of the earth is honorable but aweful: Trusted with the destinies of this solitary republic of the world, the only monument of human rights and the sole repository of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, from whence it is to be lighted up in other regions of the earth, if other regions of the earth ever become susceptible of its genial influence."

On this Human Rights Day of 1963, we can still agree that our station is both "honorable" and "aweful". But no longer are we the "sole repository of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government". No longer are we "the solitary republic of the world", for Jefferson's fire has indeed kindled the earth. No longer are we the only monument of human rights, because the chief precepts of our Bill of Rights have been adopted in many lands, have been expressed in the constitutions of most of the new republics, and have been reaffirmed for the world in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Charter of the United Nations properly links the rights of individuals with the rights of nations, and tolerance with peace. President Kennedy made the same vital connection last June when he said: "As is not peace, in the last analysis, a matter of human rights?"

Many nations have yet to insure equal rights for all of their citizens, and the struggle to obtain these fundamental rights will color the future course of world affairs.

Personal independence depends not alone on equal rights but, more importantly, on mutual respect. There is no more urgent task before us as a people than to secure for every individual the rights and respect due to him as a human being.

As President Johnson said in his address to Congress on November 27:

"We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law.

"There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad than to eliminate * * * every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color."

V

I turn now to a fifth element in our foreign policy. While we seek to protect and build the free world, we search earnestly and untiringly for areas of common interest with our adversaries—and especially for measures to reduce the danger of a great war.

Recently, we have reached a few limited agreements with the Soviet Union. The first was on a "hot wire" or direct line of communication between the President and the head of the Soviet Government—for use at moments of crisis.

We achieved the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. We are pleased that this has now been signed by 107 governments.

The Soviets and we both supported the United Nations declaration against placing in orbit weapons of mass destruction. And they and we have reached a broad agreement on principles of law for outer space.

These are small but useful steps toward peace. But—let me say this frankly—these steps do not yet constitute a detente. The Soviets have not abandoned their aims of world revolution—and neither has Peiping. Chairman Khrushchev has stated on several occasions that the ideological struggle will continue.

There can be no full and lasting detente between the chief Communist states and the free world without settlement of critical and dangerous political issues—such as the division of Berlin and Germany, the aggressions against Laos and South Vietnam, and the use of Cuba as a base for subversive activity in Latin America.

Moreover, this world will remain a very dangerous place until progress is made in controlling armaments and in reducing the dangers of war from surprise or miscalculation.

President Johnson, like President Kennedy, is determined to explore most earnestly and patiently every possibility of reaching agreements on further steps toward a more stable peace. But as yet we are not in the slightest justified in relaxing our vigilance or reducing our effort.

VI

There are significant developments within the Communist world. There is the Sino-Soviet quarrel, which involves both ideology and state relations. It is serious but not a complete break. And, as dictatorships can change dirction overnight, it might be patched up.

There are growing signs of nationalism throughout the Soviet bloc. The smaller Communist states of Europe are finding a little more autonomy for themselves and seeking to increase their trade and other relations with the nations of Western Europe and the United States. And not only in these smaller Communist states but in the Soviet Union itself, there are signs of growing interest in more personal freedom.

The Communist states have problems in allocating their economic resources among the competing demands of armaments, industrialization, consumer satisfaction, and the promotion of the Communist world revolution.

Processes of change are clearly evident behind the Iron Curtain. It would be a mistake to expect these changes to come rapidly. But it would be a mistake to underestimate the power of historic nationalism and of the ideas of freedom.

The ideas of freedom, which gave birth to our Nation and which we have nurtured and fought to defend, have spread over the earth. They are, I believe, inherent in the nature of man. They are shared today by men everywhere, including behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. They are our most priceless possession—and our mightiest asset.

But we cannot win this worldwide struggle between coercion and freedom by standing at ease. We cannot make the world safe for freedom by retreating. There are those who would have us quit the struggle—by slashing our defense and our foreign aid, by abandoning our alliance, by leaving the United Nations. That is a prescription for defeat and disaster.

I believe that the American people are determined to win this struggle—win it by achieving a stable peace in which we and others can live in freedom. We can win if we persevere—if we work at protecting and building the free world with unwavering resolve.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate 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; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOW, and Mr. LIPSCOMB were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the Act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 8720, so that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may explain the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which was read twice by its title.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill is the House version of an amendment to increase authorizations for the Manpower Development and Training Act. Senators may recall that earlier this session the Senate passed S. 1716 and S. 1831, bills which deal in general with the training of school dropouts and the percentage of the total training allowance which could be used for youth training and the matching requirements which were imposed on the States under the original act, and which the Senate decided to waive until June 30, 1965.

The Senate bills also added 52 weeks of literacy training.

Instead of acting on the Senate bill, the House passed its own bill. I now ask the Senate to accept the House bill. This request is made at the suggestion of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. The bill has been cleared with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the chairman and all the other members, Republican as well as Democratic, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I pay particular tribute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has been a source of great strength to the committee and to the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower throughout the passage of the Senate bills, and who is quite content to have the Senate act now on the substitute, the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the accolade bestowed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania upon my compatriot the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. He has done yeoman work in this field. He introduced substitute legislation in connection with the Youth Conservation Corps and other matters, some of which has found its way into an improved manpower training bill. So I salute him for the great work which he has done.

Mr. CLARK. I concur in the statement just made by the minority leader.

The differences between the House bill and the Senate bill are relatively minor. The House bill is a little more extensive than the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a compilation showing the differences between the House and Senate versions.

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

HOUSE VERSION	SENATE VERSION
1. Lowers the age of youths eligible for training allowances from 19, as in existing act, to 17. The 17-year-olds would have to have been out of school at least a year.	1. Lowers the age to 16. Youth would have to have been out of school 6 months. (S. 1831.)
2. Permits up to 25 percent of the persons receiving training allowances to be youths under 22 years of age. (Present law limits youth training allowances to 5 percent of the total training allowances.)	2. Permits up to 15 percent of the total training allowances to be used for youth training allowances. (S. 1831.)
3. Postpones all matching until July 1, 1965. (Present law requires such matching begin July 1, 1964.) The amendment would require one-third matching in fiscal year 1966.	3. Eliminates 50–50 match requirement for the duration of the program—that is, June 30, 1965. (S. 1716.)
4. Adds 20 weeks of basic education in reading and writing to training allowance period for those trainees receiving training.	4. Adds 52 weeks of literacy training. (S. 1831.)
5. Permits increases in the weekly training allowance to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This provision is designed as an incentive to get unemployed workers to seek training rather than draw unemployment pay.	
6. Permits trainees to work up to 20 hours part time without any loss in training allowances.	
7. Reduces to 2 years the prior work experience required for trainees to be eligible. (Present law requires 3 years.)	
8. Permits a member of the family, where the head is unemployed, to receive a training allowance. Only one person in the family group is eligible at any one time. (Present law limits training to heads of household.)	
9. Provides, through demonstration projects, grants and/or loans to unemployed workers to help finance their relocation expenses.	
10. Title II: Authorizes $161 million for fiscal year 1964, $407 million for fiscal year 1965, and $281 million for fiscal year 1966 for the training programs. (Present law authorizes $161 million for each of fiscal years 1964 and 1965.)	

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the differences in the authorizations in the two bills.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS UNDER TITLE II, COMBINING S. 1716 AND S. 1831 FOR COMPARISON WITH H.R. 8720

SENATE BILL	
Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	$100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Total	261,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	422,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1966	0
HOUSE BILL	
Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	0
Old programs	161,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	85,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	407,000,000

Fiscal year June 30, 1966: $281 million, which with State matching of one-third ($140 million) brings program level to $422 million.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should be glad to explain the House bill at greater length, if any Senator desired to question me. But in view of the unanimity between the Republicans and the Democrats on the committee, the concurrence of the majority leader and the minority leader, and the desire of the Secretary of Labor to have the House version accepted, I shall not, unless asked to do so, give any further explanation of the differences between the two bills, because they will clearly appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning, in the insertions I have just made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. As I understand, the basic objective of the Manpower Development and Training Act is the reduction of hard-core unemployment, unemployment which results from the fact that the potential employee lacks the skills essential to performance in an existing job vacancy. The bill was designed for situations where there is a demand for labor, but in which prior training or a specific skill is a substantial prerequisite for employment in the given job.

It is not intended to cover industries, such as the garment and apparel industry, where minimal training is needed, where traditionally the employer has provided the necessary on-the-job training, and where there exist a substantial number of experienced and able workers who are presently unemployed. As I understand it, we do not intend to give a competitive advantage to one employer over another by having the Manpower Development and Training Act pay costs which usually and traditionally the employer has assumed, nor do we intend hereby merely to transfer unemployment from one area to another. We do not expect use of the Manpower Development and Training Act training programs in highly mobile, highly competitive industries where minimal employee training is needed and now is undertaken by the employer. I feel that Manpower Development and Training Act assistance in such cases would only add to industrial dislocation. It would be a waste of manpower resources, and in the long run would serve only to discredit the Manpower Development and Training Act and detract from its value.

Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CLARK. So I understand, also.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill will yield further, there seems to be some question about this matter.

Mr. CLARK. If the Secretary of Labor is not adhering to the policy outlined by the Senator from Michigan—although I think he is—I hope he will begin to do so without, of course, hastily and unexpectedly interrupting any ongoing projects.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I think the bill is a good one, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Before the vote is taken I wish to express my appreciation to the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for their contributions in connection with this bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the most knowledgeable people in this Congress on manpower problems. He shaped this bill and guided it to pleasant destiny.

Mr. President, 26 million young people will enter the labor force in the 1960's. This great influx of jobseekers at a time when we still have heavy pockets of unemployment is a matter of concern to all.

Right now the unemployment rate is 5.9 percent yet many jobs are unfilled because we lack the skilled people to fill them.

In April of this year I urged the Senate to accept as a substitute for the Youth Conservation Corps an amendment which would alter the Manpower Development and Training Act and make the young unemployed eligible for training allowances. My proposal was defeated at that time. A few days later a Presidential Commission endorsed the same plan and subsequently it was made a part of the administration program.

The bill before us incorporates the idea I offered once before on the Senate floor and which I also introduced as a bill, S. 1691.

The pending legislation also contains other features, and some of these I must concede are untested and of uncertain value. Let us hope that time proves their wisdom.

In closing may I pay tribute to Ed Friedman, Ray Hurley and Mike Bernstein for their fine assistance in drafting this legislation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8720) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider by laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the passage of the vocational education bill is another milestone in the field of education. Rising to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the passage of this measure and on the passage of other important educational measures is becoming a habit, and I must say in all candor that it is a most enjoyable one.

Congress has taken the following noteworthy steps in the field of education:

First. An excellent medical school and dental school bill, under the managership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Second. A milestone—and the first one—in the field of mental health and mental retardation, also under the distinguished leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Third. A bill to help our colleges and universities build academic facilities—under the distinguished leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

And now, fourth, the bill for modernization of the vocational education program, which is the most significant advance in this field since the inauguration, 46 years ago, of vocational education programs. This bill includes an extension of the National Defense Education Act, with useful improvements, and it also extends the programs for aid to schools in federally impacted areas.

In addition, the Senate has passed an excellent library bill—again, under the skillful managership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

And a moment ago, the Senate passed a fine manpower development and training bill, under the skillful supervision of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Congress has been outstanding at this session in the field of education, and has compiled a record of which it can be proud. For this, a great deal of credit goes to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]; to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; to all other Members, on both sides of the aisle, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and also to the Congress as a whole.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, 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 of December 12, 1963, p. 24226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the major item in the conference report is on military housing. The report, as written by the Senate conferees and the House conferees, makes provision for the number of units of military housing the Senate voted, and also provides exactly the amount of money the Senate voted.

The other items were adjusted as between the House version and the Senate version; and the conference report is unanimous.

I point out, by way of explanation, that two of the items in this measure are really fixed charges, and do not really relate to military construction. So they should be in the Department of Defense appropriation bill; and next year a request to place them there will be made.

By way of summary, let me say that the conference committee on the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964, H.R. 9139, finished its work yesterday afternoon. Agreements were reached on all items. The conference committee agreed to an appropriation of $1,585,880,000 for the Department of Defense and the three military services. This is a reduction of $380,520,000 from the budget estimate of $1,966,400,000.

Mr. President, by way of explanation, I wish to point out that contained within the appropriation figure of $1,585,880,000, there is a total of $473,400,000 which is comprised of $306,003,000 for operations and maintenance, and $167,397,000 for debt payment for service housing. This amount of money really does not belong in the military construction appropriation bill. The Senate declared in its report that this money should be in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for it had no connection with military construction.

The conference committee approved $948,474,000 for the regular military construction appropriation. This is a 23.9-percent reduction from the budget estimate of $1,232 million for regular military construction projects. The appropriation is broken down as follows: Department of the Army, $200,646,000; Army Reserve, $4,500,000; Army National Guard, $5,700,000; Department of the Navy, $198,853,000; Naval Reserve, $6 million; Department of the Air Force, $468,275,000; Air Force Reserve, $4 million; Air National Guard, $16 million; Department of Defense agencies, $24 million, and Loran stations, $20,500,000.

The Senate position prevailed in the conference on defense family housing. For the sake of clarity, I would like to review briefly the housing situation. The appropriation approved in the Senate bill was $637,406,000. Included in the amount was 7,500 housing units for the 3 services at a total construction cost of $136,063,000, broken down as follows: Army, 1,366 housing units at a cost of $26,664,000; Navy, 3,142 housing units at a cost of $55,649,000, and for the Air Force, 2,992 housing units at a cost of $53,750,000. The bill has not deleted any specific projects from the housing program, but has made available funds to provide for the construction of 7,500 new housing units against the authorization of 10,140 units. The Department of Defense is charged with the responsibility of selecting the housing units and the sites on which they will be built on the basis of priority within each of the services.

Generally speaking, I believe the action of the conference reflects the thinking of the Senate. The reductions made by the Senate were accepted in the conference. And all but a few of the Senate restorations were provided for. On a few items, we were forced to yield, but in no case was the national security injured.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is the senior Republican member of the Senate conferees. He, too, has signed the report, as did all other members of the conference committee. I yield now to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support the military construction conference report. We have agreed with the House conferees upon the most important needs of the military when there was a difference between the two versions.

The House has accepted the Senate provision on housing. It is the best method of providing 7,500 houses a year. We leave it to the Department of Defense to determine which of the housing needs have the greatest priority. We do not try to make that decision in the Congress, although as expressed in the conference report we are desirous of being informed how this program is carried out.

I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report is unanimous.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. As I have said, the Senator from Massachusetts and I signed the report together.

Mr. President, unless there are questions which Senators may wish to ask, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD comparative tables as prepared by the conference committee.

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

Conference action on appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1964, showing 1963 appropriations, 1964 estimates, and congressional action

Item No.	Memo page No.	Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
								Budget estimate	House	Senate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)				
		DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY								
	7	Military construction, Army	[1] $181,272,000	$249,500,000	$200,293,000	$207,070,000	$200,646,000	−$48,854,000	+$353,000	−$6,424,000
		Military construction, Army Reserve	8,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000			
	75	Military construction, Army National Guard	7,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000	
		DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY								
	9	Military construction, Navy	[2] 193,355,000	269,900,000	194,000,000	202,223,000	198,853,000	−71,047,000	+4,853,000	−3,370,000
		Military construction, Naval Reserve	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
		DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE								
	11	Military construction, Air Force	[3] 847,810,500	628,200,000	451,000,000	487,090,000	468,275,000	−159,925,000	+17,275,000	−18,815,000
		Military construction, Air Force Reserve	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
		Military construction, Air Guard	14,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000			
		OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE								
	15	Military construction, Defense agencies	35,677,000	29,900,000	24,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	−5,900,000		−3,000,000
	17	Loran stations, Department of Defense	20,000,000	20,500,000	14,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000		+6,000,000	
		Total, military construction	1,319,114,500	1,232,000,000	917,793,000	980,083,000	948,474,000	−283,526,000	+30,681,000	−31,609,000

[1] Includes $46,625,000 family housing.
[2] Includes $92,542,000 family housing.
[3] Includes $100,771,000 family housing.

Conference action on appropriation for family housing, defense, 1964, showing 1963 appropriations, 1964 estimates, and congressional action

Item No.	Memo page No.	Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with		
								Budget estimate	House	Senate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)				
	217	Family housing, Army:								
		Construction		$57,400,000	$41,364,000	$34,681,000	$34,681,000	−$22,719,000	−$6,683,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		188,290,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	−4,894,000		
	221	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:								
		Construction		94,700,000	80,036,000	68,248,000	68,248,000	−26,452,000	−11,788,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		95,981,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	−2,037,000		
	229	Family housing, Air Force:								
		Construction		97,850,000	50,321,000	61,027,000	61,027,000	−36,823,000	+10,706,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		197,583,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	−4,069,000		
		Family housing, Defense agencies:								
		Construction		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000			
	19	Total, family housing	[1](691,715,448)	734,400,000	645,171,000	637,406,000	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	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	+22,916,000	−31,609,000

[1] No appropriation as such for fiscal year 1963 under this account. The amount of $691,715,448 was transferred from other appropriations and the unobligated balance of the Wherry housing revolving fund.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there are no questions to be asked about the conference report, I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SOLICITATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL DINNERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in January 1963, there was much talk, in the press and out, pertaining to the solicitation of Federal employees for contributions to political dinners. On January 17, I stated on the floor of the Senate that it was not the intent of the Hatch Act to prohibit a classified civil service employee from voting as he pleases or even attending a dinner properly labeled a birthday or party dinner. But that it was the intent of the law to prohibit the solicitation of a Federal employee for funds to such an occasion.

Mr. President, I made that statement because I was convinced that if such procedure were permitted to continue, it could ruin the entire merit system. Other Senators also spoke against such political maneuverings.

After so much adverse publicity had been exhibited against these solicitations, it was reported that the late President Kennedy stated that such pressure "was not right" and should not be allowed to recur.

Mr. President, it appears that these pressure tactics have recurred. I, for one, do not believe they should be permitted. I sincerely believe if we are to have a good reliable merit system, the career employee must be protected from political harassment—and that is regardless of political party. As a Member of the Senate and ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I hope the Federal employees will not yield to this pressure. I can assure them they will have my full support.

Mr. President, Joe Young, of the Washington Star, and a champion of the career Federal employee, has written a good article on "Democrats Solicit U.S. Employees for $100 Tickets to Fund Fete." The article of December 12, 1963 states that—

> The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held next year.

Mr. President, the article sets forth in detail some of the procedures being followed by the Democratic National Committee—procedures which hardly follow the letter of law pertaining to the merit system—procedures which cause career employees to fear for their jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT—DEMOCRATS SOLICIT U.S. EMPLOYEES FOR $100 TICKETS TO FUND FETE

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held here next year.

In fact, Federal careerists have received two communications from the Democratic National Committee in connection with the affair, one signed by Chairman John Bailey.

The solicitation is similar to the one last year when efforts of the Democratic National Committee to pressure Federal career employees to purchase $100 tickets for the Democratic gala held last January brought criticism from merit groups, the press, and Republican Members of Congress.

SOLICITING RENEWED

However, apparently undaunted, the Democratic National Committee is soliciting funds from Government civil servants again.

Career employees from the middle grades on up have received invitations to the affair. In some cases employees in grades as low as grade 9 ($6,675 a year) reported being contacted by the Democratic committee.

The first communication in early November was a formal invitation from the Democratic National Committee. Mailed to the employees at their homes, the letter states the committee "requests the pleasure of your company at the Third Inaugural Salute."

Accompanying this was a card to be filled out, detailing how many tickets (at $100 apiece) the employee wanted. There was also a self-addressed envelope to the Democratic Anniversary Committee, Post Office Box 1213, Washington 13, D.C., to enclose the contribution.

The affair was to have been held at the National Guard Armory on January 23. The assassination of President Kennedy caused the sponsors to cancel the event.

SECOND LETTER

However, about a week ago the career employees received a letter from Democratic National Chairman John Bailey telling them that while the event had been cancelled, a similar event will be scheduled later in the year and that they would be contacted later and advised of the date.

The form letter written by Mr. Bailey is as follows:

"DEAR FRIEND: I am writing to you for Sidney Salomon, chairman of the January affair, to announce that it has been canceled. It is planned to schedule a similar event later in the year and I will advise you of the date when it has been selected.

"I would like to extend my appreciation to those of you who have already contributed. We are taking the liberty of holding these contributions until the new date has been announced, at which time the tickets will be forwarded.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN M. BAILEY."

Democratic officials deny that pressure is being used; they contend the employees have a free choice of purchasing or not purchasing tickets.

EMPLOYEES FEAR EFFECT

However, career employees feel differently. They fear that unless they purchase the $100 tickets, their chances for advancement in their careers is apt to be jeopardized.

Furthermore, they fear it puts them in an untenable position whenever there might be a change of national political administrations.

They point out that one of the first things a new political administration does when taking office is to scan the list of contributors to the opposite political party, to see if Federal employees are on the list. This could and has led to recriminations against employees.

After the adverse publicity of last year's pressure on Government career employees, it was reported by administration insiders that the late President Kennedy said that such pressure "wasn't right" and should not be allowed to recur.

Federal civil servants are hoping that the Johnson administration, in concert with the Civil Service Commission, will make it plain that Federal civil servants are under no obligation to purchase these $100 tickets and

that their careers will not be endangered if they don't buy them.

Better still, they hope that President Johnson will use his power to see to it that no more direct solicitation of Federal employees is allowed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for his statement, and I particularly wish to commend Mr. Joseph Young of the Washington Evening Star for his timely and forthright reporting on the continued efforts by the National Democratic Committee to pressure our civil service employees into making contributions to the Democratic fundraising dinners. Mr. Young's long and confidential relationship with many of our civil service employees makes his observations worthy of attention and credence—and I refer particularly to the statement that these employees "fear that unless they purchase the $100 tickets, their chance for advancement in their careers is apt to be jeopardized."

There is only one answer to this, Mr. President, and that is for the leader of the Democratic Party, President Johnson, to direct the National Democratic Party to cease and desist from such unethical pressures. It will not do to have some Government officials say that there is no requirement to purchase these tickets, and that failure to purchase will have no effect on an employee's future promotions. The damage has already been done. The fear exists, and it is not irresponsible fear. It is fear based on experience. President Johnson ought to issue an Executive order making it clear that no civil service employees shall be permitted to purchase these $100 tickets. Only then will this fear be laid to rest.

I think that this action is highly unethical and unfair. But it is particularly repulsive coming at a time when this Nation is still in a period of mourning over the untimely death of our late President. One would think that the National Democratic Committee would have the good taste to select another period of time for pressuring our civil service employees.

May I say that I also believe this would be a timely occasion for the leaders of the various unions of civil service employees to adopt resolutions in opposition to practices such as this. The integrity of the civil service system—indeed of the executive branch of our Government—is at stake. I might add that these same practices were indulged in a year ago, and Mr. Young faithfully reported them. There were a few calloused protestations of innocent intent at the time, but nothing happened. In fact, since that time the Secretary of Labor has seen fit to solicit contributions for one of the Democratic candidates for reelection to the Senate next year—a practice which should never have happened and never recur.

The public is already sufficiently exercised over reports relating to the Bobby Baker affair and its potential involvement of members of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Now its patience is being tried still further by this action of the National Democratic Committee. If this is the kind of ethics the people want in their Federal Government, they will have an opportunity to express their approval in the 1964 election. I am confident that they will make it very clear that they want no more of these practices on the part of officials who are working for them.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does not the Senator from Kansas agree that perhaps the so-called moratorium can be applied to political speeches but does not apply to the political wherewithal that makes the "mare" go?

Mr. CARLSON. I hope it is more than a moratorium on the political contributions that are requested of Federal employees through a letter from a committee national chairman.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said: Mr. President, a short while ago, while I was presiding, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] took strong exception to an invitation which has been sent by the Democratic National Committee to certain Government employees asking them to contribute to a party function to be held sometime after the first of the year. The Senator from Iowa went so far as to suggest that the President of the United States ought to issue an order instructing Government employees that they should not make political contributions.

I disagree 100 percent with the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. I see absolutely nothing wrong with the letters that were sent by Chairman Bailey to certain Government employees inviting them to contribute to their party.

This same procedure has been followed by both political parties from time immemorial, and I think it should be. I do not think there is anything sacred about a Government employee. He is a citizen, like the rest of us. He is prevented from doing certain things under the Hatch Act. He is prevented from soliciting from other Government employees. But it is perfectly proper, and I think it is the responsibility, of a good party chairman to ask the members of it to contribute to the party of their choice.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that a Member of Congress has objected to the chairman of the national committee of a recognized political party writing a letter to a fellow citizen asking that he make a contribution to the political party?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is exactly correct.

I think the Senator from Minnesota will agree that we ought to regard it as a privilege in this country to contribute to the party of our choice. We live under a two-party system of government in this country. It requires money to operate our political parties. I personally regard it as a privilege to contribute to my political party, just as I regard it as a privilege to contribute to my church.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that in about 1956 a dinner was held in the Minneapolis auditorium, at Minneapolis, Minn., at which time our Secretary of Defense, who should not have been making political and partisan speeches, was doing so. Just about everyone who had received a contract for erasers or pen points received a letter asking him to come to the dinner and make a generous little contribution of $100 a ticket. The Republican chairman who invited the citizens to come to that dinner was a very persuasive man. I envy his talents, because 5,000 persons came to the dinner, 1,000 of them at $100 a plate.

Of course, our Republican friends have some love for the so-called class structure. There was another group that came in at a lesser amount. The Minneapolis auditorium holds a large group of people. About 5,000 people were there to hear our Republican Secretary of Defense. The chairman of the Republican National Committee of our State and the national chairman obviously were very effective in sending out letters. I received one. I am happy to report that I did not attend, but I appreciate being included on the selected mailing list, because it was to be a select list. I was invited to attend a select dinner. There were tables with fancy decorations. I was included in the $100 list. There were some who were included on the $50 list, and I suppose there were some that went down to the $5 gallery sections.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that I did not protest then, and I do not protest now. I stand here in awe and admiration for the success of that invitation. It is a better way of raising money than some other ways. One of the great needs in politics today is to find ways and means of raising campaign contributions so that candidates are not under obligations or pressures by those who have delivered. There is no better way to make such contributions than through attendance at dinners and similar gatherings, where only a limited contribution is made. If one makes a contribution of under $100, the candidate is not likely to be subject to political influences and pressures.

I commend Mr. Bailey for his success. If he is not successful, I invite him to consult the Republican chairman of my State and National chairman who did a fine job in Washington on several occasions.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator may not have discovered yet one technique which took place in the 1960 campaign, when I played a part as a candidate for the Senate. I was mildly surprised that the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Boyd Leedom, and a member of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Sigurd Anderson, joined in an appeal by letter to Government employees and to other citizens in Washington, and throughout the Nation, inviting them to contribute to my opponent. I did not raise any fuss about that, although I thought it was a little odd for members of two regulatory com-

missions to be soliciting political contributions. But what is involved here is something entirely different. This is not the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. This is not a member of the Federal Trade Commission. It is the top political officer of the Democratic Party—Chairman Bailey. No one has been able to cite a single instance in which an employee of the Government was pressured against his will to contribute to this fund-raising effort. On the contrary, our party officials have gone out of their way to make it clear that no employee need fear any obligation. It is a purely voluntary effort. It is an invitation from a responsible political committee to citizens to contribute. I think they should. Any Government employee has an obligation that goes perhaps beyond that of the ordinary citizen to contribute to our great two-party process. I would feel something like a "dead beat" if I worked for the U.S. Government, or any other organization, and was too cheap to make a modest contribution to the political party of my choice.

If a person has no political convictions, if he is something of a political eunuch, who has no concern about public issues, that is perhaps a different matter; but those people are not required to contribute. Nobody is required to contribute. This is an invitation to contribute.

I found no evidence of any undue pressure being exerted. The Senator from Iowa and, I believe, also the Senator from Kansas, implied that there was something unethical—I believe they used that word—about letters of this kind going out during the official mourning for our beloved late President. I wish to clarify the record on that point.

The first letter of appeal went out prior to the tragic death of President Kennedy. The second letter went out to notify the people who had received the first letter that the inaugural salute dinner had been canceled, but telling them that sometime next year there would be a party fund-raising function and that at that time they would again be asked to contribute.

I believe this matter has been handled according to the best standards of political responsibility, and I urgently hope that our fellow Government employees will fulfill their obligations as good citizens and make some modest contribution to the party of their choice.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall take about 10 minutes.

Yesterday, I introduced into the RECORD six case histories of gas and oil magnates with incomes of over a million dollars a year who paid either no taxes or very little or small taxes. One of these cases was that of a man who had an economic income of over $26 million in 1 year and did not pay a single cent in taxes. All this was probably done legally, but to my mind it shows a shocking lack of concern for the great common purposes of our Government and of our society.

Today, I should like to introduce into the RECORD material on the estimated depletion allowances taken by 30 of the great oil and gas companies of the country. This material is drawn from the magazine Fortune, published by Mr. Henry R. Luce, the organ of the wealthy business groups in the Nation. I do not believe any one can charge Fortune magazine with being in league with the dark forces of disorder. The material that I introduce is from page 206 of the issue which was published in April of this year.

The article produces material, in the main, on integrated gas and oil companies which are not only producing companies, but also processing companies. In the past it has been difficult to segregate their production from their processing. As a consequence, it has been difficult to estimate the precise amount of the depletion allowances they have taken.

The magazine Fortune has been able to obtain for each of these companies their net crude oil and gas production measured in physical units, and has multiplied the production of the physical units by the average price during 1961, or for fiscal year ended not later than June 30, 1962. It has, therefore, been able to obtain the value of the oil and gas thus produced.

In this connection, it should be remembered that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, in submitting his report last February, showed that a survey of some 350 oil companies, including most of the large ones, showed an average realized depletion during the 3 years 1958–60, of 26.4 percent.

It will be remembered that the depletion allowance, in addition to other tax favors, is 27½ percent of the gross revenue up to 50 percent of net revenue.

Secretary Dillon showed that the average was only 1 percentage point less than the maximum of 27½ percent. Fortune magazine reached the justifiable conclusion that an average so close to the maximum meant that the great majority of companies were clustered around the average. They, therefore, applied this figure of 26.4 percent to the estimated gross revenue of the 30 companies which they studied and they obtained a probable estimated figure therefor of what the total depreciation allowance amounted to for each of the 30 companies.

When they made their final computations, they submitted the figures to the respective companies and asked the companies to comment upon them.

Fortune magazine goes on to say that nearly two-thirds of the companies said the estimates were fairly close. Some offered minor revision. There were, however, some critical comments.

I believe it can be assumed, therefore, that these figures by Fortune magazine are comparatively accurate and that for the first time we have broken through the difficulty of segregating the producing income from the processing income.

I should like to give the main features of these results today, so that they may become a matter of record.

First, I should like to consider the five Standard Oil companies: Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Standard Oil Co. of California; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Socony, which is the Standard Oil Co. of New York; and the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio.

The estimated depletion allowance for Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was $399 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of California, it was $130 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, it was $110 million. For the Socony, or Standard Oil Co. of New York, it was $110 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, it was $10 million—a total for the five Standard Oil companies or the Rockefeller companies of $759 million.

I point out that this is $759 million of net income which is tax free. It is in addition to the deductions for depreciation, for operating costs, for the expense of drilling dry holes, and for the some 75 to 90 percent of exploration drilling and developing costs which the tax laws in this industry allow to be written off in the first year.

This is in addition to everything else.

It is interesting to consider the next five companies.

The Gulf Oil Co. received a depletion allowance deduction of $228 million. It is commonly held that the Gulf Oil Co. is largely controlled by the Mellon family.

Texaco had a depletion allowance of $216 million, and the Swayne and Hogg families were the dominant elements in that company.

Shell had a depletion allowance of $114 million. Shell is a foreign company primarily owned by Dutch and British interests. It is commonly believed that the House of Nassau, the ruling house of the Netherlands, has a heavy influence in this company. There may be other regal influences and ownership as well.

Phillips had $66 million of depletion allowances. This is the famous Phillips 66.

Cities Service had $59 million. This is the former Daugherty Co.

The total of 10 companies had depletion allowances of $1,442 million.

Then came another group of medium-sized giants.

Continental, controlled by the Marland family interests, had $53 million of depletion allowances.

Sinclair—as its name indicates, dominated by the Sinclair family, started by Harry F. Sinclair—had $52 million.

Atlantic, which is, I am informed, a breakup of the Standard Oil interests, with perhaps some Rockefeller interests remaining, had $49 million.

Sun had $47 million. Sun is managed by the famous Pew family of Philadelphia and Bryn Mawr, who have had extensive publishing interests.

Superior Oil Co., formerly operated by the Keck group, received $38 million.

It will be remembered that some years ago Mr. Keck, at the time of the gas bill was under consideration, distributed a

plentiful shower of $2,500 checks to candidates for the U.S. Senate through the Middle West. This was exposed by a very honorable and courageous Member of the Senate, the late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota. I sat by the late Senator Case while the special committee appointed by the Senate probed the revelations which he had made. For the first 3 days I thought it was Senator Case who was being put on trial, rather than Superior Oil, but the late Senator Case stood his ground because he had a clear conscience.

In addition Tidewater had $33 million, and Skelly had $23 million; a total of $56 million. These companies are controlled by the Getty interests, headed by Mr. J. Paul Getty, who has lived abroad for a great many years. Exactly where he pays his taxes, I do not know, but he is quite well known in the field of international finance and in the field of international entertainment.

I could go on, Mr. President, but I summarize by saying that the Standard Oil group received a total of $759 million and the next 5 received slightly less than $700 million, or a total of $1,442 million received by the first 10.

If we add the next five, we get a grand total of $1,681 million or, to all intents and purposes, $1.7 billion free of taxes.

Fortune also showed what this amounted to per share of common stock. There may be a misprint in connection with Superior Oil, so I reserve the right to correct, as of a later date, the figures on the depletion allowance per common share for Superior Oil, which is cited as being $89.89. This may not be accurate.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Is the Senator getting at the point that if an oil company has achieved a certain amount of percentage depletion the entire amount of that is automatically reflected in the value of its stock at the end of the year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am saying that they get a certain amount of oil and gas production income, which in practice seems to be about 26½ percent of gross revenue, completely free of taxation. The figures which I have just given were for the total amount in millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. The figures on the shares of common stocks which I have just introduced were derived by Fortune magazine by dividing those millions of dollars by the number of shares of common stock, to get an average figure per share.

Mr. MILLER. I understood that was the point the Senator was making.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest to the Senator that this would not at all be an accurate or realistic way to handle this problem. I am sure the Senator, with his great amount of experience in this particular field, knows that the money does not all go into the bank, and that the great portion of it is used for the continued exploration activities by the oil companies, much of it being lost and deducted as a matter of intangible drilling and development cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Other companies which pay their taxes pay 52 percent of their net profits to the Federal Government in the form of taxes, and those companies are freed from a large proportion of taxes by the depletion allowance.

When I last looked at the combined figure, I believe oil and gas companies paid only about 24 percent of their net income in the form of taxes, as compared to 52 percent paid by the great mass of American companies of equal size.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. Surely the Senator from Illinois realizes that a real comparison between an oil company of the kind to which he has been referring and other types of business operations cannot be made, because the other types of business operations do not have to take nearly as much of their profit for use for continued exploration-type activities, much of which is lost and is, of course, deducted in turn through the intangible drilling and development costs.

In other words, I do not believe the Senator can compare the economic situation under which the oil companies operate and the economic situation under which other companies operate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am only taking the figures given by Fortune magazine and Mr. Henry R. Luce, one of the strong supporters of the party of which the distinguished Senator from Iowa is a member. If the Senator from Iowa wishes to quarrel with Mr. Luce, I suggest he go to the Rockefeller Center, go up to the 42d floor, and see the view from there.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not quarreling with the figures the Senator from Illinois has been giving the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are given in Fortune.

Mr. MILLER. I am disputing the interpretation the Senator from Illinois seeks to draw therefrom. That is exactly the point. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Iowa might agree 100 percent with the figures Mr. Luce has given in this article. I hope, before the Senator completes his statement, he will indulge me with a little colloquy to develop the precise point, so that those who read the RECORD will know there is more than one side to this question.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes I have no interest in oil whatever. I come from a State which has no oil. There is some oil in the State from which the Senator from Illinois comes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Quite a good deal.

Mr. MILLER. But while I worked at one time as a member of the Chief Counsel's Office in the Internal Revenue Service I had an opportunity to work on some oil cases, and I think I know something about the situation in the oil industry.

May I ask the Senator a question? Is the Senator suggesting, when he points out that there is a $1.7 billion tax-free depletion allowance that some 15 oil companies have obtained, that Congress should wipe out that allowance, so that there will not be $1.7 billion of such tax-free income? As a very noted economist, does the Senator not really believe that this is such a built-in part of the cost of petroleum production that that $1.7 billion is going to get into the cost of the end product and result in an increase in the price that people will have to pay for oil, gas, and fuel?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the first place, the Senator from Iowa evidently does not understand what the Senator from Illinois is proposing. I have proposed several times that for small oil and gas enterprises, whose gross receipts in a given year are less than $1 million, there be no change in the depletion allowance percentage, but that it remains at 27½ percent; but on the increment between $1 million and $5 million the depletion percentage should be reduced to 21 percent, instead of 27½ percent; and that on the increment above $5 million the depletion allowance should be reduced to 15 percent. This would save $400 million for the taxpayers. It would be a far more productive use of resources than to give this amount to companies, encouraging, in effect, what is overinvestment in this line. That is all I am contending for. The Senator from Illinois is most moderate in what he is trying to do. He is astounded at his own moderation.

Mr. MILLER. Am I to understand now that the Senator is suggesting that the figure of $400 million represents overinvestment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I say this is an amount which can be trimmed off the $2,200 million which the industry as a whole seems to receive——

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to the figures submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, the estimate of the total amount of the depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry was $2,200 million. Those 15 companies obtained $1,700 million. They include companies with assets of over $100 million, who get over 70 percent of the depletion allowance. All I am proposing is trimming $400 million off the $2,200 million and have it go to the people of the United States, instead of to the owners of the property.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator from Illinois asserting that if his proposal were adopted, the $400 million to which he has referred would go into the Treasury, without more, or might he not recognize that the $400 million would end up in additional cost of petroleum products to the general American consumer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it would go into the Treasury, and, as a result of a somewhat lower return, it would lead to a reduced volume of investment in the industry, much of which is now uneconomic because it is done for tax purposes. This is an industry which, though it will not

admit the fact, is overcapitalized in the sense that there is more capital in it than there should be.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, the Senator recognizes that there may be some differences of opinion over his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Iowa has been a tax lawyer. He knows that when decisions are made on the basis of taxes rather than earnings, an uneconomic consideration has been introduced.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that if his proposal were adopted, the $400 million to which he has referred would end up in additional cost of gasoline, oil, and fuel to the general American consumer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to make clear that these surpluses are out of profits. They do not enter into costs. They are surpluses above cost.

Mr. MILLER. But take away those surpluses, which have long been built into the highly competitive pricing of petroleum products, and I am quite sure we shall see an increase in the price of those products.

The unfortunate feature is that when the price of gasoline, oil, or fuel is increased, the general American public pays that cost, and there is no graduated payment. That is akin to an excise tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if Mr. Getty has his income diminished, it is going to increase costs? And that is true of the Mellons, the Rockefellers, the Sinclairs, the Pews and the Kecks?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not saying that when an individual's income is reduced by an additional tax, that will necessarily be reflected in an increased cost of products.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator should not be defending the man——

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Illinois knows better than the Senator from Iowa that it is an old axiom that any time corporate—not individual—costs are increased, whether by increased taxes, or a reduced amount of deductions, or increased labor costs, sooner or later it is the general consumer who pays. In the case of the graduated income tax, there are differences in burdens. If the $400 million to which the Senator has referred is now being made up by the general taxpayers throughout the United States, it means that taxpayers, who are subjected to different kinds of graduated income tax, pay according to their relative ability to pay.

If he takes the $400 million away, and this ends up as an increased cost in end items, the people who are less able to pay are going to be stuck with the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Iowa maintain that if a man who got $28 million a year and did not now pay any taxes, and later he had to pay a million dollars in taxes, it would mean that the cost of gasoline would go up?

Mr. MILLER. No. The Senator from Iowa has just pointed out that he makes no such claim with respect to individuals. It is with respect to corporations. If we increase the corporate costs, it is the consumer who ultimately will have to pay. I am sure the Senator knows that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about Superior Oil, and the Keck Co., which, over a period of 5 years, had $65 million in profits and did not pay a cent in taxes, and got a refund of approximately $400,000? Is the Senator from Iowa saying that if they had paid taxes, the price of oil to the consumer would have gone up?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is pointing out that when the entire industry, to which the Senator's proposal would apply, is stuck with additional taxes, the competitive situation in the oil industry will bring about an increase in the cost to the consumer.

It is not possible to single out one man, or one company. It is necessary to consider a collective group. That is the point I am afraid the Senator from Illinois is not bringing out in his constant and, I am sure, very sincere criticism of this situation. What the Senator from Iowa is trying to do is to put this matter in its proper perspective.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator really believe these companies ought to get by without paying any taxes?

Mr. MILLER. Of course, no one is going to argue that someone who should pay taxes should not pay any taxes. However, what the Senator from Illinois fails to bring out in such a case is that when we talk about percentage depletion, it cannot exceed 50 percent of net income. Therefore, if a corporation or an individual has a $20 million net income, there cannot possibly be more than $10 million in deduction by percentage depletion.

The Senator forgets to bring out in such a question that the differences may come from net operating loss carryovers or carrybacks, and those adjustments are applicable to all businesses. The Senator fails to point out intangible drilling and development costs, if they are incurred in a company's attempts to find additional oil resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are written off in the first year while these same kinds of costs for the ordinary company have to be depreciated over a long period of time.

Mr. MILLER. These are continuing operations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I remind the Senator from Iowa that he does not take into consideration certain other things, such as the 14-point deduction, from 52 to 38 percent which is given to those companies which drill and operate in the Western Hemisphere, and which constitutes an additional benefit to Standard Oil, which has its fields in Venezuela. I wish to point out that he does not take into account the special treatment of capital gains, which apply to the oil industry, and on royalties, and a great many other things. This is the most favored tax-treated industry in the Nation. The result is that some huge oil income is untaxed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I hope the Senator from Illinois knows me well enough to know that I will not ignore such facts of life. The point I am trying to bring out is that when the Senator from Illinois makes these points, we ought to bring out the other side of the question, so that the general public will be able to make an informed judgment on it. The Senator spoke about the favored treatment of Western Hemisphere corporations. This is true of many other corporations.

Since the Senator made that point, it is also well to bring out the fact that a very severe competitive situation now exists. This is particularly true with respect to the Soviet Union in the petroleum field. I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows this. I suggest that if we take away some of the tax advantages of our domestic oil companies, we will reduce their competitive ability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not want that to happen.

I am not saying that we have a perfect tax law. However, I am saying that we ought to be a little careful about jumping hastily to conclusions, or stating generalities which may cause some people to arrive at erroneous conclusions.

I am not questioning the sincerity of the Senator from Illinois. He is a very dedicated individual, and he is very knowledgeable in this field.

However, I would like to bring out the other side, with which I was in contact in my own experience as a civil service employee of the Federal Government a number of years ago.

Speaking of the competitive situation involving the Soviet Union, I believe it is very important, in connection with U.S. foreign policy, that our domestic petroleum companies be able to compete effectively in the world markets. I am sure the Senator from Illinois agrees. I am sure he would not wish to threaten that competitive ability by eliminating one of the main bases on which this competition can be waged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, because I believe the Senator from Montana wishes to make a speech. However, the Senator from Iowa has wept copious tears about the sad plight of oversea oil companies, which seldom pay any taxes whatever, and who by importing oil into this country drive the small domestic producers out of business.

Standard Oil is the chief offender in this respect. Through its holdings in Venezuela and through its ownership of Aramco—the Arabian-American Oil Co.—it is the chief offender. Incidentally, it can finance its filling stations and permit the filling stations to wage rate wars on the small independents, and in that way drive the small independents out of business.

I shall be very glad to have the Senator take the floor in his own time in defense of these groups. We can continue this discussion at that time.

Unless he has further questions to ask, I ask unanimous consent that certain

material from Fortune magazine for April 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Depletion: What's at stake for 30 companies

	Estimated production revenues		Estimated depletion allowance	
	Total (millions)	As proportion of net sales	Total (millions)	Per common share
		Percent		
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	$1,511	18	$399	$1.84
Gulf Oil	862	31	228	2.18
Texaco	817	27	216	1.74
Standard Oil of California	492	24	130	2.05
Shell Oil	430	23	114	1.88
Standard Oil (Indiana)	415	20	110	3.06
Socony Mobil Oil	415	13	110	2.25
Phillips Petroleum	250	20	66	1.92
Cities Service	225	23	59	5.48
Continental Oil	200	25	53	2.47
Sinclair Oil	196	16	52	3.32
Atlantic Refining	185	33	49	5.37
Sun Oil	180	23	47	3.43
Superior Oil	144	99	38	89.89
Marathon Oil	128	36	34	2.37
Tidewater Oil	123	20	33	2.38
Union Oil of California	122	27	32	3.61
Sunray DX Oil	103	22	27	1.51
Armerada Petroleum	100	97	26	4.17
Richfield Oil	97	34	24	2.96
Pure Oil	96	17	25	2.55
Skelly Oil	86	35	23	3.93
Signal Oil & Gas	53	18	14	1.38
Standard Oil (Ohio)	39	9	10	2.09
Kerr-McGee Oil Industries	19	11	5	.80
Ashland Oil & Refining	17	6	4	.66
Murphy	16	15	4	1.08
Delhi-Taylor Oil	11	10	3	.43
American Petrofina	11	14	3	.40
Clark Oil & Refining	(1)			

[1] Negligible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor, unless the Senator from Iowa has some questions to ask.

Mr. MILLER. No; I have no further questions to ask. I thank my friend from Illinois for his responsive answers. I am sure he recognizes that although he and I may arrive at different conclusions, he agrees that we ought to put all the facts before the people, so that they can arrive at a balanced view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to debate this subject in the State of the Senator from Iowa, and he can come into my State and debate it with me there.

"EUGENIE II" DOCUMENTED AS VESSEL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 749, S. 1322.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1322) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 11), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause that certain vessel now known as the Eugenie II, built in 1955 in New Brunswick, and now owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges, upon compliance with the usual requirements so long as the vessel is owned, and shall continue to be owned, by a citizen of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 768), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to document, with full coastwise privileges, the *Eugenie II*, a Canadian-built vessel of approximately 15 net tons.

The Commerce Committee reported and the Senate passed a similar measure applying to this same vessel in the last Congress. The action was too late in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, however, for the House to conclude deliberations.

REASON FOR THE BILL

The *Eugenie II*, a 50-foot vessel, was built in New Brunswick, Canada, in 1955, and hence is not eligible (1) under the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1927, to transport merchandise between points in the United States, and (2) under section 4132 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 11) to be documented for operation in the coastwise trade.

Under existing maritime statutes, vessels constructed in foreign yards are not eligible to participate in the domestic or coastwise trades. This old and durable restriction has been largely responsible for the preservation of American shipyards. At the same time and for unusual and pressing circumstances, the Congress has on rare occasion enacted special legislation permitting individual vessels the right to participate in the domestic trades, a right they might never have had because of foreign construction or one that was lost due to a transfer from American to foreign registry.

In the case at hand, the vessel, *Eugenie II*, is of such limited size that it is unlikely that she would be able to participate in any traffic competitive with that served by American-built craft. Moreover, this ship would provide what appears to the committee to be a desirable and needed service in a portion of the Maine seacoast that could not otherwise be served. Though this is an exception, it is one of such a limited nature that it will not pose a threat to the overall goals of our still sound coastwise restrictions.

The vessel is owned by J. C. Strout, a U.S. citizen, of Milbridge, Maine, who proposes to use it to supply charterboat and mail service in that area if this bill is enacted. Your committee is informed that no such service is presently available and that its initiation would be a welcome addition to the economy of the area.

The Department of Commerce reports that, in view of the small size of the vessel, it has no objection to favorable consideration of the bill, if there is no objection on the part of the Treasury Department whose responsibility it is to administer, through the Bureau of Customs, the navigation laws which cover the documentation of vessels.

The Treasury Department report stated that the question of granting the coastwise privileges sought is a matter of policy upon which the Department expresses no opinion.

No opposition to the bill has been received from any source.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PERSONS INVOLVED IN FORGED AND FRAUDULENT GOVERNMENT CHECKS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 752, H.R. 4839.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4839) for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiations of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 771), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The proposed legislation would grant relief to persons who became liable to the United States because they negotiated or presented for payment checks originally procured by fraud at the Parks Air Force Base, Calif.,

when they had no knowledge of any fact which would constitute notice of infirmity of the checks or defect in the title of persons negotiating them. The bill would grant relief by providing authority:

(a) To relieve persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be liable to the United States by reason of negotiating or presenting for payment any forged or fraudulent check drawn on the Treasury of the United States beginning July 1, 1955, and ending March 31, 1958, provided such persons were without knowledge of any fact which would constitute notice of an infirmity in such check or defect in the title of the person negotiating it;

(b) To authorize refunds to anyone who has made restitution to the United States of any amount for which relief is granted by the bill; and

(c) To relieve the certifying or disbursing officers for all amounts for which relief is granted, if there was no fraud or criminality on the part of such officer.

STATEMENT

The facts of the bill are set out in the following statement from the favorable House Report 321, 88th Congress, 1st session:

"In September 1957 the Air Force Audit Branch, General Accounting Office, reported it had detected irregularities in the processing of payments to military personnel at Parks Air Force Base, Calif. The irregularities were of such a nature that the Office of Special Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the U.S. Secret Service were immediately requested to make an investigation. (The FBI later withdrew from the investigation.) As a result of the investigation, three enlisted men (T. Sgt. Theodore Barry, S. Sgt. Charles A. Evans, and Airman James R. Hoyle) confessed to the forging of signatures of payees on a number of checks validly issued by the disbursing office at Parks Air Force Base. It also developed that one of the men, assigned to the disbursing office, had obtained and with the assistance of the other two cashed Government checks issued in accordance with fictitious payrolls prepared by him. The investigation and subsequent audits of the records at Parks Air Force Base disclosed that 426 U.S. Government checks totaling $80,079 had been illegally converted to the personal use of the three members. The men have been discharged from the Air Force. They were tried in the Federal district court, San Francisco, Calif., in November 1957. All were convicted and two were committed for 7 years to the Federal Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash., and one was given an indeterminate sentence to be served at Federal Correctional Institute, Englewood, Colo.

"In connection with this matter, this committee has carefully considered the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress concerning the military payroll irregularities at Parks Air Force Base accounts for the period July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1956. During that period, one of the functions of the Parks Air Base was to disburse military pay and travel allowances to members of the Air Force returning to the United States by water transportation from oversea stations in the Pacific area. Copies of transfer orders and pay records were received in advance of members' arrival at Parks. Amounts payable for travel advances and partial pay were computed and checks were drawn so that payments could be made to the servicemen at dockside as they disembarked. When it was learned that a member would be eligible for discharge within 60 days or would be hospitalized, payment was not made at dockside, and the checks for those individuals were to be returned to the finance office for cancellation.

"In the course of the audit it was determined that 126 checks in the amount of $18,190 were diverted from the rightful payees and were fraudulently negotiated. It was found that checks made out to members to be hospitalized and those eligible for discharge within 60 days were not delivered to the payees but were returned to the finance office as outlined above. Then the checks were to be canceled, but there a member of the Air Force, the staff sergeant referred to above, diverted many of the undelivered checks to his own use since no one apparently checked on the disposition of the returned checks. The crime was apparently hidden by the device of lining out payment entries on the pay records so that the amounts would not be charged against members' accounts, thus precluding subsequent complaints from the actual payee of the check involved. Where checks were returned for cancellation after the pay records were transferred to another finance officer, only he could line out the payment entry. In three instances the staff sergeant initiated action which resulted in the Parks Air Force Base finance officers requesting other finance officers having custody of such pay records to line out the postings and the request erroneously indicated that the checks had been canceled. In these cases the finance officer at Parks Air Force Base failed to verify the status of the checks, and they were subsequently forged.

"In the course of the check frauds at Parks Air Force Base checks were also obtained by the processing of fraudulent payrolls. The corrupt sergeant who perpetrated the frauds instructed his clerks to prepare payrolls based on extra transfer orders which were frequently received in his section with the pay records. This was generally done from 2 to 3 weeks after the members concerned had left the base. The payrolls prepared in this fashion were placed in the normal processing line for check preparation. Checks were issued and the same sergeant picked up the payroll and checks from the cashier on the pretext of delivering the checks to the personnel processing squadron for payment of the airmen. He was given the checks to deliver without question. This was done although he prepared the payrolls and had access to the pay records. All of the checks prepared in this manner were converted to unauthorized use.

"It must also be observed that the finance officer executed the required certificate for each of the fraudulent payrolls. This certificate stated that payments had been made to properly identified individuals and entered on their pay records.

"The checks obtained through the manipulation of pay records and the preparation of fraudulent rolls were disposed of by the staff sergeant and his accomplice by forging first endorsements and then negotiating the fraudulent checks. At first the checks were cashed through bartenders and taxicab drivers. When the dishonest servicemen began obtaining checks in larger quantities, a restaurant business called Chicken on Call was opened to serve as an outlet for passing the forged checks.

"This committee has carefully considered the matter of extending legislative relief in accordance with the provisions of this bill, and has determined that such relief is clearly required in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. In making this recommendation, the committee is fully aware of the position of the Treasury Department which states in its report to this committee:

" 'The Treasury Department is opposed to the enactment of private relief legislation in cases involving Treasury checks where the liability of the parties is governed by applicable principles of law.'

"This committee feels that such a statement misses the point completely. The local businessmen and banks from the area surrounding Parks Air Force Base have appealed to the Congress for relief for the very fact that they find themselves bound to pay in this situation. The question of legislative relief in the light of the facts of this case, and the responsibility shared by the Government, cannot be resolved simply by a legalistic reference to the principles of negotiable instruments law.

"In this connection it is relevant to refer to the findings of the Comptroller General as to the fault of the Government in permitting the conditions which made such a fraud possible. In the report to the Congress it was stated:

" 'A review of the circumstances under which the fraud was perpetrated, and particularly the length of time the fraudulent practices were carried on, clearly demonstrates that management failed to provide adequate controls to safeguard the interests of the Government.'

"The basis for this conclusion was that there were failures to segregate payroll duties which enabled the single sergeant to control or participate in all of the duties to provide himself with the opportunity for fraudulent operations. Further, the undelivered checks should have been turned back directly to the finance officer or his deputy. Proper internal control was violated when the same person preparing the payroll could obtain the checks. The report further condemned the inadequate supervision of payroll duties, and stated:

" 'The personnel responsible for management of the base, including the operation of the finance office, did not adequately perform their supervisory duties.'

"Here it was pointed out that there was a failure to check that certified statements relating to the fraudulent payrolls were factually correct. The Comptroller General further noted that resident auditors of the Air Force Auditor General's office responsible for the review of procedures and controls at the base failed to disclose the irregularities although the fraudulent practices were carried on for over a year. On the basis of this record, the committee has concluded that the Government shares in the responsibility for this situation, and it should be noted that had proper controls and procedures been utilized the frauds would not have continued for such a period and consequently the local businessmen and banks would not have been placed in as desperate a position as they ultimately found themselves. The facts of this matter, outlined in some detail in this report, in the opinion of the committee, make it inequitable for the Government to deny relief and thereby require the losses resulting from the fraud to be borne by the individuals, businessmen, and banks in the Parks area.

"This committee feels that it is to the best interest of the Air Force that relief be granted in this instance. In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of the Air Force stated that it 'supports the objectives' of the bill, but then stated that it deferred to the Treasury Department as to 'technical comment' on the matters involved in sections 1 and 2, the sections which provide for relief and which are the actual heart of the bill. This somewhat ambiguous position has been interpreted by this committee as reflecting the dilemma faced by the Air Force where a sympathetic resolution of the matter would plainly be in the best interest of the Air Force and its relationships with the people in the Parks Air Force Base area.

"On the basis of these considerations the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF A CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND TO STATE OF DELAWARE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 754, S. 1767.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1767) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to sell and convey to the State of Delaware, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such federally owned lands of the Fort Miles Military Reservation, Delaware, which are now declared to be excess to the needs of the United States, excluding, however, approximately ten acres located within the town of Lewes, Delaware, known as the off-post housing area.

"SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized herein shall be upon the following terms and conditions.

"a. That portion of the presently excess lands comprising approximately one hundred and fifty-five acres, more or less, which was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Delaware without cost, shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware without monetary payment.

"b. Such lands, other than described in (a) above, as are presently excess shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware upon payment to the United States by the State of Delaware of the amount of money determined by the Secretary of the Army to have been paid by the United States for the acquisition of subject lands.

"c. The lands conveyed shall be used solely for educational and/or public park and recreational purposes, and if such use shall ever cease, title to these lands shall revert to, and become the property of the United States which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

"d. The State of Delaware shall pay the cost of such surveys as may be necessary to determine the exact legal description of the real property to be conveyed.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army shall include in the deed of conveyance authorized to be made by this Act a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense, in any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, to enter upon and use without cost to the United States the lands conveyed by such deed if such lands are considered necessary for national defense purposes by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of the Army may also include in the deed of conveyance such additional reservations and conditions he considers to be in the public interest."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of calling up the measure is to have it pending. Very likely its consideration will be resumed later in the afternoon.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, not only is the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] a highly respected Member of the Senate, but he has included in his background and his experience in the Senate a marked proficiency in a number of highly important subjects, in the list of which is his lifelong interest in the problem of an adequate water supply for the people of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska is necessarily absent from the Senate today. He had prepared an excellent statement on S. 1111, recently passed by the Senate. In his comments, the Senator from Nebraska said, in part:

The development of this Nation's water resources is, in the long run, the most important problem facing the American people.

How true. S. 1111 is designed in some fashion to assist the people of the United States in making progress toward the development of the Nation's water resources.

The distinguished Senator comments with respect to the responsibilities of local government as well as Federal Government in this field. In his text, he gives a deserved salute to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the prime author of S. 1111.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I was on the floor Monday when the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] rose to dictate—as he put it—a memorandum for the files. He spoke of the unrecorded history of the evolution of our water policy and of those who have participated in the foundation of that policy. He referred to the work that has been done by the committees of the Senate and reviewed the individual efforts of several of our colleagues.

The Senator from New Mexico is a humble man, and I was pleased and delighted when several Members of this body rose to return his tribute to them. It was obvious to all that the words they spoke reflected genuine respect and admiration.

I would like to add a further note to those remarks and those expressions of warm sentiment. Dedication and ability are never in short supply when the Senator from New Mexico turns his energies to a problem. Having worked with him on other water conservation matters, I know firsthand of his dedication to this cause. Again we witness Senator ANDERSON's steady legislative hand guiding S. 1111 and its supporting record.

While perhaps not as spectacular as tax cuts or civil rights, the development of this Nation's water resources is, in the long run, the most important problem facing the American people. By 1980, major portions of the United States will not have sufficient water to meet the demands of a growing population and an expanding industry. Indeed, in some areas a time of crisis already has arrived.

To hesitate or delay today would be to invite an emergency catastrophe tomorrow. We can ill afford another crash program with its inevitable waste and inefficiency. Nor can we be capricious with our time; 1980 may seem remote to some, but experience shows that it takes many years to bring water resource facilities into operation.

Because of the urgent nature of our water resources problem and because I fully agree with the purposes and objectives of S. 1111, I supported its enactment. On balance, it is a sound bill. Moreover, it moves us substantially along the way of water conservation and development, which course cannot be disputed.

It is too early to predict the precise policies that will be adopted under the auspices of this measure. But it is not too early to sound a warning and to point out some dangers for the benefit of those who will administer this program and who will participate in the activities provided by the legislation.

All levels of government have basic responsibilities in the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources. This must not be disturbed. I am hopeful that under this legislation, there will continue to be a deep commitment and full participation at all levels.

We are dealing in an area where there are varied viewpoints and competing rights. As yet, no lines have been drawn to define the areas of respective authority. It behooves us, therefore, to proceed with caution and with due regard for the interests of each sovereignty.

I am not unmindful of the efforts which have been made to avoid controversy. Many troublesome issues have been put aside. However, we can fairly anticipate that there will be disputed points of view both as to issues involving broad policy and issues involving the implementation of the machinery provided in this bill.

I see the States as full and equal partners in the ventures contemplated in S. 1111. Will they in fact achieve this function or will they be overwhelmed by the Federal Government? Will theirs be a meaningful and useful participation or will they be quietly elbowed out of the way and dispatched to a role of unimportance?

How are these problems going to be solved? Whose counsel is going to be heard and whose recommendation are going to be followed? Whose rights are going to be paramount and whose rights servient?

In time these broad questions will come into sharper focus. As the planning involved in this bill moves forward, we will be better able to pinpoint specific weaknesses and consequently, better able to provide specific relief. We have made a good beginning. We have a good foundation on which to build. But we must stand ready to legislate against domination and disproportionate influence and to provide revision and reform whenever and wherever needed.

The point has been made that S. 1111 is merely a planning measure; that it still will be for Congress to authorize and fund the projects that will emerge. This is true. The bill does relate only to planning. But when one considers that it requires months and sometimes years to develop a comprehensive plan for the maximum use of water, it must be recognized that by the time the planning is completed, there is not much anyone can do. In view of this, there is considerable merit in the contention that he who controls the planning controls the water.

It is for this reason that I so strongly urge that the Congress follow the administration of this bill closely. We must be satisfied

that no point of view is slighted or ignored. As legislators vested with the final authority, we must be confident that the plans submitted to us are a true and accurate consensus of opinion and that long held rights have been neither disturbed nor destroyed. In short, we must make absolutely certain that no one interest dominates the planning.

S. 1111 is a pioneering effort. It has been conceived in a spirit of cooperation and good faith. If that spirit is continued, much good can be accomplished. If that spirit is lost, considerable harm can be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for what remains of this week and for the following week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Nothing remains for this week, thank the Lord. But for next week, the following measures, not necessarily in the order that I announce them, will be considered—I hope.

From the Committee on Banking and Currency, probably the Kennedy 50-cent coin bill, which I understand the House will consider on Monday.

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chamizal Treaty, which was reported today by a vote of 16 to 0. It will be taken up in the Senate on Tuesday; at least, that is the time tentatively set. It will not be brought up on Monday.

Both S. 2214, relating to the International Development Association, and H.R. 7406, relating to the Inter-American Development Bank, have been reported, and they may likewise be taken up.

Another meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be held on Monday, but what the agenda will be as a result of that meeting, I do not know at this time.

From the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, there will come H.R. 6756, the Mesa Verde National Park bill, on which I understand the report was filed today; and S. 792, the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill, the report on which is expected to be filed today or Monday.

From the Committee on the Judiciary there may be some private claim bills.

From the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we expect to have for consideration S. 2379, a bill to establish a national council on the arts.

From the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, postmaster nominations are expected to be reported.

From the Committee on Public Works, we hope to receive the House joint resolution to rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

I understand that on Monday the House will act on the foreign aid appropriation bill. I would hope that the Senate Committee on Appropriations could complete its markup of this bill either this weekend or by Monday next, and that the bill could be brought to the floor of the Senate during next week.

In conference at the present time are the District of Columbia, and the legislative, and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bills.

While the appropriation bill for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the judiciary is not in conference at the moment, it is my understanding that it will go to conference either Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning.

That, in general, is the schedule which should keep us quite busy until the 20th of the month.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

DEFENSE AND MR. McNAMARA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for some time the Government Operations Committee has been inquiring into the circumstances surrounding the award of a contract for development of the TFX plane. What will emerge from this investigation, what legislation will derive from it, cannot be foreseen. It is not my intention to anticipate, much less to prejudge the committee's findings. But whatever the outcome, let there be no doubt as to the interest of the Senate in this matter. It is an entirely appropriate and pertinent interest.

Public funds are spent in vast sums for military research and development. Together with the President, it is the Congress which provides the legal basis for the procedures under which these funds are expended. It is the Congress which appropriates these funds. It is the Congress which must answer to the people as to the general wisdom of the appropriations. And in part at least, the Congress must answer for the effectiveness with which these appropriations are disbursed by the executive branch. The very process of committee inquiry, moreover, has significant value in an educative sense. And in the end, that which may be learned in this or any particular case could well have wider legislative application. In inquiring deeply into the TFX matter, therefore, the Committee on Government Operations is discharging a wholly legitimate function by authority of and on behalf of the Senate.

May I say that what has transpired to date in the investigation has led me to take the floor today. I do so to give voice to the views of one Member of the Senate, a Senator from Montana. The views are not new. Rather, they are views which have accumulated over the years and have begun to crystallize in the light of developments in the TFX inquiry.

It is apparent from these hearings, that an immense number of factors were involved in the TFX contract award. Some of these factors are of a military nature. Others are broader than military in their implications. And many are not open or shut tangibles but, rather, involve best judgments on the part of the men who are expected by the nature of the responsibilities entrusted to them to make best judgments.

Since such is the case, I do not believe that it is reasonable to expect any Senator or committee of Senators to say with certainty that Secretary McNamara's decision in the TFX was the right one or the wrong one. Nor do I believe that the spokesman of any particular branch of the armed services is competent to say with certainty that the Secretary's decision was the right one or the wrong one. Nor, in the light of the factors involved, are all of the spokesmen of the military services combined competent to do so. To be sure, their professionalism gives great weight to such objective military opinions as they may advance. But we should not overlook the fact that their very professionalism compels them to regard the development of a piece of military equipment, not in the context of total costs and national policies but largely in terms of military desirability and specific utility and, perhaps, even more pointedly, in terms of military desirability and specific utility as seen against a background of a particular training and service experience. That is as it should be. Military leaders are not required and ought not to be required to answer the questions of the people of this Nation as to the additional tax burdens or the neglected civilian needs which any military cost may entail. But these questions must be answered by someone in this Government. Indeed, they must be answered by the President and by the Congress. And because that is the case and must remain so under a system of free and responsible government, it is not appropriate and it may be misleading to weigh military observations on any weapons system in a vacuum and to assume that decisions arrived at on that basis are automatically the valid decisions.

Even Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, with all due respect, cannot speak with certainty as to the correctness of his decisions in the TFX matter. Only time, if even that, will permit a logical assessment of his specific judgments.

The truth is that there are no certainties in matters of this kind.

TFX apart, I am inclined to think—and I reason now from history rather than specifics—that at some future date it will be seen in retrospect that Mr. McNamara made many correct decisions as Secretary of Defense and occasionally that he made wrong decisions. But for the present, all that can be asked, all that should be asked, of any man in his position is that, under the President, he exercise every diligence and full dedication to his public responsibility and do his best to reach the best decisions.

On that score, Mr. McNamara needs no defense from me or anyone else. His record speaks for itself. His is, in these times, the most difficult and the most complex assignment in the Government after the President. His immense international responsibilities which dovetail with those of the Secretary of State involve questions of life or death for tens of millions in this country and elsewhere.

In addition, he has the supreme administrative responsibilities for the Defense Establishment. That department now contains a million civilian employees and more than two and a half million men and women in uniform.

Reposed in him is the trust of dispensing public funds in excess of $50 billion a year, a sum equal to more than the total of all other Federal expenditures combined.

In the light of these vast responsibilities, Secretary McNamara has been an outstanding and exceptional servant of the people of this Nation. He was a tower of strength to the late President in carrying the great burdens of Chief Executive. His remaining in office at the request of President Johnson is an assurance to the Nation that we will continue to have the highest possible degree of intelligent, experienced and dedicated public service in this most critical Cabinet position.

Mr. McNamara was confirmed by the Senate as Secretary of Defense to see to it that this Nation has the kind of defense structure which the President, together with the Congress, deem necessary for national security. He was confirmed by the Senate to bring about and maintain that structure at the lowest possible cost to the people of the United States. That—no more, no less—is what the law, the constitutional powers of the Presidency, and the dimensions of the Office of Secretary of Defense requires of him. And I should think that every Member of this body would want to consider a long time, a very long time, before seeking to require anything else of this Secretary of Defense or any other. I should think, too, that we would want to consider a long time, a very long time, before curbing or undermining the authority of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in view of the critical decisions which must be made if this responsibility is to be effectively exercised.

If the Secretary of Defense does not have the authority to make the critical decisions where else shall it be lodged in this Government? What shall we require of the Secretary if it is not the critical decisions? That he serve as a kind of coach or waterboy or, perhaps, a chaplain for the military services? That the final decisions, not merely those of the battlefield but of defense management and technology in effect, shall be made by military personnel? If I may be blunt, Mr. President, it would appear, in that concept, that the Secretary's principal functions would be reduced to fighting for the Defense Establishment's share of the total national budgetary pie and then to keeping the various services from coming to blows over how it is to be divided. If I may be blunt, in prior years we have had our experience with that kind of an approach.

Indeed, the Secretary of Defense is a sort of umpire. But the fact is that the present Secretary of Defense is an umpire who has sought increasingly to establish service needs and expenditures on the basis of the requirements of total national policies and in response to the admonitions of the Congress for economic and efficient operation of the Defense Establishment. He is an umpire who has exercised the authority of his office to say, not only "Yes," but "No," when necessary, and to make the "no" stick. He has exercised the power to say "No," increasingly, to curb that notorious invitation to waste and extravagence, the cost-plus contract. He has exercised the power to say "No" to budgetary requests from the various services which often and understandably are heavily influenced by a one-service rather than an all-service concept of national defense. He has exercised the power to say "No" to separate service purchase of common use items of equipment and supply. And the Congress knows that this type of purchasing did much to bring about the stockpiling of military surpluses, surpluses whose costs dwarf even those engendered in agriculture. He has exercised the power to say "No" to certain new weapons developments. However, any such development may intrigue its advocates, from the national point of view it ought not to be pursued unless it contains sufficient promise and can otherwise justify itself on the basis of cost-to-potential contribution to total defense. And lest there be any doubt of the need of such curbs, I shall read to the Senate a list of projects and their cost to the public—projects which over the past 10 years did indeed intrigue their advocates but which were abandoned before completion or declared obsolete or surplus soon after completion.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

Missile: Dart; canceled 1958; funds invested, $44 million; prime contractor, Aerophysics Corp. A wire-guided surface-to-surface antitank missile with a range of approximately 6,000 yards. This missile system was canceled since the French-designed SS–10 proved to be more effective in this role.

Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment: Vigilante; cancelled, 1961; funds invested, $32 million; prime contractor, Sperry Gyroscope. A 6-barrel, 37-millimeter automatic antiaircraft gun system mounted on a full-track vehicle chassis and complete with radar fire control. This gun system was canceled since the Mauler surface-to-air missile system has been designed and should be more effective in the antiaircraft role intended.

Other equipment: AN/USD 4 Drone; cancelled, 1960; funds invested, $40 million; prime contractor, Republic Aviation. A medium endurance survelliance drone, capable of carrying a 450-pound payload for 55 minutes duration. This drone program was canceled since it was considered that the AN/USD–5, when developed, could perform this mission as well.

AN/USD 5 Drone; canceled, 1962; funds invested, $103.3 million; prime contractor, Fairchild Astro Corp. A long-endurance surveillance drone, capable of carrying a 450-pound payload for 90 minutes' duration. This drone program was canceled since cost effectiveness studies have indicated that the Air Force with their F4C and RF–101 modernization program can perform the mission more effectively.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

Aircraft: Seamaster; canceled, 1959; funds invested, $330.4 million; prime contractors, Martin Co., Marlan Construction Co. Jet powered mine-laying seaplane. Specialized for low altitude attack against submarine pens. Canceled because of technical problems, high cost and slippage in program.

Missile: Regulus II; canceled, 1958; funds invested, $144.4 million; prime contractors, Ling-Temco, L. F. Stillwell & Co. Surface-to-surface missile with 500-nautical-mile range and weight of 11,570 pounds equipped with Shoran grid guidance. Canceled because it became redundant when better systems were assured before its completion.

Missile: Petrel; canceled, 1957; funds invested, $87.2 million; prime contractors, Fairchild A/C. Air-to-surface missile with 20-nautical-mile range and weight of 3300 pounds equipped with active radar homing plus acoustic torpedo. Canceled for consideration of reasons including state-of-the-art advances, changing military requirements and cost considerations.

Missile: Corvus; canceled, 1960; funds invested, $80 million; prime contractor, Ling-Temco. Air-to-surface missile with 170-nautical-mile range and weight of 1750 pounds equipped with passive or semiactive radar homing. Canceled for consideration of reasons including state-of-the-art advances, changing military requirements, cost considerations, plus contractor difficulties.

Missile: Eagle; canceled, 1961; funds invested, $53 million; prime contractor, Bendix Aviation. Air-to-air missile with 70-nautical-mile range and weight of 1400 pounds equipped with midcourse command plus active radar homing. Since this was the missile system for the Missileer aircraft, it was canceled when Missileer was dropped.

Missile: Meteor; canceled, 1954; funds invested, $52.6 million; prime contractor, MIT. Air-to-air missile with 10-nautical-mile range and weight of 510 pounds and semiactive homing. Canceled in weeding out of early air-to-air missile projects in favor of more promising air-to-air projects.

Missile: Rigel; canceled, 1953; funds invested, $38.1; prime contractor, Grumman A/C. Surface-to-surface missile with 400-nautical-mile range and weight of 19,000 pounds equipped with ramjet, command midcourse, plus radar homing. Canceled for same weeding out process as Meteor above, plus it was a competitor to Regulus.

Missile: Dove; canceled, 1955; funds invested, $33.7 million; prime contractor, Eastman Kodak Co. Air-to-surface missile with gravity bomb and weight of 1,300 pounds equipped with infrared homing. Canceled because of changing requirements plus technical difficulties.

Ship: Submarine underwater propulsion systems; canceled, 1954; funds invested, $25 million; prime contractors, General Electric, Allis-Chalmers, Elliott Co., Westinghouse Electric. Work began in 1945 and continued to 1954 on closed and semiclosed propulsion cycles, all of which could be used to propel submarines in fully submerged conditions. Canceled because of the success of nuclear propulsion.

Other: NRRS, Sugar Grove; canceled, 1962; funds invested, $70 million; prime

contractors, Tidewater Construction Co., Patterson-Emerson Construction. A 600-foot diameter, rotatable radio antenna device to provide an improved capability in space research and intelligence gathering activities. Canceled because costs increased from initial estimate of less than $80 million to over $190 million and, during the period when the structural design phase of the antenna was in progress, other scientific techniques capable of performing the antenna functions were perfected.

Zip fuel: canceled, 1959; funds invested, $123 million; prime contractor, Callery Chemical Co. Fuel of 50 percent higher energy than jet fuel, for use in gas turbines. Canceled because of high cost and technical difficulties.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

AIRCRAFT

ANP: Canceled, 1961; funds invested, $511.6 million; prime contractors, Boeing/General Dynamics, G.E./P. & W. This was a program to develop a nuclear-powered, long-range, long-endurance aircraft for possible strategic application. The program was canceled because it had inadequate military potential in any form which was technically feasible.

F–108: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $141.9 million; prime contractor, North American. This program was for development of a long-range (1,000 mile), supersonic, manned interceptor, equipped with a highly sophisticated fire control system, to counter the airborne bomber threat of the 1960's and 1970's. The overall program was canceled because of the relative decrease of the manned bomber threat.

XF–103: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $104 million; prime contractor, Republic. This was an advanced fighter concept for a titanium mach 3.0 fighter, powered by a dual cycle—turbojet/ramjet—propulsion system. It was canceled primary as a result of technical problems—for example, poor visibility, J–67 engine problems—rising costs, and greater promise of the F–108 program—for example, long range.

F–107: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $100 million; prime contractor, North American. This was a fighter-bomber development program in competition with the F–105. It was canceled in favor of the latter, which proved to be a superior weapon system.

J–83 Engines: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $55 million; prime contractor, Fairchild. This was a small lightweight turbojet engine in the 2,000-pound-thrust range, for possible missile or aircraft application. It was canceled in favor of a competitively superior engine.

C–132: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $54 million; prime contractor, Douglas. This was a turboprop heavy long-range transport designed to carry a 100,000-pound payload. It was canceled because of potential high cost and because the C–133, although not capable of as high a payload, appeared sufficiently versatile to meet Air Force needs.

T–61 Engine: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $37.4 million; prime contractor, Allison. This was an internal combustion turboprop engine of advanced design. Cancellation was based on the fact that the engine had not been designated for application to any specific future weapon system.

H–16: Canceled, 1954; funds invested, $23.4 million; prime contractor, Vertol. This was an extremely large fuselage, twin-rotor, high capacity helicopter. Hampered by technical problems, delays and cost overrun, it was canceled as a result of reappraisal following the crash of an experimental model.

MISSILES

Navaho: Canceled 1957; funds invested, $679.8 million; prime contractor, North American. This was a supersonic surface-to-surface intercontinental strategic missile. It was canceled in its flight test phase, having been overtaken by the accelerated ICBM development program.

Snark: Canceled, 1962; funds invested, $677.4 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This was a subsonic surface-to-surface intercontinental strategic missile. Although completely developed and placed in the active inventory, it was rendered quickly obsolete by the accelerated ICBM program.

GAM–63 Rascal: Canceled, 1958; funds invested, $448 million; prime contractor, Bell. This was an air-launched air-to-surface missile for use by strategic forces (B–47). The program was canceled in favor of the inherently superior Hound Dog.

GAM–87 Skybolt: Canceled, 1963; funds invested, $440 million; prime contractor, Douglas. This was a ballistic missile to be air launched from the B–52 or British Vulcan bombers. Cost escalation, time delay, revised estimates of actual performance, and availability of other ways to do the job better on a cost-effectiveness basis caused cancelation.

Talos—land based: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $118.1 million; prime contractor, Bendix. This was a land-based surface-to-air missile for the air defense mission. Air Force effort terminated when short-range surface-to-air missiles were designated as an Army sole responsibility.

Mobile Minuteman: Canceled, 1962; funds invested, $108.4 million; prime contractor, Boeing. This program consisted of the present Minuteman surface-to-surface missile transported and fired from railroad cars. It was canceled because of high cost and little military value versus other systems.

Q–4 Drone: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $84.4 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This was a small turbojet drone to be used by Air Defense Command for training. It was canceled because of a lack of funds and a change in requirements.

SM–73 Goose: Canceled, 1958; funds invested, $78.5 million; prime contractor, Fairchild. This was a subsonic long-range decoy missile for strategic application, to be ground launched as an electronic countermeasure device. The program was overtaken by other developments—e.g. GAM–72 Quail—and by changes in concept of operation.

GAM–67 Crossbow: Canceled, 1956; funds invested, $74.6 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This program was the original air-to-surface antiradiation missile—ARM. The modern version is the Shrike. It was canceled because other systems were considered more favorable and because of uncertainties in the guidance system.

OTHER

AN/ALQ–27: Canceled, 1959, funds invested, $142 million; prime contractor, Sperry. This program was a complete integrated electronic countermeasures system for the B–52. It was canceled because of the extreme cost.

Hi energy boron fuel: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $135.8 million; prime contractor, Olin Mathieson and others. The program was for the development of fuel to power a chemically powered bomber. It was canceled because it was overtaken by other developments, because of technical problems encountered, and because the requirement was canceled for the specific aircraft to which it had known application.

The total cost of these abandoned projects in the past 10 years is over $5 billion. To be sure, some value, some experience, may well have been obtained from each of them. But let there be no mistake about it. Taken together they are indicative, to say the least, of an immense and conspicuous consumption of the Nation's supply of talent and facilities for research and development. For this technological high living, it is the people of the United States who must pick up the check in actual military costs and in the incalculable costs of a distorted usage of scarce scientific and technological resources.

Taken together these abandoned projects have represented, too, a major factor in running up the accumulation of surplus and obsolescent property by the armed services. For years in the past the total of such property disposed of at a fraction of cost has fluctuated between $4 billion and $8 billion annually. To put this figure in some kind of perspective, consider that it means that every year our Military Establishment got rid of, at a fraction of cost, assets with a value anywhere from about equivalent to, to double the amount that the United Kingdom expends on all its armed services for all purposes. In short, the British have been running their Army, Navy, and Air Forces year in and year out for something less than the cost to us of our annual losses through excess military accumulations or obsolescence.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense, has, indeed, said "No" with frequency during the 3 years in which he has been in office. Yet there is nothing to suggest that because he has done so our defense position in the world is any less effective, any less impressive than heretofore. On the contrary, such indications as there are suggest that the Defense Establishment is better prepared and more capable of meeting a wider range of possible military challenges to this Nation.

There is a good deal of talk about the high cost of Government and the need to cut expenditures. In the light of this talk, I cannot imagine that anyone in the Senate would wish to undermine the Secretary's authority to say "no" to the

ever-present and immense bureaucratic pressures for expenditures within the Defense Establishment. To be sure we can chop away at almost any item in the budget. The Department of State, for example, had a budget request for $374 million this year and a show of economy can be made by reducing it and closing a few consulates abroad in the process. But we are deluding ourselves if we believe for one moment that it will be possible to curb the growth in the cost of the Federal Government, let alone reduce that cost significantly unless someone has the authority, under the President, to act decisively in connection with defense expenditures. For that is where the great expenditures are. In the 1964 budget, for example, $53.7 billion was proposed by the President for the Defense Establishment. The next allocation in size in that budget was $11.3 billion for Treasury, and of this total $10.2 billion represents an allocation for interest on the public debt.

I ask the Senate to note, further, that the figure of $53.7 billion in new obligational authority for the Defense Department represented the final figure proposed in the budget submitted to Congress early this year. But before it was arrived at, Secretary McNamara had pared down requests from all of the individual military services under his supervision. When these individual requests initially reached his desk they totaled the great sum of $67 billion. In other words, Mr. President, the services, left to their own individual devices, would have sought of the Congress $13.3 billion more than the Secretary of Defense, in the end, allowed them to ask. And yet in spite of this enormous cut, the $53.7 billion requested for the armed services for fiscal year 1964 was still a record high.

With all due respect, would the President have been in a position to direct, except arbitrarily, a cut of $13.3 billion in the combined requests of the various services? With all due respect, would this body or even its exceptionally capable Armed Services Committee have been able to say "No," with any degree of confidence, to the tune of a reduction of $13.3 billion? Would the equivalent body in the House? With all due respect, I think the Congress would have had great difficulty in knowing where to enter the jungle of defense finance and I doubt that we would have gone much beyond the fringes for fear of jeopardizing the necessary defense of the Nation.

And, so, Mr. President, we are back to a Secretary of Defense with authority. If we did not have one he would have to be invented.

I am persuaded that we have in office an exceptional Secretary of Defense who is attempting to meet the full responsibilities of that office. I believe that he is exercising with great determination, intelligence, and knowledge the authority which must go with those responsibilities.

It would seem to me that we ought to do whatever we are able to do to help him in his responsibilities. For we are all in agreement that we are seriously challenged by Communist power from abroad in a military sense as well as in other ways. We are all in agreement that against the military challenge there must be posed the necessary military defense for the security of the Nation, at whatever the cost.

But the extent of the challenge from abroad is a variable depending upon changes in the world situation. The phrase "necessary military defense" is a variable, subject in interpretation to infinite extension.

And the phrase "at whatever the cost" is a blank check which if taken in a literal sense, can be drawn, in the end, upon the total resources of the people of the United States.

These are realities, Mr. President, which are just beginning to dawn upon us. These are realities with which, I believe, the present Secretary of Defense is seeking to grapple. These are realities to which, as legislators, we must turn our attention. It seems to me that we must begin to think deeply as to how the dimensions of "necessary military defense" may be drawn and redrawn more accurately in the light of an ever-changing international situation. And we must ask ourselves, too, how are we to keep "whatever the cost" of that necessary defense at a rational level in order that, in the end, it does not overwhelm the Nation.

These are not empty questions nor are they theoretical questions. "Necessary defense" has been defined and redefined consistently over the past decade as more and more. "Whatever the cost" has risen from $37.8 billion in fiscal 1954 to the $53.7 billion which was requested for fiscal 1964. And the latter figure, as already noted, was presented to the Congress after the Secretary of Defense had reduced the initial service requests of $67 billion by $13.3 billion.

May I say that it is understandable if, in defining the dimensions of necessary military defense, those who have direct military responsibility are inclined to leave a margin for safety. That is appropriate; it is proper; it is to be commended rather than criticized. After all, those who have these responsibilities are grappling in an area which is both inexact and ever changing and one which is not subject, in the end, to computer calculation.

I, for one, do not begrudge the cost of a margin for extra safety—a substantial margin—and I believe the people of the Nation are similarly inclined. But the problem still remains. We must be ever mindful lest in determining what is necessary for military defense we become so obsessed with the extra margin for safety that it grows into a fear-fed monster which, in the end, devours that which it is designed to safeguard.

In the same fashion, our willingness to pay "whatever the cost" of necessary defense must not be an invitation to acquiesce in administrative procedures within the Defense Establishment which tend toward wasteful rather than prudent expenditures. And I would emphasize that in this area—in the area of management procedures—there is no excuse for an excessive margin of safety. Expenditures for the management of the Defense Establishment, unlike the determination of overall defense needs, can be subject to reasonably exact control by computer calculation, by accounting procedures and by the many other tools of modern American business management.

If I may sum up, Mr. President, two questions ought to be ever present in our minds in considering any problem of defense:

First. How are we to insure that this Government defines and redefines "necessary military defense" with full adequacy but without fantastic and obsessive excess, in a world situation in which "necessary defense" is an ever-changing but not necessarily an ever-increasing quantity?

Second. How are we to design the procedures within this Government and within the Defense Establishment so that they will provide this fully adequate necessary defense at the least cost to the people of the Nation, who, in the end, must pay for it?

There is no formula by which these questions may be answered. For years, we have been ordering and reordering the processes of the executive branch, in order that that branch may define more accurately for the President the nature of the international dangers which confront us. For years we have been ordering and reordering the structure of the Defense Department, in an effort to limit expenditures to the necessary. Yet year after year the problem has loomed larger.

If there is not an easy formula, there are certain negatives which might be examined for the light that they shed on what may stimulate defense costs far beyond the necessary. These are the things, it seems to me, we must not do, if we mean to keep a rational perspective on the realities which face us in the world and, in the light of them, hold expenditures for defense at a rational level consistent with national security. These negatives, these tentative observations, I should like to leave with the Senate in concluding my remarks.

In defining and redefining the dimensions of "what is necessary" for defense, we are likely to leave a most wasteful, rather than a desirable, margin for safety, unless these realities are recognized anew:

First. That, under our system of government, there can be no substitute for the preponderant judgments of the President as to the total and the ever-changing challenge from abroad to this Nation. These judgments must provide the key for determining the essential dimensions of what is militarily necessary for the security of the Nation.

Second. That, in making his judgments, the President must necessarily depend on advice and counsel from whatever sources he deems appropriate—military and civilian; but once his judgments are made, it is inappropriate for any permanent official of the executive branch—military or civilian—to do other than his best to carry them into effect.

Third. That the President's judgments—once made—in this connection are subject to challenge, not by permanent officials of the executive branch—military or civilian, but only by the Con-

gress, acting as the Constitution makes clear that it can and shall act—by legislative initiative and by legislative oversight.

Fourth. That, under the President and the laws of the land, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to establish—with the help of the Joint Chiefs—the strategic concepts which shall set, for all the armed services, their appropriate roles in maintaining the kind of defense which the President and the Congress have deemed necessary for the Nation's security; and, further, that within the Defense Establishment, the Secretary of Defense has authority to control administrative procedures and practices for efficient and effective operations.

And if I may continue with the negatives, Mr. President, I should like also to stress that we are not going to get an effective and efficient defense at a tolerable cost unless it is recognized in all frankness:

First. That the Defense Establishment, as the largest single purchaser of goods and services in the Nation, has come to occupy a substantial position in the civilian economy of this Nation; that, in this connection, what the Defense Department does or does not do has come to have great importance not only for defense but for the well-being of business, labor, and whole communities scattered throughout the Nation.

Second. That, in the light of this economic position which the Defense Establishment occupies it would be a gross naivete to assume that pressures—increasing pressures—will not be present for decisions to be made by the Defense Department not solely on considerations of necessary, effective, and efficient defense—and may I say that colloquies on the floor between Senators from various of the larger States underscore this point.

Third. That however understandable these pressures may be—and as Senator from Montana I hope that I try to do as much for my State as any other Member—the Nation will be ill served if there is not within this Government those attitudes and those conditions for administration of the affairs of the Defense Establishment which permit the decisions, in the end, to be made on the basis of necessary, effective, and efficient defense.

Mr. President, in making these remarks today, I have not been unaware of the eloquent farewell address of the former President, Mr. Eisenhower, in which he warned of the need to guard against the development of an industrial-military complex of power in the Nation. Nor have I been unmindful of dangers to that classic doctrine of freedom—the doctrine of civilian supremacy.

And yet, with all due respect, I do not see the principal difficulty which confronts us in these contexts. If there were ever to be an imminent danger to freedom in this Nation of the kind alluded to by Mr. Eisenhower, it is not likely to be the cause of the failure of popularly responsible government. Rather it is likely to be the consequence of the failure of civilian responsibility in the Congress no less than in the executive branch of the Government. And I want to say to the Senate, that this system of freedom which we know will not fail. It will not fail so long as an excessive fear does not drive us to an obsessive interpretation of what is necessary for defense. It will not fail if we are prepared to face the economic and social difficulties which confront the Nation and deal with them on their own merits—their civilian merits—rather than to seek to evade them, or to act on them haphazardly and inadequately and ineffectively because we find it easier to act under the camouflage of an inflated concept of military necessity.

These, then, Mr. President, are some of the observations which I have to make. They are observations stimulated by the work of the TFX inquiry which is being conducted by the very able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and his distinguished colleagues on the Government Operations Committee. They are observations growing out of a very high respect for the patriotic dedication and the ability with which Mr. McNamara is seeking to serve the Nation under the President.

It is incumbent upon all of us, it seems to me, not to ignore these larger implications of the TFX matter. It is incumbent upon us—the President, the Congress, the press, and the people of the United States—to face them, to discuss them, and, as necessary, to act on them within the Constitution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a brief comment on his remarks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am grateful that my schedule permitted me to be here on the floor while the majority leader was speaking, because I think his statement of today is one of the most important and one of the most impressive statements made at this session of the Senate.

I share his very high regard for the Secretary of Defense; I think he is the ablest man ever to hold that office.

I wish to ask the majority leader whether, in his wisdom and knowledge, at a time when we have been thinking somewhat painfully over the accomplishments of President Kennedy and his administration, the Senator from Montana regards the revitalization and reestablishment of strong civilian leadership and control in the Pentagon as one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it; and I think the exhortation, in effect, laid down in the last communication by our former President, General Eisenhower, has been followed out quite carefully.

Furthermore, in my opinion the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have shown true respect for civilian authority; and, in my further opinion, they have acted within the bounds of that at all times.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind comments.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, later on, I shall have more to say about this matter.

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, almost immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy, there were those on the national scene who seized on this tragic event as a pretext for attempts to visit invective upon the particular segments of American society which were the natural objects of their abomination. For the most part, the attempts have been directed at fixing responsibility for the President's assassination on either conservatives, usually referred to with the general smear term "rightwing radicals," or persons living in the southern area of the United States, the latter being most usually referred to with the smear terms "racists" or "bigots."

From some quarters such unfounded attacks are to be expected. For example, the official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Worker, issued just such a smear attack in a printed dodger under the date of November 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from this publication be reprinted 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 Worker, Nov. 23, 1963]

AN EDITORIAL

The heart of our Nation is heavy with anguish. Our people's grief hangs like crepe across the land, from border to border, from ocean to ocean.

From all parts of the world messages of condolence, sorrow, and compassion pour into Washington.

President John F. Kennedy was martyred by the bullet of a craven gunman. But it was more than the life of the President that the murderer had in his sights. The progress of the Nation and the freedom of our people were his target.

We do not think that this unspeakable crime was the work of the fevered brain of some madman. We think it was the long deliberated and planned for deed of the Fascist-minded forces of the political ultraright and the segregationists with their vested interests in maintaining the racist oppression of Negroes at any cost.

The murder of President Kennedy was the extension into action of the advertised conspiracy of the anti-Negro racehaters, the warmongers, and plotters against every step which would lead toward world peace.

To the ultraright and the racists, President Kennedy's popular leadership was an obstacle to the disaster course down which the reactionaries seek to take our country. The policies of reason and reasonableness in a groping toward a foreign policy of peace through coexistence and toward universal disarmament; the attitude of concern for the economic and social welfare of the working people; the policy of urgent and definitive elimination of all manner of racism and segregation, for securing to the Negro people their full and equal rights. Though killed before these commitments could be fully developed and attained, these policies of Kennedy will live after him.

They constitute a legacy which the people are called upon to make into a mandate upon Congress and the Government to carry into law with utmost urgency.

The finger of guilt points beyond the triggerman who wielded the assassin's gun to a criminal cabal of White Citizen Councilmen, Birch Society plotters, the National States Rights Party chieftains, American Nazi Party

moguls, the National Renaissance Party, the Minute Men bandits, and other paramilitary Fascist-racist groups.

It is not fortuitous that the scene of the murder of the President was in Dallas, Tex. where the Dallas Morning News is published and where the Fascist-minded Gen. Edwin Walker lives.

These bands of conspirators against the people's liberties and the Nation's progress must be outlawed and their leaders brought to justice.

The Governor Wallaces, the Ross Barnetts, and Senator Eastlands, and Strom Thurmonds—these foulmouthed inciters to racist crimes—these Kennedy-haters have their share in this crime.

So indeed, must J. Edgar Hoover account to the Nation for the dismal failure of the FBI to bring the neo-Fascist plotters against the President's life and the Nation's liberties to justice.

The tragedy to the Nation in the death of the President must be answered by the Attorney General with sweeping action to enforce the liberties and equal rights of Negro and white Americans equally throughout the South.

In mourning the death of President John F. Kennedy we join with all patriotic citizens in pledging to redouble our work for the realization of all lofty democratic visions which President Kennedy articulated at various times.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, despite the known information about the assassin of President Kennedy, which is rather conclusive that an individual who embraced Marxist beliefs and the foreign ideology of communism murdered the President, attempts to fix the blame on the American public or some segment of it continue, not only from Communist sources, but from others. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a compilation of comments which appeared in the December 17, 1963, issue of National Review entitled "Re Extremism."

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

[From National Review, Dec. 17, 1963]

RE EXTREMISM

Among their contributions to the calm and reasonable mood, ending all anger, hate, and division, toward which they have so movingly called us, the liberals and the left offer these:

Pravda, official organ of the Soviet Government: "All circumstances of President Kennedy's tragic death give grounds for considering that the murder was conceived and carried out by ultraright, Fascist, and racialist circles."

Emile Servan-Schreiber, veteran French leftist and journalist, in the Paris newspaper Combat: "Confronting the destiny of this young wife clasping the bloody body of her husband in her arms, how can we fail to evoke the image of the Mother of Christ holding on her knees the corpse of her Son, He also killed in the prime of life? It is not a coincidence that so many chiefs of state and of government from regimes of so many diverse sorts came to bow before a tomb as formerly the three magi did before a cradle. Kennedy is dead, but Kennedyism is born. A mystique will unfurl over every continent and will spread, not this time in one or several centuries as the message of the great prophets of old, but with the immediacy of radio and television. A mystique? Perhaps a religion"

Max Lerner in the New York Post: "John F. Kennedy was as surely a victim of a crazed Civil War mentality as was another American President, who fell a victim to the bullet of John Wilkes Booth. * * * It was, I suppose, a cruel accident of history that felled him. Yet was it wholly accident? When rightwing racist fanatics are told over and over again that the President is a traitor, a Red, a nigger lover, that he has traduced the Constitution and is handing America over to a mongrelized world-state, there are bound to be some fanatics dull witted enough to follow the logic of the indictment all the way and rid America of the man who is betraying it."

Trybuna Ludu, official organ of the Polish Government: "The entire world is convinced that the author of the crime should have been sought only among the extremists of racism and fascism."

Bishop James A. Pike: "But in fixing the blame we must include all those who, by their race hate and extreme radical right propaganda, have constantly supplied the fuel which would fire up such an assassin."

Harvard Professor H. Stuart Hughes, the Nation, December 14: "I heard just one expression of anger. A Negro came by shaking his head and muttering in bitter irony: 'Only in America.' His anger reflected what most of us at first thought: That the crime had been committed by a southern racist. Indeed, if we look deeply into our souls, I think many of us will recognize that we were disappointed to learn that such was not the case. As I have tried to meditate on these matters, I have finally come to the conclusion that it is better this way. Had the assassin been a southern extremist, it would have fitted our own prejudices and our own political commitment. Our grief would have been tinged with a spirit of hatred and revenge. This way, our sorrow is pure: there is no hate in our hearts."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, funeral oration at the bier: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life. What a price we pay for this fanaticism."

Michel Bosquet in L'Express, the leading magazine of the French non-Communist left: "The lid has opened. Inside the box a horrified America sees a nest of vipers. * * * Texas today is the Algeria of 1959: a colonial country * * * where the oil tycoons, paymasters of the extreme right (in particular, the John Birch Society, which has its headquarters in Dallas and $500 million in its treasury) ferociously defend their ancient privileges by corruption, terror, and armed thugs. * * * The Texas police 'investigate' the murder of John F. Kennedy exactly as the police of Algiers investigated the crimes of the OAS. To prove that the murderer of John Kennedy is a Communist; to destroy anything that might discredit the proof; to unchain popular anger against 'Castro-Communism'; to liquidate Cuba, and level charges of high treason against liberals of all types—how much the Texas tycoons and their police long to do all that. Can they set America ablaze as the Reichstag fire, in January 1933, set Germany ablaze and gave all power to Hitler?"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is no excuse for the continuation of the diatribes against southerners, conservatives or the American people as a whole for the assassination of President Kennedy. There were many who disagreed with his political views. There was only one misfit who perpetrated the dastardly crime of assassinating the President. This fact has been pointed out in numerous newspaper articles and editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that a number of these articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 4, 1963]

DESPITE BACKWASH OF VENOM: THE TRAIL OF GUILT LEADS BEYOND U.S. SHORES

In aftermath of shock, following the tragedy of November 22, not all succumbed to the thunder of mass accusation—searching for "answers" in sound and fury about mass guilt. To quiet that bedlam, a mixture of hysteria and venom, some calming voices have been heard; one of these Kentucky's Senator THRUSTON MORTON, addressing the Senate:

"It was not a flaw in the American system or the American character that struck down John Kennedy. It was not the sin of a city or its citizens. It was not a tragedy that struck from some dark stain of violence on the American system or on the American soul. And we do not serve the best interest of our Nation, or of the memory of a murdered President, by letting wrongly placed recriminations overcome the good sense of this great Nation." The assassin, he added, was "a stranger to the American heritage, and his mind had been warped by an alien violence, not by a native condition.

"Let us mourn the terrible event, but let us not mourn for the American soul—for that soul is stout and lighted by truth and faith. Let the blame be on him who actually committed the crime. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not torture it with a guilt that is undeserved and unworthy of the cause in which our Presidents live and for which sometimes they tragically die."

Tennessee Senator ALBERT GORE seconded that speech, adding for himself, "I accept no blame for what this demented man did. I feel no sense of personal guilt. Why should all America be blamed for the actions of one fanatic? * * * It is an injustice to our millions of people of good will, even the teeming thousands of hospitable, cheering people in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. I reject it for myself and for my people."

In sharp contrast to that reasoned reminder of where the guilt lay, came the screaming invective of former Gov. LeRoy Collins (of Florida) last night, playing divisive demagogue with charges that the assassination was fostered by "Dixie battlecries which incite sick souls to violence."

The assault by this spokesman for the National Association of Broadcasters compounded the affront already registered by flannelmouths among his colleagues.

It was not the people of the United States—North, South, East or West—who killed President Kennedy, as established by all the evidence, it was a self-styled pro-Castro Communist, and a head of the "Fair Play For Cuba Committee."

It probably is true that in the literal sense of the term, he had no "accomplices." That is, there was one hand (his) at the gun; and one finger (his) that pulled the trigger. But that is not to say that he was alone in the conspiracy; or that he was not carrying it out as the triggerman assigned.

Who sponsored Lee Harvey Oswald in this hideous crime? It is pertinent to national security to find out; to establish some answers by following the trial wherever it may lead.

It could not have been by sheer coincidence that it followed the threat voiced by Fidel Castro in September—a speech reported by the Associated Press, containing the warning that "United States leaders" would be in danger if they helped in any attempt to do away with leaders of Cuba.

"We are prepared to fight them and answer in kind," he said. "United States lead-

ers should think that if they are aiding terrorists' plans to eliminate Cuban leaders, they cannot themselves be safe."

Of what was the Caribbean brigand speaking, if not a premonition that his days of personal privileged sanctuary were ending? His threat was not a case simply of fanning the breeze.

As pointed out by the Richmond News-Leader editorial reprinted on this page yesterday, he was rapidly approaching a crisis. "The Soviets were withdrawing troops and aid. There were well-founded rumors that Averell Harriman's deal between Washington and Moscow dealt Castro out. On Monday (November 18) the late President spoke at Miami, and offered to help a Cuban government, any sort of government, if foreign domination were thrown off. It was an open invitation to do away with Castro."

Was the President's offer to help in event of the elimination of Castro an implied consequence of the reported Harriman-Khrushchev deal?

Maybe policymakers know. But policymakers should know the risks involved; and should be deeply cognizant also of the hazards of blind commitment; or any commitment short of enforcible assurance that what followed in Cuba, to be recognized diplomatically and eligible for U.S. help, would be a government totally free of Communist ties—with the Soviet and Chinese forces out, along with their arsenal of hemispheric aggression.

Maybe that would be too much to hope for on the basis of any deal negotiated. It is the least a thinking America, responsibly led, could accept.

Putting the pieces together is the only way of intelligently appraising this mosaic of tragedy—and accounting for it in ramifications leading both far from Dallas and from these shores. It was not the product of any American hate. Despite all the hysteria generated by noisemaking pundits seeking to ascribe those bullets to the far right, they came from the far left.

Banner Columnist Henry J. Taylor drew attention yesterday to the fact that "immediately after Oswald's identification the State Department asked newsmen to play down the possibility that Oswald was a Castro or Kremlin agent, suggesting that this could damage Soviet relations."

That raises its own further questions: Is the State Department more interested in soothing the feelings of Castro and the Kremlin than in finding out who inspired and promoted the killing of President Kennedy? Was it more concerned lest a thorough inquiry should reveal what reportedly was agreed upon by Harriman and Khrushchev with reference to Castro?

From Castro's speech it was clear that he knew he was to be liquidated. It was equally clear—or should have been—that before he allowed that to happen he was going to do his utmost against "U.S. leaders."

This at least is the suspicion and uncontroverted background of the death of a President.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Dec. 4, 1963]

A NATION WRONGLY CONDEMNED

(Guest editorial from the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel.)

Unwittingly several speakers and commentators have committed a grave injustice against the great body of loyal and patriotic American men and women of good will.

They have sought to sow the seeds of a universal guilt for the compounded crimes in Dallas.

They have said that the assassination and its ugly aftermath of the slaying of the accused slayer were the result of the sowing of hatred promiscuously among the people of America.

Here they knowingly or unknowingly condemn wrongly a great and good people. If Oswald was, indeed, the killer of President Kennedy, the deed was not done because of grave political disagreements or bloodshed over the civil rights issue. Oswald was a Communist sympathizer. Communism is dedicated to the proposition of gaining its objective through any means, fair or foul, through lies, murders, duplicity, cunning, confusion.

To impute the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy to a massive guilt on the part of the whole population of America is a grievous wrong to the American people.

As the Sentinel has observed, a catastrophe always brings to the surface the hidden ugly details of humanity's day-to-day life. A frustrated Texan murders the President; a night club operator murders the murderer. But so far only two men in a population of 180 million Americans are involved. That does not prove that a heavy blanket of hatred lies over the whole land. The everyday peaceful procedures of a whole continent belie the stigma that speakers and writers would attach to the people.

At Jackson, Miss., at Birmingham, Ala., at Little Rock, Ark.—at a number of places, North and South, East and West—the ugly face of hate has reared itself; and blood has been spilled. Yet America is a great and a good nation. The obligation now resting upon its people is to demonstrate its true character to the world.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 7, 1963]

REDS SEEK TO DIVIDE, CONFUSE AMERICANS—EXPLOIT KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Clever Soviet worldwide propaganda with an incredible assist from the United States is cashing in on our martyred President's assassination by blaming internal America. "President Kennedy was killed by hate festering within the United States," says Pravda.

President Kennedy was killed by Lee Harvey Oswald. What, conceivably, has this man to do with the American soul? We have grievous, tragic problems here, but Oswald does not represent them.

Such ghastly distortion is par for the course in Soviet policy. Yet it is extraordinary, if not astounding, that American frictions, including integration, the nature of American society, etc. are likewise blamed by so many among us for what is, in fact, a typical act by a dedicated Red.

The claim is made (meaningless) that even the Soviet did not like Lee Harvey Oswald. But can anyone claim that Kremlin policy regrets his tarnishing the distinction of the United States? We abhor hate and violence, in anybody by anybody. Does the Kremlin?

Spiders see in eight different directions at once because most species have eight single-lens eyes. So does Soviet policy in regard to conspiracy and demoralization abroad, as well as assassination, and traditionally. Its roots are old.

Young fanatic Serbian Gavrillo Prinzip fired the fatal assassination shots at Sarajevo signaling World War I. But control over Prinzip's hand was Russia's minister at Belgrade, N. de Hartwig, who organized Pan-Slav movements in Austro-Hungarian provinces to consolidate the Slavs under Russia.

The significance, however, couldn't have been worse reported or estimated than to the then President of the United States.

On July 3, 1914, a week after the assassination of Sarajevo, Col. Edward House, Woodrow Wilson's personal envoy touring Europe, wrote him about encouraging talks he had with sovereigns and ministers. House stated: "So you see, things are moving in the right direction (toward peace) as rapidly as we could hope."

As for World War II, while Soviet generals discussed cooperation against Nazi aggression with the combined French-British general staffs the Kremlin was secretly arranging a military alliance with Hitler. Hitler could then avoid a two-front war and, as we know, was free to attack France and Britain.

The Soviet spider's objective was to remain out of the conflict and allow communism to reap the rewards of devastation by the German-French-Britain war in the West.

Kremlin tactics were the same in the Pacific. Tokyo-based Soviet spy Richard Sorge, who greased countless assassins' bullets, was regarded by the Nazis as their own ace agent. But Sorge was a double-agent in Kremlin pay who served Hitler badly and Stalin well. By the summer of 1941 Sorge gave Stalin definite evidence that the Japanese had no intentions against the Soviet and would strike against Pearl Harbor and the Philippines.

Russia could denude her Pacific flank, for she knew she would not have to fight on two flanks. The Soviet acknowledged its debt to Sorge but did nothing to save him when he was caught. Nor did Russia warn us about Pearl Harbor. This is pure communism in practice.

As one result, before World War II Communist parties existed in 43 countries and totaled 4.2 million members. Today Communist parties number 90 and the total number of members exceeds 42 million.

Lack of evidence that Marxist Lee Harvey Oswald was linked to a Castro or Kremlin conspiracy is not pertinent. The splendid commission President Johnson appointed will attempt to unearth all facts; including how this man got an American passport and got back to the United States after renouncing American citizenship. But, in any case, nothing could please the Soviet more than to manage to have us somehow blame ourselves and forget that man's background entirely.

Compounding this diversion here clouds our vision of the enemy confronting us—the nature and tentacles of the Soviet spider as a whole.

It cannot be too often repeated how gainfully all of us could read "The Craft of Intelligence" by former Central Intelligence Agency chief Allen Dulles. There you'll learn how the Soviet helps trap the American mind into mass make-believe. There you'll find all the forces we face. The entire spider—the whole tarantula—is the unending problem on which to focus public attention as a result of Oswald's horrible, horrible gun.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal, Nov. 30, 1963]

AS THE PASTOR SEES IT

(By Dr. W. H. Clapp, pastor, Southside Baptist Church)

Last week, we were all saddened by the assassination of our President. I don't believe there was a man or woman anywhere in the United States who did not feel that a great crime had been committed and that all the laws of God and man had been broken. There can be no doubt that it took a warped mind to plan and execute such an act.

From what we have been told, a man completely steeped in Communist ideology was responsible. There can be no doubting the fact that a true Communist could do such a thing. To them, any action is justified which will advance the cause of communism. Here is one of the great reasons why it is fallacious for us to think there can be any real meeting of Christian and Communist minds. There is no solid ground upon which we can stand together. The Christian has a system of moral and ethical values based upon a concept of a personal God. Communists have no God. Therefore, morality, to them is that which is expedient for the moment.

Many of us did not see eye to eye with our late President on many of his domestic and foreign policies. However, we, as Americans, believed in all the due processes of law and the final authority of the ballot. There can be no justification for his murder, just as there can be no justification for the murder of the man accused of the crime.

As a minister, I have tried to admonish the people of my congregation time and time again there can be no excuse for violence. These times through which we are passing are fraught with much tension. Traditions, which have been almost sacred for centuries, have been challenged. Entire ways of life have had to be altered. Emotions have been deeply stirred. Yet in the face of all this there can be no excuse for violence. Our Lord said that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. The only answer to the confusion of our day is a clear and certain note. We must not be caught up in the emotional frenzies of those who would lead us downward and not upward.

I have not appreciated the insinuations which have fallen from the lips of some men in high places during the past few hours. The murder of the President was not brought on by those of us here in the South who have reacted in a natural way to the invasion on our rights. We have not been guilty of preaching a disrespect for law and the orderly processes of law. Because we love our Lord, we love our country. However, it has been hard for some of us to accept suddenly that which was the law of the land for so many years is no longer the law. That those who interpreted the law for so many years were completely mistaken through all those years.

Some people seem to feel that we should accept, with a calm acquiescence, all the dictates and desires of those who say we are wrong. May the time never come when we do not have the right to challenge the thinking of any person, whether he be the President or the Judges who sit on the Supreme Court. We have never been guilty of preaching anarchy. We have never paraded down the streets nor marched on our Capitol to demand a change. We have sought every legal means to reverse the decision of our highest Court. We have openly criticized them, and we feel we have that privilege today.

We shall mourn the loss of our late President. We shall pray for him who is our President now. We shall rise up together with all free men who love a risen, coming again Saviour to meet the forces of communism at every street corner. They may kill our President, but we serve notice now, in the name of our Lord, that they shall have to do the same to each one of us, if they are to keep the Gospel of Jesus Christ from the final and ultimate triumph.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 2, 1963]

LEFTISTS NOT WATCHED

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Was John F. Kennedy assassinated because the Secret Service and FBI were watching every radical rightist in Dallas and letting lunatic leftists like Lee Harvey Oswald run wild?

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, has raised this question in an interview with me. The Senator waited for a decent interval after Mr. Kennedy's stately, heart-touching funeral, but now he says:

"We have reports from Texas that the rightist figures were closely watched during the President's visit to Dallas on November 22. It appears that the leftist figures were not watched."

TOWER, a conservative but no radical by any definition, is an anti-Birchite.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1962, will prove it. On that date, TOWER caused the reprinting of a famous article in the rightwing magazine, "National Review," in which the John Birch Society leader, Robert Welch, was drummed out of the conservative movement.

Nevertheless, TOWER has been the target of leftist crackpots who blame the Kennedy assassination on rightist extremists. Undaunted, the Senator will demand investigation of his Dallas reports. He sticks by his conviction that America's worst enemies have been misidentified:

"The radical right," he says, "is the symptom of the disease we call extremism. The radical left is the disease itself."

Was there a failure in high places to take the Marxist menace as seriously as the Birchite menace?

Did that failure contribute to the President's coming within gunfire of a leftist crackpot? It is a hideous thought to contemplate, but it cannot be discarded for that reason. Even if Oswald turns out not to have been the killer (and we may never know), TOWER has much documentary evidence to show that the man was one who bore watching.

In January 1962, Oswald wrote from Minsk, in Russia, complaining to his Senator that the Soviets were holding him and his Russian-born wife in the U.S.S.R. against their will. Upon inquiry at the State Department, TOWER was told that Oswald was a man who had "requested that his American citizenship be revoked," and also a man who had previously, on November 2, 1959, sworn to this affidavit:

"I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

Yet the Federal Government, having helped Oswald to return, apparently did not mark him as a dangerous citizen.

Oswald was able to buy a murder weapon, hide himself with the weapon in a warehouse along the route of Mr. Kennedy's fatal journey in Dallas.

Why wasn't Oswald under surveillance?

Was it because the Federal Government, and to some extent the general public, have really come to believe that foolish, ill-mannered hecklers who spit at Adlai Stevenson represent a graver danger than the Communist system whose members and fellow travelers are the terrorists in Venezuela, the guerrillas in Vietnam, and the conquerors of Cuba?

These queries at the heart of TOWER's main question are going to uncork the vials of political passion which abated, very briefly, during the tragic interval of Mr. Kennedy's death and burial.

Three investigations—Federal, congressional, and Texan—are now haltingly in motion to search out the cause of J. F. K.'s foul murder. One or more of these probes had better come up with plausible reports.

Otherwise, the sensational and unprecedented issue of a presidential slaying will be at the center of next year's election.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 10, 1963]

A VICIOUS LIBEL

At 1:59 p.m., November 22, the Voice of America overseas broadcast announced the murder of President Kennedy. "Dallas," the VOA explained to the world, "is the center of the extreme rightwing."

Arthur Krock of the New York Times, commenting on the vicious suggestion that conservatives were connected with the President's death, declared in a signed column:

"This gratuitous, and as it proved, false, suggestion that such was the affiliation of the assassin was deleted from the broadcast at 2:10 p.m. But it was grist to Moscow's mill, which has been grinding ever since."

Mr. Krock, one of the Nation's most respected journalists, said this implication "especially lacks merit by reason of the only facts known about the suspect, Oswald. He was a Marxist; at least a sympathizer with the religion of communism; emigrated to the Soviet Union; and trying to return. This is certainly not a dossier of the rightwing extremists, a stigmatic label of Dallas which some members of the administration are too prone to affix."

What an outrage that the Soviet Union should find the clue to its own propaganda line in a Voice of America broadcast. Edward R. Murrow, Director of the VOA, should be required to explain and to apologize for a shameful suggestion.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 1963]

ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY *KILLING* TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy to Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and "far right" issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same plot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected therefore, that the man in the street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

[From the Nashville Banner, Nov. 25, 1963]

TIGHTEN UP SECURITY: RED PLOT CLEARLY IS TO DESTROY FROM WITHIN

Dimensions of that assassination plot costing the life Friday of President John F. Kennedy exceeded, unquestionably, the facts revealed to date—and demand the investigation and action of a Government truly concerned for the national security such a conspiracy imperils.

To President Lyndon Johnson, newly installed, fell the duty of rebuking any impression that the case was closed with apprehension of Lee Harvey Oswald as the trigger man—or his death yesterday as the startling sequel, a link in the chain of mysteries binding the whole case upon Federal authorities to solve, leaving no loose ends of doubt.

It would be patently absurd to conclude that the Kennedy assassination was an isolated thing, conceived in the mind of one man who thereupon proceeded to carry it out. It was a plot, and executed as such, whose full proportions can be established only by the full investigation now ordered. As a foreign-hatched conspiracy, it must be met by security action calculated to put the finger on every enemy inside the United States.

Essential to that, and as a primary step, the Federal Bureau of Investigation must be turned loose to tighten up the watch, by whatever provision of surveillance is necessary, on every known Communist in this country.

As a nation we must stop being fools in the soft treatment of those who overtly or covertly are out to destroy us. Under the pretext of "liberties," we have permitted them to say, or do, what they please—inciting hate and poisoning the very wellsprings of the freedom under which they cloak their conspiracy.

The time has come to quit handling internal enemies with kid gloves; to quit subjecting America to the policy of folly which exploded into tragedy last week because one of these—clearly identifiable and identified as a subversive—was permitted to run at large.

It was the supreme irony, surely, that this climax of conspiracy came almost on the 30th anniversary of historic blunder—the renewal of diplomatic relations with Russia; extending recognition to that Communist land, on the promise that it would engage in no subversion here.

To the everlasting credit of one Tennessean, Gordon Browning—then a member of Congress—he strenuously opposed that act of folly, and voted against it. He saw, as did many of his countrymen, the danger invited by taking Moscow to the Nation's bosom, and opening the door thus to the apparatus of godless Communist intrigue. He recognized the Bolshevik movement for what it was and is.

Tragic as this moment is, reflecting the cost of leniency toward a known enemy whose every effort is bent toward America's downfall, it surely awakens the Nation to the realities—and the frivolity of treating the enemy, on either the foreign or the domestic front, with wishful thinking; or glad-handing its evangels from Moscow or elsewhere, whose guise of "friendship" partakes of hypocrisy. The very presence of Deputy Premier Mikoyan as his country's representative at the funeral of President Kennedy is an affront, no less than a message of condolence from Fidel Castro would be.

The plot was carried out at Dallas because that was where the opportunity and the assassin were together. That it was far-reaching, and its ramifications not as yet completely determined, are facts so obvious that none can doubt the necessity—as realized by President Johnson—to pursue this investigaiton all the way. Though the one apprehended as the triggerman is dead, the FBI can unearth all the facts in the case; and must.

Security in this country is more at stake than ever; internal security, that is. And it is time for an awakened nation, through its government, possessed of that responsibility, to tighten that security by intelligent address to the fact of a ruthless, conscienceless, murderous enemy within.

It is time to quit coddling a criminal conspiracy as if it were a mere nonconformist idiosyncracy. The FBI knows it is not that. Director J. Edgar Hoover knows that enemy for what it is.

Let's start acting like an adult people aware that the survival of the Nation we love is at stake.

And furthermore—

A QUESTION TO BE ANSWERED

When Oswald was arrested the world heard him screaming from television screens that he wanted Abt to be his lawyer. United Press International said it was John Abt, of New York.

According to the late Whitaker Chambers, reformed Communist who turned against his friend, Alger Hiss, Abt was a member of the first Communist cell organized in Washington at a location within a block of St. Matthews Cathedral where funeral services for the late President Kennedy were held today.

Chambers said Abt was part of an underground group, including Hiss, and the attorney Oswald apparently was calling for, took the fifth amendment in the now famous hearing of August 1948. His long service with the U.S. Government, beginning in 1933, included work for the Department of Agriculture and as chief counsel for the Senate Labor and Education Committee.

David M. Dallin, author of "Soviet Espionage," lists Federal employees who were a part of the Russian apparatus in this country. Abt and Hiss are among those named.

Abt's last public appearance of prominence was as chief counsel for the Communist Party last December when it was convicted on a charge of failing to register as an agent of the Soviet Union.

The man who murdered the President of the United States called himself a Communist and a pro-Castro Marxist. Why did this man, Lee Harvey Oswald, who went to Russia and sought to become a citizen of Russia, call hysterically for John Abt to represent him as attorney?

The assassin's lips are sealed by death but the Federal Bureau of Investigation has ways of finding out. Does Jack Ruby, who silenced Oswald, know? What are the ramifications of the relationships of this underworld character?

There are many questions to be answered, and under the order of President Johnson, the answers should be forthcoming.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 10, 1963]

MORE ON HATRED

As time, even so little as a few weeks, begins to soothe the profound shock experienced by the Nation at President Kennedy's death, it becomes possible to gain some perspective on subjects of intense and widespread reaction immediately after the tragedy.

The most notable of these was surely hatred. It remains impossible to believe that some voices among us were not deliberately using the tragic occasion to attack their political opponents, especially the "radical right." The notion died very hard that the right was somehow responsible for the assassination, even though all evidence points to an acknowledged radical leftist as the killer. And even where the personal identity of the assassin was acknowledged, there was a tendency to blame his action on a "climate of hatred" supposedly permeating the land.

Hatred itself is a state of mind that all men must struggle to free themselves from. Yet in any political system based on differences of opinion, some political hatred is probably inevitable. Total personal commitment among any substantial group of citizens to any important political goal is bound to produce some hatred of those who block the way to that goal.

Aren't there now, for example, some dedicated liberals who truly hate the congressional system which allows Chairman SMITH his personal control over civil rights legislation? Is it unreasonable to believe that some among them feel hatred also for the chairman himself?

The difference between what is denounced as hatred and what is defended as righteous indignation often seems to be wholly a difference of who's talking about whom.

Since we are men, not angels, the only practicable way to eliminate every vestige of hatred from political thought in a democracy is to eliminate both political thought and democracy.

Justice Holmes insisted on the importance of "freedom for the thought we hate." That about sums it up.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 10, 1963]

ASSASSINATING NATIONAL CHARACTER: NEWSPAPER BLAMES DISTORTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 3, was forwarded to the State by Houston Manning of Latta. In his letter of transmittal, Manning was sharply critical of the address made to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce by former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

("The bias of the broadcasters," Manning wrote, "is astounding and he [Collins] is the proper man to head them."

(Manning suggests that the accompanying editorial provides a fitting rebuttal to Governor Collins' attempt to link President Kennedy's assassination with "Dixie battle cries * * * employed to incite sick souls to violence.")

[From the Wall Street Journal]

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 variety 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.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Nov. 26, 1963]

A LONER OR A PLOT IS CRUX OF KENNEDY DEATH

All of the ramifications behind the motive for the assassination of President Kennedy may never be revealed, but most Americans probably believe that the death of the President was no more than the whim of a fanatic.

It is easy to suppose that the prime suspect, and possibly others, may have had a direct link to either Moscow or Havana. Lee Oswald, the accused, did attempt to obtain Soviet citizenship and lived in Russia for 3 years. He also was a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a leftwing activist organization propagandizing in the United States.

If it should develop that the assassination was an international plot, one may rest assured the death of the President will be avenged. Such a connection is unlikely, if for no other reason than the obvious political activities of the accused. More credible seems the motive apparent in the correspondence sent by Oswald to Governor Connally in which Oswald spoke of obtaining justice for his dishonorable discharge from the U.S. Marines. Connally is a former Secretary of the Navy.

More likely, if Oswald is indisputably proved to be the murderer, is the possibility that the assassination was the work of an undisciplined "loner" whose leftist fanaticism twisted his mind over the years into a final, horrible blow at established society.

What is frequently forgotten in the traditional American forbearance for extremely diverse political opinions is that the leftist hue, containing many pro-Castro and pro-Khrushchev activist groups in the United States, owes its allegiance to a foreign government. The sole loyalty of such groups is to the international conspiracy of which they are a part.

If not directly, at least indirectly, all local and national committees and activist organizations alined with the Kremlin subject American society to dire danger. A reawakening to this danger should result from the Kennedy tragedy.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Nov. 27, 1963]

RETURN TO SANITY

While investigators are sifting the history of Lee H. Oswald and the man who killed him, in an effort to shed light on the murder of President Kennedy, it would be good for the country if every citizen would now calm down and restore national composure. The deluge of emotion that has spilled over the country, however understandable, is capable of upsetting normal life and sending disturbed individuals over the brink.

Such a one, we suppose, was Lee H. Oswald. An American woman reporter has made public her recollections of an interview with him in 1959 at Moscow. Her impression was that his desire to become a citizen of Soviet Russia came from "a combination of poverty, the plight of the U.S. Negro, and the U.S. Marines."

"After watching the way workers are treated in New York," Priscilla Johnson said that Oswald told her, "and Negroes in the South, I was looking for a key to my environment. Then I discovered Socialist literature."

Something of the sort has happened to many thousand Americans, judging from the outpouring of talk in recent years. Misunderstanding and dissatisfaction with life in a free country, which requires personal responsibility rather than reliance on blind collective action under rigid rules, have set up a new sort of mass mental illness among a formerly rugged people.

They seem beset by fear. Exploitation of this fear has been perpetrated at many levels. Sometimes motives are noble and sometimes less than noble.

What made Oswald decide to kill the President we do not know. Speculation that he was a hired gun now is being given serious consideration. The Richmond News Leader, a responsible newspaper, says "the finger points to Fidel Castro, an old hand at assassination." Oswald was in Mexico, it has been learned, within the last 7 weeks.

Where did Oswald, who fretted about downtrodden workers, get the money to travel to Mexico? Whence came the money to reach Moscow in 1959? The United States gave him $435 to return from Russia.

These and other questions need answers. Jack Rubinstein's bullet silenced Oswald. But the trail still may be uncovered.

Meanwhile, excesses of emotionalism are confusing the public. Assignment of collective guilt is a favorite pastime in some circles. One of the worst examples that has come to our notice was written by Jimmy Breslin for the New York Herald-Tribune and distributed by the Herald-Tribune news service. In wildly emotional language, Breslin attributed the President's murder to "a country that has let the art of hating grow so strong that we now kill Presidents because of it * * * Dallas is a collective word and it means Birmingham and Tuscaloosa and, yes, Scarsdale and Bay Ridge and the Bronx, too."

Breslin seems obsessed with racial and religious differences, but ignores altogether the solid fact about the assassin; namely, Oswald's Marxist background.

We single out Breslin's article merely because it is the most extreme of a flood of extremism. Until more facts are known, prudent people will reserve judgment. Oswald may have been a madman. He may have been a Communist agent. He was not, we insist, representative of decent Americans of any faith, color, or place of residence.

The suggestion that this tragedy stems from collective guilt of peace-loving people is a shameful lie. Regardless of their individual views, the overwhelming majority of people shared equally the grief of President Kennedy's death.

Collective smearing must stop. It must stop not only as regards the crime of November 22, but with respect to many other aspects of life in America. If freemen cannot discipline themselves in crisis, they will find themselves in the kind of collective straitjacket used to subdue the victims of uncontrollable insanity.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Nov. 26, 1963]

THE NATION IS NOT TO BLAME

As if sadness and shock were not enough for Americans to have to bear, some among us are seeking—in the wake of President Kennedy's assassination—to assign the burden of guilt to the Nation, rather than to an individual. There is no logical or factual basis for such an interpretation.

"Society" cannot be said to have created an environment conducive to the slaying of a President. That we have sharp differences of political opinion and even some "pockets of hate" cannot be held responsible for so dastardly a deed as that committed by Mr. Kennedy's assassin.

This Nation has known political discord and elements of hatred throughout its history. It also has known previous assassinations and assassination attempts. But history reveals no correlation between the two.

Certainly there is no visible connection between President Kennedy's tragic death and the expression of honest differences of opinion, no matter how militant, among loyal Americans. If Lee Harvey Oswald was indeed the assassin, we probably will never know just what motivated his violent deed. But what we know of his life and loyalties strongly indicates that he could not even have pretended to have America's interests at heart and could even have been the agent of a foreign power.

This is the fallacy, it seems to us, in characterizing President Kennedy's death as a reflection of extremism within our own political spectrum. Intense, even radical, political feelings cannot be equated with the emotions that move men to plot and commit murder.

As for the implications by some that the Nation has tolerated irresponsible conduct in the past and thereby helped to squeeze the trigger, this concept violates the Chris-

tian and American principle of individual responsibility.

This is not to deny, of course, that each of us needs constantly to reexamine our lives and to seek a higher plane for ourselves and our Nation. But to suggest that the Nation is to blame for this act of terror, which virtually every American sincerely deplores, is to abandon proper perspective.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

LET'S BE SENSIBLE

The first reaction upon seeing Lyndon Johnson walking with the others to the service at St. Matthew's was one of surprise. Was it wise for the President, after what happened in Dallas, to take the risk?

The more one thought about it the more proper it seemed. Should the President have ridden behind bulletproof glass? Should the same precaution have been taken in the case of Charles de Gaulle, Prince Philip, Anastas Mikoyan and the others? We think not. For to have done this might have lent a certain plausibility to the false notion that there is a sort of madness abroad in the land; that it was this, not a deranged mind, upon which must rest the blame for the assassination of President Kennedy.

There are, of course, those who preach violence in America. And there are those who practice it. But does this call for an indictment of all of us? Does it mean that ours is a generation apart? There are those who are suggesting as much. But how do they explain the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley? How account for the excesses of our own American Revolution? Is there some weakness that is inherent in and peculiar to a free society such as ours? If so, what is the explanation for the assassinations in the closed societies?

No one knows what was at work in the unbalanced mind of Lee Harvey Oswald. Perhaps we will never know. He said something about being embittered because of hardship endured by his mother during the great depression. But millions of mothers suffered during those years. Yet their sons do not go around killing Presidents.

No, this theory of national guilt will not wash. The lunatic always has been and always will be with us. Every proper precaution should be taken to safeguard the President. But his security can never be made absolute. And we might just as well face up to it.

Another absurdity is the conspiratorial explanation of the murder of Lee Oswald by Jack Ruby. The official East German news agency quotes the inevitable "political observers" as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was ordered by the extreme rightwingers, that an attempt was made to link the Communists to the crime, and that it was then decided to "eliminate" Oswald "in the fascist manner" so that he would never be able to name the real killers. This same line is being heard in veiled suggestions by otherwise sane Americans.

What utter nonsense. President Johnson has wisely called for a "prompt and thorough" investivation of all the circumstances surrounding the President's murder. The report which results should set to rest the orgy of speculation to which we have been treated in recent days.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE "DROP THE HATE" HOKUM

We grow exceedingly weary of the current talk about how, in the wake of the Kennedy assassination, we've all got to drop hatred and extremism and get milksoppish and ever-lovin'. Dire consequences are threatened if we disregard this advice.

Our reaction: Nonsense; also nerts, to revive a good old slang word.

The drop-the-hate talk is coming mainly from pinkos and leftists who are bitterly disappointed that Lee H. Oswald, President John F. Kennedy's murderer, was a Communist and a Castroite.

Had Oswald been a member of the John Birch Society or a hater of Negroes, the current peddlers of love and kisses would be stirring up a witch hunt in every one of the 50 States at this moment.

Reds hate all non-Reds and anti-Reds. Hatred is at the core of their creed. They cannot justly complain, and their friends, open or secret, should not be surprised that the Reds' hatred generates counterhatred of equal intensity. Every action, says a law of physics, generates an opposite and equal reaction. It's the same with human emotions.

We think most Americans are going to go right on hating Reds—and the more so because one of these rodents killed a much loved young U.S. President.

Also very boring, we feel, is—the "we're all to blame" blah—being voiced by some supposedly serious thinkers concerning the Kennedy assassination.

MYSTICISM GONE WILD

Insofar as we can follow these eggheads' logic at all, they reason that there is something sinister or cruel or violent in most Americans, and that this mass trait somehow impelled Oswald to murder the President.

If this is so, why is it that the great majority of us neither murder nor maim people we dislike or disagree with, or anybody else? Why do we contribute billions a year to charity and churches? Why don't juries in our homicide cases always convict? And a dozen other questions like unto those.

This we're all to blame stuff just won't wash, as we see it, and is an insult to 99 Americans out of 100, or maybe 999 out of 1,000.

Equally nonsensical, in our opinion, is—the shame of Dallas baloney—peddled by still other serious thinkers, including some in Dallas itself. Or, if you happen to hate Texas, you can speak of the shame of Texas as springing from the fact that President Kennedy was murdered in Dallas, Tex.

WHERE'S ALL THIS SHAME?

True, Dallas is a bit on the wild side. But it is no more so than Birmingham, Chicago, Hollywood, and parts of New York City, among other places.

Nuts, killers, rapists, and arsonists live in all of those cities and frequently do grave harm to harmless citizens. But no shame properly attaches to the cities on that account. Chiefly, it indicates a need for more police and tougher judges. Certainly it is no disgrace to Dallas that President Kennedy happened to be murdered there by a Communist whose spiritual home was Havana or Moscow.

(We're not speaking at this time of the Dallas police and the later assassination of Oswald. We expect to discuss that some other day or days.)

Well, we've been a long time getting around to Thanksgiving Day 1963, and a few remarks concerning this beloved holiday.

The tragic death of the 35th President overshadows the occasion this year; no question about that.

And yet, there were aspects of this hideous event, even, for which we can all be grateful.

MIGHT HAVE BEEN WORSE

By the grace of God, Mr. Kennedy was spared a miserable lingering death like those suffered by our other martyred Chief Executives. He never knew what had hit him, which is the best way to die.

And in the courageous, beautiful, and utterly appealing conduct of Mrs. Kennedy and the two children following the tragedy, Americans have a memory to treasure for decades.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Nov. 29, 1963]

LESSONS IN THE TRAGIC EVENTS

(By Thurman Sensing)

For all decent Americans of all political views, the death of President John F. Kennedy was a tragedy that they will remember all their days. No matter how much conservatives disagreed with the policies of his administration, which was their right as citizens, they respected the constitutional office of the President, admired the individual who had served his country bravely in wartime, and wished nothing but personal happiness for Mr. Kennedy, his wife, his children.

A tragic, unexpected fate lay in store for President Kennedy. He was removed from his high office in a way no good man or woman in America wanted or ever thought would happen. Not only was the murder of Mr. Kennedy a dastardly blow at a brave man but a blow at the American system, for the office of the President is the greatest gift that can be conferred under the Constitution that is sacred to our citizens. The assassin who fired at John F. Kennedy fired at the system of government—at the Republic—that is nearest and dearest to the hearts of Americans.

These recent days have been days of darkness and turmoil. They also have been days of confusion. Yet there must be lessons in the tragic events—lessons that the Nation must take to heart.

The man who was charged with the murder of the President was a self-admitted Marxist and a self-described official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a Castro front organization. It is tragic as well as ironic that a man connected with such ideas and such a movement should have been the one who police authorities are convinced was the one who struck him down.

In this last year, there has been extraordinary tolerance for Marxists. Student groups that described themselves as Marxist have reappeared on university campuses in the United States and have been accorded tolerance. The "liberal" climate of opinion has been that Marxism is harmless—just another political point of view that a so-called "sophisticated" society should be able to tolerate. But perhaps if the country had not been so "sophisticated," if it had not bought this line, John F. Kennedy would be alive today and safe with his wife and children.

As for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigated this group in the spring of 1961. Conservative writers repeatedly urged the Justice Department to make a deep probe of this organization, which the Senate learned had received funds from Fidel Castro.

But the Justice Department, headed, ironically, by the late President's brother, never listed the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as subversive. "Liberals" continually preached against what they called "a witch hunt." They had torrents of words for so-called "rightwing" extremists, but they saw no evil, heard no evil when it came to leftwing extremists.

Well, tragic events have proven that investigations could have turned up real witches, real subversives, that is. A deep probe of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and of Marxist groups might have turned up the man charged with killing the President.

What the country needs to learn is that there can be an excessive degree of tolerance. A Marxist cannot be dismissed as a mere student or dissenting thinker. A man who regards himself as a Marxist inevitably regards himself as an enemy of American society and of our Government officials. The history of Marxism is intertwined with the history of terrorism and of assassination.

It is to be hoped that these facts will be brought to the attention of the American people in this time of mourning. One of the best ways for people to honor the fallen President is to demand that the Justice Department, through the agency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, conduct the long overdue deep investigation of all the Marxist and pro-Castro groups now operating inside the borders of the United States.

Indeed, in order to assure the personal safety of President Johnson and of State Governors and other high American officials, it is imperative that the leftist groups subverting our way of life be exposed to the pitiless glare of publicity and surveillance.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Nov. 27, 1963]

LEE OSWALD: A THREAT TO RED TIMETABLE

At first glance, the reaction of most people across the United States is that the Dallas police would rate No. 1 in the Nation for the "booby" prize of all police departments. First, President Kennedy is shot to death in Dallas and then the man who was believed to be President Kennedy's assassin is shot to death while in the custody of the Dallas police. The killing of the man suspected of murdering the President was such a stupid performance that one wonders whether there could have been something behind all this that does not meet the eye.

It is quite evident that Lee Harvey Oswald, the man who is believed to have assassinated the President, had strong Communist connections. He had a Russian wife whom he married in Russia. He had been in Russia and tried to renounce his citizenship. He was an official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He was a Castroite. Yesterday this newspaper printed a special dispatch from Florida, detailing Oswald's activities on behalf of Castro in that area.

This Communist, leftwing background of the President's assassin, of course, came as a terrible shock to those elements within our society who have for years been telling the American people that the only danger to this country comes from the "extreme rightwing."

Leftwing propagandists in this country have also carefully hidden the fact that many of their number have a direct affiliation and an apparent supreme loyalty to a foreign power; namely, the Soviet Union. You will see, in the next few days, weeks and months, every attempt made by many communications media in the United States to suppress the fact that Oswald was a Marxist and a Communist. That is what makes the murder of Oswald, before his trial, all the more reprehensible.

An extended trial would have brought out in detail Oswald's Communist connections and exposed much of the Communist plot in this country, something that the leftwingers in our Government and communications media have for years denied ever existed at all.

Already you hear sugar-tongued commentators on the radio saying it would be horrible if the fact that Oswald had been a Communist should lead to a revival of "McCarthyism." Heaven forbid.

Of course, poor Joe McCarthy, in his blundering way, was on the track of the Communist conspiracy when those who controlled the conspiracy in this country ordered him destroyed as a warning to anyone else who might dare to investigate what was going on inside the Communist conspiracy in this country.

Since the downfall of McCarthy, almost no individual or newspaper—except a few, such as our own—has dared to point out the fact that there was indeed a Communist conspiracy going on inside this country. Oswald, who obviously was not the best-balanced individual in the world, upset the applecart of the Communists by killing the President. The Communists in this country and abroad are not interested at this moment in that type of direct action. They want, rather, to lull the United States and its Government to sleep and gain concession after concession from us. At the same time they want to influence our military policy so as to weaken our ability to defend ourselves.

Then, when this Nation is in a completely helpless position versus the Communists, from the standpoint of armed strength, then and then only do they intend to strike. In other words, like the assassins that they are, they want us to have our backs turned to them, just as President Kennedy's back was turned to the foul assassin who struck him down in Dallas. Then when our guard is down and our backs are turned, then and then only do they intend to strike.

It is easy to understand why Premier Khrushchev, on hearing the news of President Kennedy's death, hurried back from the Ukraine to Moscow. Oswald, by his uncontrolled act, had upset the Communist timetable for the takeover of the United States. Khrushchev immediately had to try to cover up the damage. Almost within the minutes of the news of the assassination, the Communist news media all over the world were blaring out the fact that President Kennedy had been slain by a "rightwinger," that it was all a "rightwing plot."

Now, the latest Red line is that the Dallas police allowed Oswald to be killed so as to cover up the fact that he wasn't guilty and it was really rightwingers who killed the President. Actually, the Communists must have heaved a great sigh of relief when the accused killer of President Kennedy was slain, because they knew this would silence much of the publicity which would have been so harmful to the Communist cause and might have awakened more Americans to the nature of the Communist conspiracy within the United States and throughout the world.

While we can sympathize with the White House advisers and the State Department functionaries, who for years have had their little pipedream that communism was changing, and that they, by being nice to the Communists, could make gentlemen out of them, we do hope that President Johnson will take immediate steps to have a real housecleaning in the White House and the State Department and, once and for all, get rid of these men whose wishful thinking could lead to the complete and utter destruction of the United States.

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 3, 1963]

OSWALD SYMBOL OF COMMUNISM IN PRACTICE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Associated Press photograph of handcuffed assassin Lee Harvey Oswald giving the hammer-and-sickle (clenched-fist) salute in the Dallas jail should not be forgotten in the confused contentions about what kind of American we have today.

It's a picture of pure communism in practice. That fact should not be lost in the debris.

Except for this, Lee Oswald teaches us no more about America than a leopard in a zoo and is about as indicative of true American problems (including civil rights) as was Stalin himself; a man whose agent—alias Jacques Mornard—assassinated Leon Trotsky with an Alpine climber's axe 11 years after Trotsky's exile and half a world away from home.

The Castro Communists' kidnapping of U.S. Col. James James K. Chenault in Caracas is pure communism in practice. In June Reds had attacked our Venezuelan military mission headquarters and set it afire in the same pattern that they burned the British Embassy in Jakarta, September 16. This is also pure communism in practice, as was the November 28 terrorist hijacking of the Venezuelan airliner at gunpoint.

Nothing changes. Valerin Zorin, the Soviet ambassador to the U.N., masterminded the assassinations in the 1948 Czechoslovakian Communist coup from within the Soviet Embassy in Prague.

Poland? The hard core of terrorists there today consists of wartime Communists who fled Warsaw to Moscow and returned to Poland in 1944 with Polish military units accompanying the Red Army. Moreover, Soviet intelligence picked up everywhere, and employs, all the former Nazi SS assassins it could find.

A central and permanent feature of Soviet policy is to cash in on the prestige of violence. Serving this purpose of violence, as well as specific political objectives, the Reds never run out of rope.

The Kremlin also maintains a special department of the Soviet Security Service (KGB) known as the "Disinformation Bureau" for manipulating misinformation. Read all about this in former Central Intelligence Agency Chief Allen Dulles' current "The Craft of Intelligence," a vital, revealing, remarkable book. For it also shows—the number officially revealed for the first time—that the Soviet had "over 40 high-level agents in various departments and agencies in Washington during World War II." Are there fewer now? This is pure communism in practice.

So is the November 15 notice in the newspaper Pradva Vostoka. It states that three Baptist women missionaries in Namangan are sentenced to 2 years in prison. They're accused of "organizing secret meetings of an unregistered Baptist sect." Their crime is "transcribing and distributing so-called Baptist hymns by means of which the character and world outlook of a granddaughter were influenced." It's just the same in Cuba, where if your neighbor does not like you, his word can kill you.

We abhor slums and maybe you can blame Al Capone on the slums of Chicago, although I don't think so; the same slums that produced many a fine Governor and countless civic leaders in the State of Illinois. But to blame American society for President Kennedy's horrible assassination and gratuitously drag in the grievous problem of integration, indict "the American soul," etc., is as preposterous as it is mysterious.

Immediately after Oswald's identification the State Department asked newsmen to play down the possibility that Oswald was a Castro or Kremlin agent, suggesting this could damage Soviet relations. And at this writing there is no known evidence of either link. But does it follow from this that blame be placed on nearly everything except Communist behaviorism, worldwide and traditional?

This was no ordinary murder. Our President was killed. Oswald was no ordinary Texan. He had no more roots in Dallas or Texas or America as a whole than in Timbuktu. But if this bestial act is to teach us anything it should at least teach us the penalty of softheadedness, supineness and apology for a doctrine that has always taught murder as an instrument of national policy whether this particular man was an agent for it or not; a man utterly disciplined in his task and even at the police station.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Dec. 1, 1963]

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 contradition 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 blood stream.

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 1,900 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.

[From the Charleston, (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 1, 1963]

FALSE INDICTMENT: THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE NOT GUILTY

(From an editorial in the Wall Street Journal)

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt.

It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was 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.

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.

WHY PICK ON DALLAS?

We rise to the defense of Dallas, Tex.

Many commentators and public figures have used the phrase, "the shame of Dallas" in suggesting that a million people in that area must take the major blame, and do penance for the horrible act of one mentally disturbed young man who was, after all, a newcomer in their midst.

Certainly the residents and officials of that unhappy city are expressing an extra measure of shock and grief at their direct witnessing of our Nation's tragedy. That is understandable. But it is not their shame or their failure.

This youth originated in the Bronx, where as a grade school pupil he was given a psychiatric examination, was found to be maladjusted, and to have "potentially dangerous" tendencies. If a city is to be held responsibile for him, the primary responsibility was in the Bronx, which had its chance to set the boy straight, and failed. Yet nobody has come forward with the suggestion that the Bronx should put on sackcloth and ashes.

Oswald went to high school in Fort Worth, and his former classmates there have said he was a "loner" and an oddball. But if Dallas should point the finger of blame at its nearest rival, Fort Worth would indignantly reject the accusation.

The young killer spent 2 years in the Soviet Union; he tried to resign his American citizenship; he married a Russian wife; he devoured Marxist literature as what he called his "personal Bible." But, strange to say, it has not been suggested that the blame for his confusion should rest in the city of Moscow.

He went to New Orleans, where he worked with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, definitely proved by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security to be a Communist front. Pictures of Oswald passing out Communist circulars on the streets of New Orleans were shown to the whole Nation. Yet we have heard nobody express the opinion that New Orleans is a culprit city.

Oswald's travel expenses from Russia back to this country were paid for with money advanced by the State Department, yet Washington is not asked to share the blame for what happened.

Why, then, should Dallas be called upon to undergo the ordeal of recrimination because Lee Harvey Oswald arrived there by way of the Bronx, Fort Worth, New Orleans, Moscow, and Washington with his mind made up, his personality already warped into a pattern which emerged soon after in a heinous crime that has been universally condemned?

If any city were dissected the way Dallas has been, the publicity would reveal the same sort of elements of hate and strife, and would most of all reveal the general lack of concern that allows them to breed. We have a long way to go in detecting and diagnosing mental illness, and in knowing what to do to keep it from being a public menace. The blame does not lie with the city of Dallas, but with all humanity. We can fix the blame for individual failures and mistakes there, but there are potential killers walking the streets of every city of the world. The real question is, "What are we going to do about them—and for them?"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on December 3, Mr. LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, spoke in Columbia, S.C., and accused the South with guilt for the assassination of President Kennedy. In a speech which professed to deplore hate, Mr. Collins resorted to the most intemperate charges in his unfounded and completely unjustified attack on the people of the Southern States. For one who professes to abhor the emotion of hate, Mr. Collins proves himself singularly adept at verbally purveying this most violent emotion. If Mr. Collins had prepared for months to the end of arousing the strongest possible emotional reaction, he could not have done a more thorough job than he did accomplish with his speech in Columbia on December 3. I ask unanimous consent that a number of newspaper editorials and articles commenting on the remarks of Mr. Collins be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, perhaps the most concise appraisal of Mr. Collins' speech appeared at the conclusion of an editorial in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., of December 5. This editorial stated:

> If Mr. Collins professes to believe what he has said, he is infected by a germ of extreme aberrations, and employers should dump him as a very sick man.

Mr. President, so vicious and so unfounded are the attempts to fix blame for the President's assassination on either the southerners or the conservatives, that there arises a suspicion that those who make such charges are much more incensed that the assassination was not perpetrated by a member of the American groups which they so despise and on which they attempt to place the guilt for any real or imagined defects in the American society, than they were over the fact of the assassination of the President itself.

If the guilt for the tragic and dastardly assassination of the President is to be placed on a broader base than the individual or individuals who actually participated in the assassination, then the guilt must logically be placed on those who purvey the insidious ideology of communism, for it is they who are the real purveyors of class warfare, bigotry, hatred, and violence in the world today.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 5, 1963]

LEROY COLLINS, ET AL—THE FACTS ARE IGNORED BY HUCKSTERS OF HATE

Peddlers of demagogy carry their own sample kit, and LeRoy Collins—who was a "liberal" politician before becoming president of the National Broadcasters Association—went fully equipped in that particular for his Tuesday evening mission to South Carolina. There he let go with one more swipe with the smear brush at the South—his allegation being that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence."

Desperation can lead to hysteria, it is true—and maybe the charitable thing would be to ascribe this vitriol to ignorance. But Mr. Collins is not a run-of-mine ignoramus. He is the purposeful protagonist of a point of view so foreign to truth that it can only be intended, not to enlighten on facts, but obscure them; not to ameliorate and solidify, but to excite passions of the hate pack with which he clearly runs. Whose ideological bread he eats, their chant he joins.

"Look," they say drooling for another bite of the infected morsel, "he's singing our song."

As a divisive demagog, thus deliberately ignoring facts of record, he fits into the pattern of the propagandists dispensing entirely with fact to pin guilt just anywhere except where it belongs. The South is their target; therefore they act, to a man, as if they had never heard of Lee Harvey Oswald; nor are aware that as triggerman he was an avowed pro-Castro Communist, doing that enemy's business.

To these, mention of the Communist connection seems to be a mustn't-mustn't. It's still more expedient, apparently, to persist in the assertion—launched at the outset as a spontaneous defamation—that southern *hate killed John* Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Some of the commentators among Mr. Collins' colleagues have been persisting in that. They have been addicted to that hate needle by long use; their Operation Dixie rigging the picture for their own propaganda spiel, and playing pundit to the point of difficult extrication when facts of record leave them stranded, to squirm on their own hook.

If Mr. Collins has been listening exclusively to these for his information, it would be understandable that he is totally uninformed; still one would expect somebody going out on the lecture circuit, to discuss a matter of utmost gravity, to at least have a brush with facts before mounting the rostrum.

That the ex-Governor of Florida finds himself thus in the company of Chief Justice Earl Warren is not a circumstance augmenting his stature; the latter also delivered himself of a similar diatribe—no less shockingly wide of the truth because it was an offhand observation—voiced immediately after the President's death before the Red ideology of the killer was known. Nevertheless he repeated his scattergun blast of hate as he stood at Mr. Kennedy's bier in the Capitol Rotunda. Of the three who delivered eulogies, only Warren used the sad and solemn occasion to hurl a jarring note of anger by assigning guilt to fellow Americans.

It is nothing less than peculiar that the insulting conclusions reached by this school of South-baiting extremists parallel the charges peddled by Tass and Izvestia. The propaganda line being circulated by the latter in Russia is that President Kennedy was the victim of a Southern assassination plot. And it is the line emphasized at every opportunity by most of the commentators featured by the medium that pays Mr. Collins' salary. Apparently for pay, the former Governor of Florida takes his cue and turns traitor to his own region, which bears the name of Dixie. Characteristically, no mention of the fact that Lee Oswald was a pro-Castro Marxist, and working member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Most of Washington knows the score on that, even if for the moment it isn't talking much about it. There are facts still to come out; but salient facts already have emerged.

Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, hit the nail on the head when he rebuked those who blame American "society" for the Presidential murder. "These people overlook the simple fact—or refuse to admit it—that Lee Harvey Oswald was not fashioned by our society. His mind was, in fact, fashioned by the propaganda of Marx, an atheist who laid the foundation of communism.

"Let us remember," he added, "that in talking about extremists, in talking about the purveyors of hate, that the real purveyors of hate in this world, the real fomenters of class war and bigotry are the Communists; and the real disease of this world is Communist imperialism."

Among those refuted by the facts stated are the pundits striving to manufacture of this tragedy a propaganda case for their own further purveyance.

Infamies heaped upon the South this time are so transparently false that the entire Nation must see them for what they are.

If Mr. Collins professes to believe what he has said, he is infected by a germ of extreme aberrations, and employers should dump him as a very sick man.

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Dec. 4, 1963]

THE COLLINS SPEECH IN COLUMBIA

There is the account of the speech of former Governor Collins in Columbia yesterday with bold heading on the front page of this morning's paper. Too much of the speech is untruth, and on the whole it is a misrepresentation spoken in the face of southern people.

Mr. Collins is now president of the National Association of Broadcasters whose monopoly for propaganda is today the most powerful single voice in the country. Whether it is used with the best taste, in the best national interest, is questionable, but it and its president are adept at propaganda.

The building of a new world through the airways engages much of the time of Mr. Collins, one may be sure. Not content with visiting the homes of the South through remote broadcast of entertainment, he comes into the Deep South to the capital of the Secession State, to preach against the South's evil, which he says is segregation.

It is typical and unfortunate that as men move into positions of power they lose something of the values that made them what they were, but are no longer.

The greatest power is not always at the top, and that is why centralization, seeking perfection in the whole, is bereft of the means of achieving it.

Dictatorship may have many good reasons for acceptance, but it has been historically true that dictatorship and the ultimate ideals of good have been two separate and distinct things.

People naturally and historically resent intrusion; for there is no absolute power except in the conscience of the individual, and there is no power to be respected above one's own convictions.

Mr. Collins has been drawn into the central establishment of power in the United States, which assumes that it can engineer a new social order from the top.

The baptism of power is often fatal; and, in a country of liberty, it is only power that can destroy it. Mr. Collins, who blames the South for the assassination of President Kennedy, would deny criticism, opposition, the spoken and written word, it seems. He would deny the very freedoms that are conscienceful forces in our country dedicated to maintaining our freedoms.

Destroy them, and the well of liberty has gone dry.

Years ago in the days of steam pumps, an engineer was being examined for graduation, when his examiner proposed the following question: "Suppose you have a steam pump constructed for a ship, under your own supervision, and know that everything is in perfect working order yet, when you throw out the hose, it will not draw. What would you think?"

"I should think, sir, there should be a defect somewhere."

"But such a conclusion is not admissible, for the supposition is, that everything is perfect, and yet it will not work."

"Then, sir, I should look over the side to see if the river had run dry."

Those who stand in positions of power inevitably want to create a perfect machine, which now in contemplation is a new world order without freedom.

When, along the way, will they learn that no matter how perfect the machine is designed, the river of liberty, which is life itself, is to be reckoned with, too?

One must agree with Mr. Collins that politicians have misled the people into believing that the public law in time will uphold segregation. Segregation will never be a public ideal. It is a private, personal matter, embraced by freedom, but not by the law.

The idea that men are created equal, he said, "is an idea that can never be stopped, not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force * * * has the invincibility of simple truth, justice and right."

With all that most southerners agree, and anyone of heart and reason must ever wish that it will be so. It is a great ideal.

But there is no known order, in all history, no system of government, no manmade laws, no army bayonet, no appropriation of funds, or anything else that can be done to bring about equality without first the complete destruction of freedom; for ultimate equality is an ideal of freedom, not of power.

And, while so many leaders talk of advancing the cause of humanity, of moving forward in social and economic fields—all of which sounds so promising and so winning—they seldom say that a dictatorship could get it all done quickly and easily; but that is what they would say, if they wanted to be truthful all the way, which Mr. Collins has not been. But he did say this—thanks to his frankness—"The advancement of all rights * * * as we know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government * * *."

And, all the while, the power establishment softens its approach to the dictators of the world who are committed to bury us all, and to whom freedom is the sinister evil.

In the power establishment—closely supported by the National Association of Broadcasters—the leaders, the public casually observes, are nearly all millionaires or very rich; and this is so on nearly all leadership levels, the wealth of government having its courtiers now as it did in the early days of royalty.

It becomes importunate that they gather before humanity a set of ideals attractive to the masses, and that they crusade to justify their power and good fortune, to soothe their conscience, to seem to supply a high service and thus to further their own interest—to accomplish what they would like to be given

credit for but are not competent either to conceive or to administer.

And like the infallible kings of old, while what they say is a form of power itself, they themselves contribute almost nothing. Like the royalty of ancient times, their work consists of spending money taken from the pockets of the people.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE MOTE IN COLLINS' EYE

Not in his most genial mood was Leroy Collins known, as far as we can ascertain, as a Dixiephile. Rather, the former Florida Governor has long been recognized as holding little regard for anything—man or beast—residing below the Mason and Dixon line.

That became evident during his tenure as chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference as well as when he presided over the National Democratic Convention. Nothing he had to say could have been construed as being complimentary to the section of the Nation which had been so good to him.

Even so, there was an absence of vitriol in what Collins had to say about the South. It was damaging, but not dirty.

Now, however, as it has for so many other misdirected Americans, the assassination of President Kennedy has so unbalanced Collins' rationality that we find him unleashing against the South a hatred which seems even more extreme than that which he charges to it.

His address before the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce was a smear of all things southern, carrying with it the implication that the South colluded in the murder of President Kennedy.

He named no officeholders in his remarks, but it was obvious that he referred to elected officials of this area when he asked how long "are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured by these Claghorns."

And, as though it were an everyday occurrence unique to the South and condoned by the South, he asked: "How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?"

It must be presumed that Mr. Collins, in this wholly unfair reference, holds the southern politicians responsible for the violence that has come as the outgrowth of civil rights demands. In so doing, he charges the basest of crimes to men who are motivated not by the hate and extremism that the former Florida Governor himself exhibits, but by deep convictions that States rights are guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, and that compulsion is neither the way to gain integration nor admiration.

In the soul-filled dislike which he displays for the South, Collins lays to it the abhorrent assassination of President Kennedy as he conveniently ignores the Communist background of the alleged assassin.

It is understandable, in that he, as president of the National Association of Broadcasters, brazenly and banefully, vents his spleen against this region in a chamber of commerce address, how it is that so many members of his current profession—those especially in network positions—are utterly intolerant of the South and the southern viewpoint.

In their hate of us, they fail to see their own.

[From the News and Courier, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE COLLINS INSULT

Besides insulting millions of southerners with public blame for President Kennedy's murder, former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida managed in his speech at Columbia to work in a specific insult to a southern family by the name of Claghorn.

The late Fred Allen, one of the greatest American comics of our time, invented a character with a southern accent and called him Senator Claghorn. Members of the Claghorn clan may not have liked this use of the name but at least they could enjoy Mr. Allen's harmless humor.

The venom in Mr. Collin's barb about "these Claghorns"—whom he linked with several murders, including Mr. Kennedy's—is something altogether different. At least one descendant of a Claghorn—a name with an honorable record in American history—has already expressed the resentment that we are confident is spreading throughout this region. Mrs. B. Ellis deTreville of Beaufort, whose mother was a Claghorn, has said she intends to sue Mr. Collins unless he makes a public apology.

We wish it were possible for every affronted southerner, whatever his name and ancestry, to extract an apology from the man, though we are not prepared to say what it would be worth.

[From the Greenville News, Dec. 6, 1963]

LEROY COLLINS' GRIEVOUS ERRORS

We feel for the hosts at the annual meeting of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and, especially for Gov. Donald S. Russell who was called upon to introduce former Gov. Leroy Collins of Florida prior to his speech in which he denounced, in terms at least as vicious as its most extreme critics have used, his native South.

When he declared that "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence" fostered or contributed to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the once politically ambitious Floridian not only libeled the South but the whole Nation.

For the things he said of his own region could be said with just as much truth—or the lack of it—of any other region or of the country as a whole.

We shall not waste time taking Governor Collins' remarks apart and dignifying and further broadcasting them by refuting them. But when he spoke in the most extreme terms of the behavior of what he referred to as a few southern extremists, he committed the selfsame sin of which he was accusing them.

Nothing can be said by us or anyone else to excuse or mitigate some of the bombings, shootings, and other crimes to which Mr. Collins referred in the course of his remarks. But he spoke as if they occurred only in the South, and he certainly knows better than that.

The South has its sick souls, of course. But they are about equally divided between the two extremes on the race issue, which Collins attempted to say was the main cause if not the whole cause of the assassination. The available evidence does not support that thesis.

And, as for the incitement of the sick souls, the kind of man who killed the late John Kennedy is capable of killing anyone for the same paranoid reasons; in fact, they don't need any reasons.

The flames of incitement are already burning within their troubled hearts and twisted minds.

Mr. Collins should know that every region and every community in the country has its potential paranoiac assassins. They strike often, except that their victims are lesser folk than Presidents and we call it murder instead of assassination.

Mr. Collins has committed two grievous errors in addition to embarrassing his hosts.

One is that, like certain others, he has attempted to indict unfairly a whole people for the crime of one man or one small group of men.

The other has to do with the old adage that it's a pretty sorry bird who will foul his own nest.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser, Dec. 5, 1963]

A SWINISH LIBEL

The latest and not least offensive hellmouth to indict the South, and Alabama in particular, for the murder of President Kennedy is a native son—former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, who is now the czar of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Alabamians will remember Collins as the presiding officer at the 1960 Democratic Convention in Los Angeles—prematurely gray, handsome, virile, and athirst for the vice-presidential nomination.

Collins has now hastened to make a finding that upstages the official assassination report to come from the Warren Commission.

The Commission need not consult the FBI, for the elegant, ambitious Collins has ruled that the assassination was the result of "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence."

Collins deposed that the Communist Oswald was inspired by "the rabble-rousers" who urge the country to "stand up and fight" for segregation and States rights.

Collins referred to unnamed southern politicians and asked:

"How long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?"

This swinish libel of a people comes from a man who seeks the patronage of other sections. In times past, even Time magazine has slurred Collins as a civil rights phony. It observed in the September 1, 1958, issue:

"With many a pear-shaped preachment * * * Collins has built a reputation as a civil rights statesman, won favorable mention as a southern moderate who might do nicely as a Democratic vice presidential nominee in 1960. But Collins' practice falls far short of his preachment: Not once during his 3 years as Governor has he proposed even a token program for admitting Negro children to white classrooms in Florida's 100-percent segregated public school system."

What Collins now says is designed to stifle political opposition to the Democratic Party. And it is plainly frivolous.

The Communist Oswald was scarcely inspired to his crime by sympathy with States rights.

Oswald was not inspired by either southern or northern agitators. If anything, he was angry because he couldn't get a visa to return to Russia.

Nobody, including Collins, knows with any certainty what impelled Oswald to his horrendous crime. He was a madman of the kind who could have killed Kennedy one day and Khrushchev the next day with equal pleasure.

And something that Collins and his demagogic breed leave up in the air is this: If Oswald murdered Kennedy because of States rights debate, then what explains the equally crazed act that was Jack Ruby murdering Oswald?

[From the State, Dec. 5, 1963]

THE MAN WHO CAME TO DINNER

Agree or disagree with LeRoy Collins, you must give him credit for consistency if not for propriety.

The former Governor of Florida long has wanted to remake the image of the South into something more nearly resembling that of the rest of the Nation. His efforts in that direction were apparent when he was the chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference—and when he was the presiding chairman over the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

Now that he is president of the National Association of Broadcasters, he carries the same uncharitable view of many things and many people of the South. That is his privilege, and we would be the last to stand in his way of sounding off.

But it seemed singularly inappropriate for him to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to castigate the South and its spokesmen. We accept, with somewhat qualified gratitude, his differentiation of South Carolina from our sister Southern States. We cannot accept his more general indictment of the South.

Least of all can we accept from him or anyone else the accusation that Southerners are "un-American" in their adherence to values and traditions which have their very origins in the birth of this Nation of ours.

And for him to impute some sort of collective guilt to the South for the assassination of President Kennedy is both inexcusable and insulting.

If he is genuinely concerned with madmen and meanness, he need only look about in the Northern region where he now resides.

The greatest service LeRoy Collins could render the South, and indeed the Nation, would be to use his considerable influence in the world of network broadcasting to throttle those false messiahs of the microphone who glory in misrepresenting all that is decent in Dixie.

[From the Columbia Record, Dec. 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR COLLINS' SPEECH

"A Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate," the former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, declared in a Columbia speech Tuesday night.

Nor do southerners have to soak themselves in the oil of guilt and set themselves aflame for distant hordes of Saracens to applaud.

Donning the sackcloth of the apologist, he addressed the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce on "some thoughts that have been brooding in my mind lately. I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States," he declared. Then, with his customary urbane eloquence, he proceeded to sharpen the lines of misunderstanding and condemnation.

"For too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it," he said. He might have added, "And too often do the South's own best friends speak against it."

"We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South," the former Governor, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, continued. "They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region. * * * And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?"

The distortion will continue as long as these extremists, these Claghorns, are the only prosouthern voices to which the national press and Governor Collins' own national broadcasters will listen.

The speaker deplored "Dixie battle cries (that) have been employed to incite sick souls to violence," but he ignored the sources of much of the incitement and preachment of hate which are neither Claghorn nor Southern.

"How many Sunday School children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?" Governor Collins asked, compounding the reckless libel that crime and lawlessness are a hallmark of Southern society.

"It is time the decent people of the South, with all their might and strength," he added, "told the bloody-shirt-wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry." And they should speak loudly enough to be heard afar in the unholy sanctums of intolerance and prejudiced ignorance.

"Too many politicians down our way," the top broadcaster said, "talk defensively of 'States rights' when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty." One of the indictments against the South by those who confuse "national duty" with personal ideology is that the South is too American, too patriotic. Where true national duty has been concerned, the people of Dixie have always stood in the forefront and provided a shield against those who would destroy our national character and heritage. They have observed no conflict between loyalty to State and loyalty to Nation.

"Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership," the speaker declared in his conclusion. "And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy."

Yes, Governor, there certainly are.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

BYRNES TAKES ISSUE WITH COLLINS SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is reprinted from the Columbia State:)

James F. Byrnes, in a statement Friday, charged that "if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate it has been the broadcasters."

Mr. Byrnes, former Governor of South Carolina, and Secretary of State, was taking issue with LeRoy Collins, ex-Governor of Florida, who in a Columbia address attributed hate to the South and racial prejudices. Collins is president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The firing last summer on a Citadel cadet by a young Negro, and the subsequent shot at that institution's president, Gen. Mark Clark, were cited by Mr. Byrnes. "No broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate," he declared.

Mr. Byrnes refuted the idea that Lee Harvey Oswald was motivated by racial feeling in the killing of President Kennedy. "On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government," Mr. Byrnes said.

Following is the text of the statement of Mr. Byrnes:

"Everybody will agree that there should not be developed in any community, or in the country at large, a climate of hatred for an individual or group because of differences in views about political issues. However, Mr. LeRoy Collins spent his time emphasizing that the climate of hate was built up in Birmingham and other southern spots because of race hatred and race prejudices.

"The fact is, in all the thousands of words written about the assassination of President Kennedy, not one witness has offered a statement indicating even that Oswald was motivated by any feeling on the race question. On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government which caused him to try to become a citizen of that country and caused him to go to the trouble and expense of advocating fair play for Cuba.

"In addition, it is noteworthy that when asked about counsel to represent him, he stated he did not want any Texas lawyer but that he would like to have Mr. Abt, of New York, who first came into public view as a close friend of Alger Hiss and who has been the subject of investigation by some Government agencies.

"Oswald was young. He could not have personally known Abt. His immediately expressed desire to have this lawyer represent him would indicate that he has knowledge of and probably has sympathy with the man who, like Hiss and Lee Pressman, has been active in the causes sympathetic with the Communists.

"The truth is, if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate, it has been the broadcasters, because they have consistently misrepresented the South and a people who are misrepresented necessarily resent such treatment.

"The press carried a statement last summer that a Citadel cadet while driving a young lady home from a dance at the Citadel, was fired upon by a young Negro. The bullet entered his jaw and was removed from his chin. No broadcaster talked about that being due to the climate of hate that was built up.

"Within 48 hours after that incident, Gen. Mark Clark, a distinguished general in the U.S. Army and a hero of the attempted assassination, driving to the Citadel, was fired upon. The bullet struck his car but fortunately he was not hurt. The press carried a statement of the attempted assassination but so far as we can recall, no broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate.

"When Oswald, who admittedly is a Communist sympathizer, and who gave the hammer and sickle salute (clenched fist) in the Dallas jail, killed the President of the United States, his act is attributed by Mr. Collins, to a climate of hate growing out of race prejudice."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

ORANGEBURG STATION RAPS COLLINS SPEECH

ORANGEBURG.—Radio station WDIX here yesterday took issue with a speech made by former Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

The editorial stated that Mr. Collins said many extreme and radical things but used the time to comment on only one point made by the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Mr. Collins said: "The assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' "

The full text of the editorial follows:

"Speaker at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia (S.C.) Chamber of Commerce was the Honorable Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida and now the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. The Associated Press reports the broadcasters' president as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' The broadcasters' president said many other extreme and radical things—intolerant and violent things. We will observe only the one thing—that Dixie battle cries fostered the assassination of President Kennedy.

"What Mr. Collins said was equally well said by the three top officers of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Gus Hall, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Benjamin J. Davis—also reported by the Associated Press that they 'called the President's assassination "the ultimate end * * * by the racists and forces of the ultraright,"' the Communist Party, U.S.A. What the Honorable Mr. Collins said and what the top Reds in the United States said, has also been said by the Communist news agency, Tass, since their first release on President Kennedy's death. The Honorable Mr. Collins, it must be noted, is joined by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Communists, in a similar view. That is the privilege of Chief Justice Warren and the Communists and the Honorable Mr. Collins—to smear the South, the segregationists,

and 'unnamed southern politicians' who advocate States rights.

"Thank goodness, not all responsible people—like the Honorable Mr. Collins—aline themselves in the manner he has. For instance, in referring to Supreme Court Justice Warren's statement about the 'forces of hatred and malevolence,' the Chicago Tribune said: 'This perverted thesis may be reduced to an attempt, naked and without apology, to liquidate dissent in the United States.' "

STATEMENT OF WALTER J. BROWN, PRESIDENT OF SPARTAN RADIOCASTING CO. AND FORMER PRESIDENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

It was "inappropriate" to use the words of the Columbia State, for Governor Collins to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion "to castigate the South and its spokesmen."

As a broadcaster, I go further and say Governor Collins broke faith with those of us who broadcast his speech when, without warning, he chose the occasion to impugn the motives of most southern leaders over a statewide broadcast which had been set with the written commitment that "Governor Collins will deal with the Government threat to the broadcasting industry."

In fairness to Governor Collins, it should be said that late in the afternoon he released his speech to news media, and Governor Russell, having seen an advance copy, had the opportunity in his introduction to issue a disclaimer, but the broadcasting stations carrying the broadcast had no such opportunity.

What I resented most about the Governor's speech was his attempt to link opposition to the so-called civil rights program to the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Everyone knows he was killed by a known Communist and Castro sympathizer. It is so unfair for anyone, whether he be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court or president of the National Association of Broadcasters, to contend that opposition by the people of the South or any other section to far-reaching proposals of the civil rights program pending in the Congress was in any way responsible for the trigger that was pulled in Dallas which took the President's life.

No one certainly would want to take from Governor Collins the right to say what he pleases about any subject at any time. However, he is the paid and recognized spokesman for broadcasters. When he makes a blanket indictment against the people of the South and a vast majority of their duly elected Members of Congress, we feel he oversteps his authority and does a disservice to broadcasting.

If Governor Collins wants to come South and talk about "claghorns," "bloody shirt wavers," and riders of "buckboards of bigotry," he should name names. At least this would enable those of us who broadcast his speech to offer equal time.

I know personally most of the southern leaders in Congress, as well as many of our southern Governors. We may not agree with them on all subjects, but none of them falls under the Governor's indictment.

I realize there is a hysteria sweeping the country about civil rights. Perhaps Governor Collins was swept away by this emotional virus when he came to Columbia. But as one broadcaster, I agree with Senator RUSSELL that this civil rights program takes away more liberty than it gives. It deserves calm and deliberate legislative consideration. Governor Collins made no contribution to that end and he made it difficult for those of us who agreed to serve with him in promoting better relations in the Congress for the worthwhile legislative objectives of our association.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND TO STATE OF DELAWARE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1767) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my desire to cooperate with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his bill, S. 1767; but as the author of the so-called Morse formula, I have the obligation of making sure that the Morse formula is not violated in this case.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 2, on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, contain provisions which relate directly to the Morse formula.

Subsection (a) of section 2 would not violate the formula if this subsection calls for the reconveyance of lands which were ceded—gratuitously conveyed—to the United States by the State of Delaware in 1873.

Therefore, first, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware if it is correct that the lands described in section 2(a) were acquired by the United States and the State of Delaware without compensation in 1873?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an act of the legislature as passed in Dover, Del., February 5, 1873, in which this land was ceded to the U.S. Government for a specific purpose.

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

[From Laws of Delaware, vol. 14, pt. 2, 1873]

CHAPTER 356 OF PUBLIC LANDS

An act to cede certain lands to the United States of America

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met,* That William D. Waples, N. W. Hickman, and Dr. D. H. Houston, of Sussex County, be and they are hereby appointed commissioners on the part of the State of Delaware, and they, or a majority of them, are hereby authorized and empowered, in conjunction with any agent or person appointed by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of War, to locate and fix the boundaries of any quantity of land belonging to the State of Delaware, not exceeding 2,100 feet front and 3,000 feet deep, from low water mark situated and lying on the Delaware Bay, southeast of the old mole, usually called the Government Mole, and between said old mole and the point of Cape Henlopen, and the land belonging to the State of Delaware, located and designated by the boundaries to be fixed and determined by the commissioners aforesaid in conjunction with the agent or person to be appointed as aforesaid by the President of the United States or by the Secretary of War, and all claim, title and right of soil and jurisdiction of the State of Delaware in, to, or over the same is hereby ceded to and vested in the United States in perpetuity; and that a plot of the land so located and hereby ceded as aforesaid be made and recorded in the office of the recorder in and for Sussex County: *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the land hereby ceded to the United States so far as that all civil and criminal process issued under any law of this State may be executed in any part of said lands and buildings or structures thereon erected.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the above cession of land and jurisdiction hereby made is upon the express condition that defenses, to be built by the United States at the Delaware breakwater harbor, shall be constructed thereon.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the north end of Reedy Island, in New Castle County, Del., not to exceed 50 acres, and also the ice harbor constructed on the east side thereof, be and the same are hereby ceded to the United States; and all claim, title, and right of soil and jurisdiction of the State of Delaware in, to, or over the same is hereby ceded to and vested in the United States in perpetuity; and that a plot of the land so located and hereby ceded as aforesaid be made and recorded in the office of the recorder in and for New Castle County: *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the land hereby ceded to the United States so far as that all civil and criminal process issued under any law of this State may be executed in any part of said lands and buildings or structures thereon erected or to be erected.

Passed at Dover, February 5, 1873.

(At this point Mr. INOUYE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. That being the case, reversion of this excess Federal land is implied, and under the Morse formula no compensation on section 2(a) lands is required. I should like to make this clear, because over the years the Morse formula has been under discussion in the Senate; it goes back to the year 1946. We have had a number of cases in which the Federal Government obtained parcels of land from a State gratuitously, with the understanding that the land would be used for a specific Federal use only. I have always pointed out that the clear implication is, under those circumstances, that when the Federal Government no longer has need of the land for such use, the land should revert to the State, the municipality, or the county that originally donated the land for specific purposes.

I say to the Senator from Delaware—and I am commenting now out of recollection—I am not so sure that some years ago he and I did not discuss the question when he helped me sustain the Morse formula in connection with a piece of property that involved one of these implied reversions.

I know such was the case with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in connection with the type of property or facility that I now mention which was involved in a bill in respect to a veterans hospital in Kentucky. This particular application of the Morse formula—or in these instances the nonapplication of it—has arisen in cases that involve veterans hospitals where a city or a State has donated to the Federal Government a rather large tract of land for a veterans hospital. Of course, the State or local officials were happy to bring a veterans hospital into a community, because it is a great economic asset to it. The Federal Government built the hospital and developed the facility, and then discovered that it had much more land than it really needed for the purpose, but having obtained it for that

purpose it had no right to keep the property for any other purpose.

Thus, we have had bills such as the Kentucky bill and the Roseburg, Oreg., bill and other bills pertaining to other parts of the country, involving implied reversion, in which the property reverted to the State or to the local agency donor.

In view of the answer of the Senator to my first question, that would be certainly true of all the property in section 2(a) of his bill previously alluded to.

A further question relative to the Morse formula is presented under section 2(b). This section calls for payment to the United States by the State of Delaware of "the amount of money determined by the Secretary of the Army to have been paid by the United States for the acquisition of subject lands."

We all know that land values throughout the Nation have increased in recent years. Where lands are to be used for public purposes, as in this case, the Morse formula requires payment of 50 percent of the fair appraised market value, with the inclusion of a reversionary clause. The bill includes the requisite reversionary clause but it does not follow verbatim the language of the Morse formula.

I have held a conference with the Senator from Delaware and we discussed the value of the land. On the basis of that discussion, I now ask him my second question:

Would the price to be paid for section 2(b) lands, as specified in that section, be equivalent to 50 percent of the present fair appraised market value of the land?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would, the portion of the land for which the Government paid as it obtained it. As I pointed out to the Senator from Oregon, there were several different portions of the land, but the particular part referred to is a portion of a 1,010-acre plot that was ceded to the Federal Government by act of the Delaware Legislature passed under date of April 24, 1945.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From Laws of Delaware, vol. 45, 1944–45]

CHAPTER 7: CESSION OF MILITARY RESERVATION TO UNITED STATES

An act granting the consent of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware to the acquisition by the United States of a certain tract or parcel of land in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Del., and ceding jurisdiction to the United States for certain purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met:

SECTION 1. That the consent of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware be, and the same is hereby given, pursuant to the 17th clause of the 8th section of the 1st article of the Constitution of the United States, to the acquisition by the United States of America of a certain tract or parcel of land situate in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Del., used in connection with a military reservation officially designated Fort Miles, being a part of the harbor defenses of Delaware, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone marked U.S., which stone is at the southwest corner of the U.S. Fort Reservation (ceded to the United States of America by act of Legislature of the State of Delaware, passed February 5, 1873), formerly known as the Delaware Breakwater Military Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation north 68°24'19", east 2104.6 feet to a stone marked U.S., which stone is the southeast corner of the said U.S. Fort Reservation; thence along the easterly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation; north 21°38'30", west 2243.5 feet to a monument on the southerly boundary of the U.S. Naval Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said U.S. Naval Reservation, north 89°57'30", east 1399.6 feet to the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean; thence southeastwardly along the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean 3,950 feet, more or less, to a stake in the northerly boundary of the former Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation (acquired by the United States of America, April 13, 1792); thence along the northerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation south 71°57'30", west 2353.7 feet to a monument at the northwest corner of said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation; thence along the westerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation south 18°2'8", east 3,298.4 feet to a monument at the southwest corner of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation, north 71°58'16", east 2,285 feet to a stake set in the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean; thence southeastwardly along the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean, 2,700 feet, more or less, to a stake; thence north 89°58'40", west 6,601.8 feet to a stake; thence due north 6,932.8 feet to a stake set in the southerly boundary line of a right-of-way now or formerly of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; thence crossing the said right-of-way and along lands of Mark T. McKee, formerly known as U.S. Pier Reservation, north 7°49'10", east 1,632.3 feet to the low water line of Delaware Bay; thence northeastwardly along the said low water line of Delaware Bay 243 feet, more or less to a stake; thence south 7°49'10", west 73 feet to a point in the high water line of Delaware Bay; thence northeastwardly along the said high water line of Delaware Bay 410 feet, more or less, to a stake set in the westerly boundary of the former U.S. Quarantine Reservation (ceded to United States of America by act of Legislature of the State of Delaware, approved May 5, 1941); thence along the westerly boundary of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation, south 24°39'0", east 1,183.4 feet to a stone set in the southwest corner of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation, north 65°21'0", east 611.9 feet to the westerly boundary of the aforesaid U.S. Fort Reservation, formerly known as the Delaware Breakwater Military Reservation; thence along the westerly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation, south 21°38'40", east 1,257.5 feet to the point or place of beginning.

Excepting a one-acre parcel of land located near the southeast corner of the above-described lands and bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, which lands are known as the Cape Henlopen Coast Guard Reservation (ceded to the United States of America by the State of Delaware, deed dated April 1, 1897).

Containing 1,010.8 acres of land, more or less.

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted,* That exclusive jurisdiction over the aforesaid land is hereby ceded to the United States of America for any of the purposes described in said clause of the Constitution of the United States; *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the said land so far as that all civil or criminal process issued under authority of any law of this State may be executed in any part of the land; said jurisdiction to continue so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer.

SEC. 3. *Be it further enacted,* That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

Approved April 24, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The State of Delaware did not receive anything for the 1,010 acres. There is one sentence in the act of the legislature which ceded the land to the Federal Government which I should like to read:

Said jurisdiction to continue so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer.

So that portion of land was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Delaware with the understanding that it would go back to the State. But on the remainder—that portion which the Federal Government received through condemnation and payment—when we reimburse them under the terms of this bill, in my opinion, it will more than meet the Morse formula.

Mr. MORSE. In connection with section 2(b), the only land that concerns me is land which the Federal Government bought from the State of Delaware. I have to be certain—and I believe the Senator made it possible for me to be certain—that, as of 1963 or 1964, the taxpayers of the United States will get, when the final deal is consummated, the equivalent of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value. They are not entitled, under the formula, to get 100 percent of the appraised fair market value but they are entitled, under the formula, to get only 50 percent.

For the purposes of the RECORD, I believe we should point out that we are dealing with land that really consists, for the most part, of sand. It is land that is so located that irrespective of what the Federal Government paid for it in the first place, it was important to the Federal Government to obtain it for quarantine purposes. That is what the Government sought it for. But it is so located that it would be, really, of little value at the present time, unless we took into account the specific purpose for which it will be used, which I will mention in a moment.

We are dealing not only with land that consists of sand, but also with land which the State of Delaware, by legislative action, has encumbered with a prohibition so far as its being used for taking out sand for commercial purposes. At one time in this area there were what we can call commercial sandpits. They were doing damage to the area, in the opinion of the lawmakers of Delaware, and they passed legislation, which at the present time prohibits use of the property for commercial purposes.

Am I not correct in my statement that that would really leave this land practically of no value, unless the Federal Government wants to use it for military purposes, and they are declaring this part surplus for that purpose; that it is practically valueless unless it is used for

the purpose that the Senator has in mind in his bill—for park or recreational purposes?

A part of this eventually will be used for Boy Scout or Girl Scout camp purposes, I believe. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The State does not permit removal of the sand from the beach area. The land would be valuable largely because of what the State wishes to do with it, which is to make it into a recreation park. The real value of the land in question comes from the value of the land which the State had turned over to the Government without payment. This would go back to the State under the agreement. The State itself owned the really valuable land around the beach. We now want to turn all of that into a park area.

As I pointed out, that land was deeded to the Federal Government at the beginning of the war, in 1941 and in 1945 for the establishment of a fort. It was deeded for national defense purposes. The act of the legislature specifically provided that the Federal Government could keep it so long as it was used for the purposes for which it was being acquired.

I have asked that the act of the legislature be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 7, 1963, signed by Leon de Valinger, Jr., State archivist, addressed to me. This letter, written upon the suggestion of Governor Carvel, of Delaware, reaffirms the fact that the other portion of the land was deeded to the Federal Government without any compensation whatever coming to the State of Delaware.

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

STATE OF DELAWARE,
PUBLIC ARCHIVES COMMISSION,
Dover, March 7, 1963.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Governor Carvel has referred your letter of February 22 to this office. On May 5, 1941, an act passed by the Delaware Legislature was approved ceding certain land to the United States for defense or other governmental purposes only. This is published in the Laws of Delaware, volume 43, chapter 4, pages 7 and 8. On April 24, 1945, another act of the general assembly was approved. It specifically defines the boundary of the Fort Miles Reservation as acquired by several previous cessions and provides that Federal jurisdiction shall continue "so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer." That act appears in Laws of Delaware, volume 45, chapter 7, pages 35–37. It also states that 1,010.8 acres of land, more or less, were acquired.

We do not find that any payment was made to the State of Delaware and it is obvious from the acts that it was ceded without payment by our State for national defense purposes. If we can supply you with any further information please call upon us. May I express the hope that you will be successful in having this land returned to our State.

Cordially yours,
LEON DEVALINGER, Jr.,
State Archivist.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of these statements by the Senator from Delaware, the land itself, covered by section 2(b) of the bill, certainly does not fall under any restriction of the Morse formula.

That leaves me only one further point, a third point which I raise with the Senator from Delaware for clarification purposes.

On some of the property there are located some old Army barracks, I am advised by the Senator from Delaware. There have been cases considered by the Senate in the past in which the Federal Government has invested huge sums of taxpayers' money on improvements on land and, at the time it was sought to return the land and the improvements to the State or city or county or other governmental agency. I always made clear that the taxpayers were entitled to compensation for the improvements. The Morse formula applies to the improvements, for half of their fair market value, in a case involving public use. The Senator from Delaware is aware of that.

No Senator has ever been more cooperative with the Senator from Oregon over the years in connection with the Morse formula than has the Senator from Delaware. On many occasions the Senator has said to me, "You are correct. Stick by your guns," or language to that effect, "So long as you are consistent and make no exceptions you will always find me supporting you."

The Senator has supported me on the Morse formula, and he is supporting me today on the Morse formula.

When we have considered these cases involving so-called improvements, the improvements have been of value.

I have talked to the Senator from Delaware about the old Army barracks which are on a portion of this sand area which is involved in the program.

I ask Senators to keep in mind that this all goes back to the 1870's and 1880's, so far as the quarantine aspect is concerned. The barracks, of course, are of much later vintage than that.

The real purpose for obtaining this property in the first place was to get a quarantine station. The Government had it for a while as a Federal quarantine station, and then the Federal Government decided it did not wish it any more for that purpose, and the land reverted back to the State of Delaware. Then at a later date the Federal Government decided it wanted a quarantine station again, so it asked for the land again, and there was set up a second time a quarantine station.

Then, as we got into the period of war, there were some barracks erected on the land.

I wish to talk about those barracks for just a moment. It is my understanding—and the Senator from Delaware can correct me if I am not correct—that so far as the present or future use of the barracks is concerned, they are valueless. In other words, they are not worth the price of demolishing them. So far as the State of Delaware is concerned, if the Federal Government wishes to go in and demolish them and pay for the cost of demolishing them that would be perfectly satisfactory, save and except for one item which I will mention in a moment.

I wish to make that very clear, because I do not want any Senator to come to me later this year, or next year, or in the years ahead, to say, "Listen, WAYNE, you gave Delaware some old barracks and you did not make the State pay for them."

I will make the State pay for them, if they are worth anything.

Mr. President, if it is true, as the Senator from Delaware assures me, that these barracks are not worth the demolition cost, I am not going to go through what would amount really to a matter of form and not a matter of substance.

I understand that on a part of this sandy area there may be some old barracks that the State might permit to be used for recreational purposes, for the Boy Scouts or some other club or organization.

Although the Senator from Delaware is not sure whether they are still in the area or not, there may be some old guns and emplacements that really belong to the Federal Government, which could be left for ornamental purposes, and as interesting attractions for young people who might be using that area of land as a Boy Scout or Girl Scout camp, at the pleasure and sufferance of the State of Maryland.

Am I correct in stating for the RECORD today that these old barracks really can be said to be of no value, even for salvage, because it would be more costly to salvage them than to let them stand or fall apart?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If a war should break out tomorrow and the Government needed them the Government has an investment in them which would be worth a lot of money. However, when the Government abandoned the fort and area it abandoned all the need for these barracks, and now they represent only an expense. As one officer pointed out, it is now costing the Government about $5,000 a month to maintain the barracks in an idle status. The Government would like to get rid of this expense.

If we do not follow the requested procedure, the barracks would have to be torn down and sold in commercial outlets for whatever salvage could be obtained.

The State is planning to open all of this area up into a park. The bill provides specifically that the area will remain in the possession of the State only so long as the State uses it for such recreational or educational purposes. The State now has plans to keep a portion of the barracks, perhaps for use by the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts of the surrounding communities. For that reason some of the barracks may be preserved. Other than that, they represent the expense of tearing down.

It has been my experience that when one is involved in tearing down a building one cannot even give it away.

As the Senator has pointed out, I do not know whether there are any old guns left on the property which were installed during World War II. I have asked the

Army if they have not moved them, to leave them, if they could. By the time they moved them and melted them down the recovery would not be much.

Since this area is to be turned into a State park it would be most advantageous if the guns could be left. I am not sure they have not been demolished. If not, we will try to persuade the Army to leave them.

Mr. MORSE. So far as those guns are concerned, I believe they would come under the so-called Monument Act, anyway, and would not be involved in the Morse formula.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not believe they would either.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further point in respect to the barracks. I hope the Senator will correct me if I am in error, but it is my understanding that if we take into account the amount of money which the Government will get back from Delaware under the terms of the bill—the Senator has already stated it will be at least equal to 50 percent of the fair market value—and if we take into account the small value of the barracks and the limited purposes to which they could be put to use, plus the fact that there is a reverter clause in the bill, if it ever becomes necessary for the Federal Government to take back the property for Federal uses the Government will have the power, and the taxpayers will suffer no loss in respect to the barracks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think so. As a State we would be delighted for them to clear the barracks and take them away.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware very much for his fine cooperation in regard to this question, because, as he knows, the Senate has increasingly cooperated with me in respect to the application of the formula. Seldom do I have to raise an objection to the violation of this formula, because it has become one of the accepted policies of the Senate, and has resulted, as we know, in a saving of a good many millions of dollars over the years to the taxpayers of the country. I say to the majority leader that not only do I raise no objection to the bill, but I support it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am very happy to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware, in support of this bill, S. 1767, which we have cosponsored.

The merits of the bill are plain: Delaware donated most of the Fort Miles area without cost to the Federal Government during World War II and now wants to recover surplus Government land for use by the public.

The land in question was considered common land for public use for more than 250 years before the Federal Government took it over in 1941.

It is important to emphasize that the State of Delaware will repay the Federal Government the amount it paid for the property in question.

The State of Delaware has drawn up plans for development of the area as Cape Henlopen State Park and as a University of Delaware education center.

My State, Mr. President, is not large as it is, and acquisition of this property will be of great benefit to it.

I strongly urge passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FORMER GOV. LEROY COLLINS OF FLORIDA—A NEW VOICE IN THE SOUTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon one of our colleagues expressed disapproval of the speech delivered by the former Governor of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, Mr. Leroy Collins. The speech was delivered on December 3, 1963, at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S.C.

When I spoke on this subject the other day, during the morning hour, I did not have a copy of the speech. I had only a news account of the speech. I praised the speech most highly as typical of the new voice of the South. It is only fair to Governor Collins, in view of the comments which were made on the floor of the Senate that a copy of that speech, which I have subsequently received, be published at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY LEROY COLLINS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GREATER COLUMBIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, COLUMBIA, S.C.

It is a high privilege for me to be here in Columbia, and to participate in this Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce annual meeting of 1963.

I like South Carolina, and I always have. Yours is a State rich in history and exciting in opportunity.

Your distinguished Governor, Donald Russell, who honors us all by his presence here tonight, is a public leader of conspicuous competence and of uncommon dedication.

I would like to add my warm congratulations to all of your chamber of commerce officers and committees. You have had a remarkably successful year; and, while the rank-and-file support of your membership doubtless has been excellent, special praise is due all who have supplied the leadership.

My message this evening is being carried by many broadcasters across this State. I am grateful to them. I also salute them, along with all other broadcasters, for their enormous efforts in reporting to the American people and to the world the story of our Nation in the agony of its trial after the assassination of President Kennedy. As soon as the first dastardly shot was fired in Dallas, response of news broadcasters was immediate. It became complete, and reflected the highest skill and dedication.

This was the free broadcaster at his finest. No one from the Government had to make the slightest move to get him going, or to keep him at his task, or to hold out any hope that his commercial losses would be offset in any way or shared by anyone else. It was his job. And in performing it, he "asked not what the country could do for him, but only what he could do for his country."

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and "raising" than I am. I love this land. Some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I think South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

I have tried to be a southerner who speaks plainly on sensitive issues, and you are sons and daughters of a State which, from the time of Sumter and Pickens and Calhoun, has been characterized by forthright debate.

Doubtless as you have detected down the years, a number of people in other neighborhoods of America have not always agreed with the forthright talk emerging from South Carolina. But debate, if it is honest and thoughtful, refines the decisions in our Republic and makes them more intelligent.

I have not come to address old grievances. It is the future of the South and of our Nation I wish to take up with you here tonight. And the one is inseparable from the other.

I would hope first that we might consider as our own the creed of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who, once exasperated by his critics in the Senate when he was the leader of that forum, sought to explain himself in these terms: "I am a freeman, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order."

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

We also like to speak of the "new, new South," which glitters with projections of future prosperity almost beyond comprehension. And I firmly believe that you and I will see all this come to pass in our lifetimes.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made.

They have done it in speeches on the floor of Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—

egged on by the rabble-rousers' call to "stand up and fight."

It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward.

The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina.

And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream.

There has been no need for Federal marshals patrolling your university campuses, thanks to the good sense and respect for law among the people of this State.

You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate.

Yes, there are forces at work in the South—men and women who do not have their faces turned backward, stalwart men and women who have not received the headlines and public notices which have been accorded the more sensational examples of lack of progress, but who have been in the vanguard of progress nonetheless.

There is a story which came out of World War I. I do not vouch for its literal accuracy. In fact, there are many reasons for doubting its truth in detail. But its message rings true.

Three American soldiers—one a Protestant, one a Catholic, and one a Jew—became fast friends as they marched and fought together in France. They entered into a pact committing the survivors to do everything possible for the family of any one of them who might be killed in action.

In a battle soon afterward, on the outskirts of a small French village, the Protestant boy was killed. The only place of worship was a little Catholic church. The Catholic boy and the Jewish boy asked the priest of this little church for permission to have their friend buried in the church cemetery adjoining. But when the priest learned that the dead boy was not Catholic, he regretfully declined, pointing out that under the regulations of the church the cemetery had been established and blessed for the burial of Catholics only.

After considerable discussion of the point, the priest suggested as an alternative that the burial be made just outside the fence of the cemetery and said, "Here we will be sure to see that the grave is cared for and not desecrated, just as faithfully as we care for the graves on the inside."

The arrangement was worked out, and the two boys who survived went on through the war. When peace came, they returned to their homes in the United States.

They had the understanding, however, that 3 years from the date their friend was killed they would meet in the French village and together visit the grave.

When this day came, they met as agreed and soon came to the little church. But when they arrived just outside the fence where they had buried their friend, they were shocked to see no sign of the grave. Angrily, they found the old priest and scolded him for his neglect.

Then the old father took the two young men out into the cemetery and led them down the inside of the fence. There was the grave just as the soldiers had left it. Then he said, "You know, some time after you left, I went back and studied our regulations further. I found it to be very clear that while I was not permitted to allow the burial inside the fence, there was nothing which prevented me from later moving the fence over."

Fellow southerners, we can talk about our mores, our local laws and customs, the low standards of many Negroes, but the time has come when we must move some fences.

The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order or a legislative act. But while courts and laws cannot change the innermost dictates of the human conscience, courts and laws most certainly can control the acts of men.

This task of assuring racial justice is no easy one for us in the South—nor is it for those in the North. But Americans everywhere must recognize that this is a national commitment and a national necessity. It is not going away.

The advancement of all rights of national citizenship, as we well know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government if local citizens and local and State governments do not move effectively to accomplish this on their own.

Yet, too many politicians down our way have been hoodwinking the people on the civil rights issue. They have been trying to pretend, for their own personal political advantage, that the changes which are coming over the hill really are not there. They talk defensively of States rights when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty.

Any rational man who looks at the horizon and sees the South of the future segregated is simply seeing a mirage.

"That all men are created equal" is not an empty cliche. It was not put in our Declaration of Independence by Jefferson merely to stir our revolutionary forces to greater sacrifice.

It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment. It is the basic idea which supports the dignity of man as an individual.

It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

It may be thwarted—it may be delayed—its triumph may be at great cost and sacrifice—but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right.

Aside from human attitudes the most basic changes which must occur to aid us in resolving our racial difficulties is the improvement of the standards of living of all underprivileged Americans. The taproot of future progress is greatly expanded and improved public education for all American youngsters.

While in the Florida Legislature many years ago, I undertook the leadership for the passage of legislation known as the minimum foundation program. Under it, the State government guaranteed to every child in Florida, regardless of where he lived or how poor his county, a public education of no less quality than certain prescribed standards. This has worked quite well, and other States have developed similar plans.

There was talk at the time that a program like this would rob local communities of local interest and influence, but this did not turn out to be the case.

Now, I feel that we should mount in this country a massive national minimum foundation plan under which the nation would assure to every child an education adequate to the full development of his talents.

This would call for the supplementing of local resources in proportion to need. It could enable us to close our educational gap and bring to an end our vicious cycle of ignorance breeding more ignorance with resulting impoverishment of body, intellect and spirit.

This is not only a national need; I say it is a necessity. We must do this to enable the nation better to meet its adversaries in a hostile and competitive world. But, more importantly, we must do it to provide for American children a seedbed of simple justice which is now their rightful heritage, although for millions it has not been their inheritance.

Our country has a right to expect the best from all of us, regardless of where we live.

And just as it is wrong for anyone, including some southerners, to sell the South short, by the same token we in the South have no right to go off in a corner and sulk.

Southerners, like Americans from every section of this land, have a solemn obligation to make whatever general and unique contributions they can to the national good.

It is high time the South rid itself of any political inferiority complex.

Leadership in the South—business, professional, educational and political—instead of being rejected out of hand nationally must be regarded as a valuable resource in the role which America must play in meeting the challenge of history.

Some politicans in other regions of the Nation contended that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership. And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy.

After all, where was this Republic founded? By whom were our Nation's principles of freedom and individual dignity hammered out?

So much of this came from the minds of Washington and Jefferson and Henry. The young Republic was nourished by the philosophies of Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Southerners all.

The South should be bright and optimistic indeed, as we face the future.

To become a more vital part of the Nation's effort for the fulfillment of national goals will not demean our posture as States, but enhance it. It will not be a retreat, but an advance. It will not be a defeat, but a victory.

My fellow countrymen, a few long days ago our young President was struck down on the street of an American city. Good men have differences, and many Americans had differences with John Kennedy. But I do not know of any fellow countryman who, after rendezvousing with his soul, would not share the sweet dream of John Kennedy for a better America or his dedication to move his dreams toward reality. He was the unusual heroic person in politics who thought not in terms of years, but in terms of generations and of what America must be for our children and the children of our children.

Just a few days before his death, President Kennedy was talking to one of our leading southern editors—a very close friend—William Baggs of the Miami News, about the year A.D. 2000, and of what we, in our generation, must plant and plow up

to make this country right for its sons and daughters in A.D. 2000.

I say to you tonight that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet.

This has not been anything like the speech that last week I expected to make here.

But the other day, as I followed the caisson drawn by the six white horses to Arlington's green hillside and listened to the bugler's mournful cry and saw the flame lighted on the grave as if to hold back at least a tiny part of the approaching darkness, my conscience grew heavy with the long promise of history: "Beyond the sundown is tomorrow's wisdom; today is going to be a long, long ago."

Oh, God of all mankind, help us to find that wisdom. Help us to make today count for more than its sorrows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some of the editorial material which was inserted in the RECORD this afternoon sought to cast reflection on the mental stability of Governor Collins. That is an old smear technique. It is particularly a smear technique used by yellow journalists, whose number is legion.

One need only read this truly great speech of Governor Collins to realize that we have here a mentality which is far ahead of the bigotry that characterizes so much of his opposition, and that any reflection upon him by yellow journalism is to his credit and not to his discredit.

I once again praise Governor Collins for his courage and for his foresight and for his challenge not only to the South, but also to all Americans.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in the praise of Governor Collins. It was my privilege last Sunday to participate in a seminar and convocation in Los Angeles under the auspices of the Fund for the Republic and the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions. I heard Governor Collins on the subject of federalism, and the relationships between Federal and State governments. It was a masterful address, thoughtful and provocative, and it indicated a sense of foresight and imagination that qualifies this man for the title of great leader. I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has given him due credit and praise, because he deserves it. He is a marvelous public servant and a fine citizen.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, because the Senate was extremely pressed for time, I did not, during my presentation of the conference report, find the time to say all I wished to say.

Yesterday and again today I had expressed my deep appreciation and thanks to the Members of the Senate conference and their great help to me in finally succeeding in that conference to come forth with an acceptable bill.

I wish to thank again the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], whose help to me has been of inestimable value. I also thank the majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I counseled with him time and again. I should think that he would have grown weary of my requests for counseling with him in handling these education bills.

He arranged the schedule in the Senate for my convenience time and time again when we thought it was most propitious to offer these two major bills. He cooperated, and spoke to my conferees about postponing action on the higher education bills on the floor of the Senate until a conference report was adopted by the conferees. I want him to know how appreciative I am.

I also wish to thank our colleagues on the House side. I am satisfied that one need only read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, from beginning to end, which I have done, to realize that no vocational bill would have come out of the House by way of conference acceptance had it not been for the leadership of the Representative from New York [Mr. POWELL]. He performed efficiently and effectively during the conference. We were deadlocked time and time again, and time and time again he was most helpful in finding areas of agreement which would make it possible for us to resolve our disagreement.

I thank him very much, indeed.

I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee in the House from which subcommittee the House vocational bill came in the first place, the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative PERKINS.

I am not trying to give undue credit, or to draw any lines of distinction, because there was no one in favor of the bill on the House conference side who was not of great help to me.

I mention Representative BRADEMAS of Indiana, and Representative GREEN of Oregon. Some of the greatest help came to me from Representative LANDRUM of Georgia. I know the Senate enjoys a chuckle now and then. All one has to do is read the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning to enjoy a chuckle. I enjoyed one this morning when I read that debate. Apparently Representative LANDRUM was having a little difficulty with some of his southern colleagues in regard to the bill. In effect, he said, as the RECORD shows, that if the Representative from Georgia can find himself in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, and if both can sign the same report, it cannot be a bad report.

It was that wonderful attitude on the part of Representative LANDRUM that was so helpful in getting the bill adopted.

There is not one of them to whom I do not wish to pay my respects.

I particularly wish to mention, however, Representative POWELL and Representative PERKINS. I mention these two men because they had the official responsibility of leadership on the House side.

Representative POWELL was the chairman of the House conferees, and Representative PERKINS was the chairman of the subcommittee from which the vocational bill came in the first place.

I know whereof I speak when I point out that the education bills, about which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] spoke, have resulted in Congress—and it is Congress, not individuals—making a record in the field of education which has not been equaled in a hundred years, which has not been equaled since the Morrill Act of 1862. The President of the United States was quite right in pointing out that historic fact.

I am greatly indebted to all of them for their assistance in bringing that record to pass.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express one Senator's appreciation of the great work that has been undertaken and accomplished by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The program of higher education, vocational education, the extension of national defense education, and education for impacted areas, that has been adopted by Congress is the most comprehensive, far-reaching, generous program of Federal aid to education that this Nation has ever known. It stands alongside the great Morill Act and the Land-Grant College Act, two of the great programs of the 1860's.

The Higher Education Act surely will bear the title of the Morse-Green Act, because the two distinguished citizens of Oregon, Senator MORSE and Representative GREEN, had so much to do with these legislative achievements. I commend both of them.

I was talking with the Senator from Oregon today. In our conversation, he told me that he introduced his first bill on higher education in 1947. I have always known that the Senator from Oregon is a tenacious, persevering, and persistent gentleman. I have tangled with him in debate on occasion. That is an exhilarating experience that ought not to be tried too often. I commend him on his tenacity and perseverance, because while it took 16 years for the Senator to accomplish his objective, he has been able to achieve it. It is a splendid record.

So far as vocational education is concerned, we are all indebted to the leadership of our late President, who admonished us and advised us and sent us the message on vocational education, expanding its activity and its scope. But the bill also had the guiding hand of the Senator from Oregon, and he has been most generous.

The bill has also received the guidance of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the other members of the committee. But I am sure the Senator from Oregon would agree with me that the honors for the bill ought to be shared by many.

I hope that when the President signs the bill, and when he speaks of it as the Higher Education Act, he will refer to it as the Morse-Green Act; and that when he signs the vocational education bill, he will refer to it as the Powell-Morse-Perkins Act.

It seems to me that that would be according just and proper honor to those who have done so much toward the enactment of that measure.

I salute the Senator from Oregon for his singular achievement.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the graciousness of the Senator from Minnesota. Although he is not a member of my subcommittee, he is the Democratic whip of the Senate. I have already paid my thanks to the majority leader; but the whip knows that he, too, has participated in many of these conversations. He has been instrumental in helping to bring these bills into a position so that they could be passed. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN TERMINAL LEASES FROM PENALTIES UNDER THE SHIPPING ACT OF 1916

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 751, S. 2317.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2317) to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

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 Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 814), be amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: *"Provided, however,* That the penalty provisions of this section shall not apply to leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities which were entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, and, if continued in effect beyond said date, submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval prior to or within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, unless such leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements for the use of terminal facilities are disapproved, modified, or canceled by the Commission and are continued in operation without regard to the Commission's action thereon. The Commission shall promptly approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify each such agreement in accordance with the provisions of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2317) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 770), explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, imposes civil penalties of up to $1,000 for each day an agreement required by that section to be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission is in effect prior to Commission approval. S. 2317, as reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, would amend section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, so as to exempt from the penalty provisions of that section leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of marine terminal property or facilities entered into prior to the date of enactment of this bill. However, those agreements for the use of terminal facilities that continue in effect beyond the date of enactment would be required to be filed within 90 days with the Federal Maritime Commission in order to be within the amnesty provided by this bill. Any such agreement that was continued in effect without regard to cancellation, modification, or disapproval by the Federal Maritime Commission would subject the parties to that agreement to civil penalties under section 15 of up to $1,000 for each day the agreement was in effect prior to Commission approval. Any agreement subject to the filing requirements of section 15 entered into subsequent to the date of enactment would not be included in the amnesty to be afforded by S. 2317.

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

The Federal Maritime Commission, charged with administration of the Shipping Act and more knowledgeable as to marine terminal problems than any other governmental body, has requested this legislation. Under section 15, agreements between persons subject to the Shipping Act which involve "fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares; giving or receiving special rates, accommodations, or other special privileges or advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition, * * * or in any manner providing for an exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangement" must be filed with the Commission, and parties to the agreement are subject to penalties of up to $1,000 for each day the agreement is in effect prior to compliance and Commission approval. Until 1959 it had never been assumed that lease-type agreements for the use of terminal facilities were within that language, nor had the Federal Maritime Board ever contended that such agreements were subject to section 15.

The Federal Maritime Board (predecessor of the Federal Maritime Commission) changed this situation in 1959 by determining that a lease-type arrangement between Baton Rouge Port Commission and Cargill, Inc., was subject to the terms of section 15. This determination was upheld in *Baton Rouge Port Commission* v. *United States* (287 F. 2d 86 (5th Cir. 1961), cert. den., 368 U.S. 985 (1962)).

Leases of terminal facilities usually contain requirements that the lessee operate the facilities in accord with specified standards and often grant future rights to the lessee. The *Baton Rouge* case involved a lease which required the lessee to charge rates competitive with and not greater than charged at other gulf ports, and afforded the lessee a right of first refusal to lease additional facilities. It is the presence of such covenants that has brought lease-type agreements within the requirements of section 15, even though for over 40 years such provisions had never been considered within the scope of that section.

Immediately following the *Baton Rouge* decision, port authorities began filing lease-type agreements, some of which had been in effect for a number of years, and others of which had terminated in years past.

The committee bill, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

"That section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 814), be amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: *'Provided, however,* That the penalty provisions of this section shall not apply to leases, licenses, assignments or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities which were entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, and, if continued in effect beyond said date, submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval prior to or within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, unless such leases, licenses, assignments or other agreements for the use of terminal facilities are disapproved, modified, or cancelled by the Commission and are continued in operation without regard to the Commission's action thereon. The Commission shall promptly approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify each such agreement in accordance with the provisions of this section.' "

Although incorporating three technical changes, S. 2317, as reported, in no way departs from the intent and purpose of the bill as introduced. These changes were advocated and supported by all witnesses at the hearing, including the Federal Maritime Commission.

The first change is that agreements within the amnesty be described as "leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities" rather than merely "leases, licenses, or assignments" of such facilities. This change was adopted in order to assure that all agreements intended to be within S. 2317 would receive that benefit even though they are not labeled as a lease, license, or assignment, or considered such under strict property concepts. It is intended that the amnesty apply to agreements involving a conveyance of some interest in terminal facilities, even though not technically leases, licenses, or assignments, if of a character similar to such arrangements.

The second change from the bill as introduced is that the amnesty be applied to all agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment rather than prior to the arbitrary date of October 1, 1963, as originally provided. The date of enactment seems a more logical cutoff date, and technical problems that would be raised in the case of a lease entered into before October 1, 1963, and expiring after that date yet prior to the date of enactment are avoided.

The final change from the bill as introduced is that only agreements continuing in effect beyond the date of enactment are required to be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission. The bill as introduced would have required all lease-type agreements not previously filed and approved be submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission, even though such agreements may have terminated many years ago.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLOSING OF DEFENSE PLANTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, more and more angles are coming to light in connection with the supposedly straightforward announcement by the Department of Defense about a "great economy program" which, so we are told, is underway.

I have just returned from a meeting with Representative PIRNIE, of New York,

and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in regard to the announced closing of the Roama Base, in Rome, N.Y. At a hurriedly assembled meeting on Wednesday, we were told by the Deputy Secretary of Defense that 7,500 jobs would be affected by that closing. That figure was used in newspaper accounts and otherwise.

Now we are told that the actual figure is 3,800. That change is a welcome one, insofar as it goes, of course, for that figure is about half the one we were originally given. But that change is an indication of the fact that this entire matter was not thought through, but instead, was hurriedly concocted in order to give a great show of "economy," in a move which I intend to demonstrate is no economy at all.

When this "great economy move" was first presented to the members of the New York congressional delegation, on Wednesday, at a meeting with high Defense Department officials, we were also told that about "35 installations will be closed throughout the country."

We were told that one—perhaps two—eastern Navy yards would be closed, but that the closing would not include the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] asked the Defense Department whether there was any bright spot in the picture. They said yes. The closing of one or two Navy yards on the east coast should give more work to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Between Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning someone changed his mind. We are now told that there is no present plan as to anything affecting the Navy yards at Philadelphia and Boston, which were originally involved. The final list of closings issued in a press release by the Defense Department on Thursday was revealing. Quite a few States had one—often a small installation—reduced or eliminated. A few had two. California had four. Texas had two, one of which had already been completely deactivated.

New York, which has recently been bearing the brunt of the so-called Defense Department economy, has seven closing down. The seven do not include Fort Slocum, in New Rochelle, N.Y., containing the Army Information School, which the Defense Department decided to remove from the New York area—from the center of the information industry—some months ago.

It also does not include the anticipated personnel reduction in the Plattsburgh Air Force Base, which will undoubtedly be announced as soon as Congress recesses.

So the total extent of the loss to New York is not seven bases but closer to nine—more than twice as many as any other State.

These are not obsolete bases. A distinguished journal of our country in an editorial today states that the purpose of a $50 billion-plus defense budget is to provide national security, not job security, and that national security is much better advanced by modern weapons than by obsolete installations.

That is the result of more Defense Department propaganda. There is no one in any position of authority of whom I know who calls either Rome or Schenectady—the two most seriously affected in the State of New York—obsolete installations. Indeed, there is not a single activity of Rome which is not to be transferred to some other base. It has the most up-to-date equipment there is. It is an electronics procurement center. Electronics is certainly one area of activity in the Air Force which is far from obsolete.

The journal I referred to also contained the following sentence:

> Senator KEATING's outrageous complaints about unemployment in New York may be true but they are irrelevant.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that I do not consider that they are irrelevant. When there is unemployment in my State I intend to continue to "yelp" about it. I believe that is the duty of a Senator representing any State, particularly when that State is singled out for an increase in unemployment.

If these New York installations were procuring obsolete aircraft or were stockpiling Civil War cannon, I certainly would not be objecting in any way to their closing. Both the Rome base and the Schenectady Army Depot are doing a job that will still have to be done, but for some reason the Defense Department does not want to have it done in the State of New York.

This work, and some other jobs, will be transferred to installations in other States that have much lower efficiency ratings and not nearly so good a performance record as these New York installations. These New York activities rank high in efficiency, and always have.

The Defense Department talks about economy. Let us analyze that a moment. In the already depressed areas, like Rome and Schenectady, which qualify for direct Federal assistance to make more jobs, the cost of creating these jobs is roughly, by their own estimates, $4,230 per job per year.

The Federal Government would have to spend nearly $38 million in upstate New York alone to counteract the depressing economic impact of Defense Department so-called economies.

What does the Defense Department say? In a rather cold manner, without much concern for the feelings of the people who will be directly affected at this season of the year—perhaps we cannot expect anything better from the Defense Department—they say, "It is not our responsibility."

Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Congress, of the President of the United States, and of the taxpayers of this country if it is going to cost $38 million to save $5 million.

Yesterday, I introduced proposed legislation to require a study by the Area Redevelopment Administration of the immediate and long-term impact of these actions. This is the kind of information that the country needs, in order properly to evaluate what the Defense Department advertises in its propaganda as great moneysaving economies. This is precisely the kind of information that the Defense Department does not have and does not care about. But it is vitally important.

In the meeting we attended, I asked a question. There are eight of the so-called "AMA's," or air materiel areas, Roama in Rome, N.Y., one of the eight. The Defense Department is closing one. They are picking out one with a high efficiency rating. I said, "How many of the others are located in depressed areas or in areas of substantial unemployment?"

The answer was, "We do not know. We do not know."

When pressed on that, the Secretary said, "We do know that the Rome Air Force Base is in the most depressed area of any of them."

The fact is that none of the others is located in depressed areas. *This is the* only one, and they recognized and knew, when they made the decision, that Rome was today the hardest hit of any. Hearings on the bill which I have introduced and which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], would provide the Congress and the country with much needed additional information and would open the way to a more intelligent overall decision as to the wisdom of these particular moves.

I am certainly not opposed to genuine economies in Government which are in the national interest. Indeed, I emphatically urge real and not fancied economies.

I am not opposed to closing down any obsolete or inefficient facilities, wherever located, either in the State of New York or anywhere else. That should have been done before now.

But I certainly am opposed to actions done for advertising purposes which will do more harm in the long run than good and to actions which at least up to this time have not been adequately explained and justified. Propaganda press releases should not be allowed to be a substitute for proof.

Hearings on the legislation which we have introduced will be an important step in the full, honest, and objective evaluation of what is going on.

Moreover, Mr. President, I have asked those responsible for economic development in the affected areas in New York to supply me as soon as possible with their views and available data as to the effects in the areas they are familiar with. This information, as well as the Defense Department figures, is an important part of the record and should be fully available.

This whole problem should be looked at not merely from the point of view of economies in one department of Government, but with a consideration of the question, "Will it result in an overall economy?"

Requests have come to the Congress for a billion dollars more money this year for the Area Redevelopment Agency, which is to take care of areas exactly like Rome and Schenectady. Both of those areas qualify for aid under that act. It makes no sense at all for a great advertisement to be made that we are to save $100 million, if it will cost $1 billion or $500 million or several times the $100 million to effect the saving.

One way to make the facts known is to have hearings on the legislation which we have introduced. I urgently appeal to the appropriate committees to conduct hearings so that the facts can be brought out and so that we will not have these one-sided statements from one Government department as to the great economies which are being effected.

MILITARY SPENDING REDUCTIONS: AN OPPORTUNITY, NOT A CATASTROPHE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday and today news stories have appeared announcing plans by the Defense Department to phase out a number of military installations which are believed not necessary for our national defense.

It has been indicated that 33 installations in 14 States will be closed or reduced, affecting an estimated 16,000 civilian employees.

Press reports tell of strong protests from Members of Congress who represent areas where surplus military installations are located.

The concern of Members of Congress in the communities affected by the phase out of these installations is of course understandable, but I believe it reveals a strange situation. Have we become so dependent upon military spending that we now regard the Defense Department as a kind of public relief agency? We cannot afford to freeze our Defense Establishment into a permanent WPA. This would endanger both our military security and the economic strength of the country.

We must be prepared, as the Secretary of Defense indicated, to accept defense cuts resulting either from shifts in weapons systems or from reductions in total defense or disarmament. Any one of these contingencies can create temporary unemployment.

I believe that what is needed is conversion planning, to minimize or avert economic dislocations caused by defense changes, rather than resistance to every proposal designed to benefit taxpayers; not only that, but also we need to streamline, to give ourselves a more efficient Defense Establishment.

Are we asking our Secretary of Defense to plan the enormously costly defense of our country on the basis of how many men he can keep working in military installations that are surplus to our real defense needs?

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator believe that Congress is entitled to have it proved that a closing is in fact a real economy and not a fancied economy?

Mr. McGOVERN. I cannot agree with the interpretation the Senator from New York has placed on the motivation of the Secretary of Defense. I respect the Senator's right, as a representative of the State of New York, to express his views to the Defense Department and to receive careful consideration of the objections he has raised.

Mr. KEATING. I respectfully suggest that that does not exactly answer my question. Whatever motivations are involved, one way or another, it seems to me it is the responsibility of Congress to look not only at defense but also at all factors, including unemployment; and that it is appropriate and proper for a Member of Congress to ask the question, "Will this closing effect a real economy in taxpayers' dollars or will it cost more in the long run than to continue the installation at a reduced figure?"

I should like to know whether the Senator disagrees with that.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is a legitimate concern. My own view on this is that we should not base our Defense Establishment on considerations as to how we are to take care of our employment needs. The only criterion should be what will give the Nation the best possible Defense Establishment.

The problem to which the Senator referred both in his question and in his earlier remarks is an important one. It involves the question as to what we should do with respect to areas of economic depression and what we should do with respect to related unemployment problems in those areas.

This is not a matter under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. I believe it is an area the Congress should deal with, using such programs as the manpower training program and construction of needed public facilities, such as classrooms for our young people, hospitals, improvement of city transportation systems, and other things which will put men and women to work on useful, needed functions. We should not ask the Secretary of Defense to continue unnecessary installations insofar as our defense needs are concerned.

Mr. KEATING. Let me put the case to the Senator this way: If the activities carried on at a base are absolutely essential to the operations of our Defense Establishment and are admitted to be such, would not the Senator agree that one factor—I do not necessarily say the controlling factor—properly to be considered by the Defense Department is whether those activities shall be carried on at a present installation which is in a depressed area or shall be moved to another area which has no problem of unemployment whatever?

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator's assumption that the activities are essential to our national defense is correct, then, of course, that is a different matter. My understanding has been that, after a careful review of these defense installations that have been recommended for phasing out, the Secretary of Defense has actually concluded that they are not contributing to our defense.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield further—and I do not want to interfere with the continuity of his presentation—perhaps the Senator, not being involved in the problem from the point of view of South Dakota, has not given to this matter the study we have. I have just come from a meeting at which the Secretary of the Air Force said that procurement of electronic equipment, which the Senator and I know is one of the most important areas in the Air Force, and which is the activity at the Rome Air Base, of course, must be carried on and expanded, but it is proposed to move that activity to a lot of different bases.

If that work were to be given up, I would not for a moment protest it, but it seems to me that one of the factors to be considered is that Rome is a depressed area, and those facilities will be moved from that area into areas that have no problems of unemployment. That is the factual situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. When the Senator states those facts, I think there is great merit to the point he makes.

On the general matter to which I was addressing myself, I personally applaud the efforts of President Johnson and Secretary McNamara to effect savings in defense costs. Having offered an amendment on September 24, to reduce defense appropriations by $2.2 billion, I am encouraged by press reports that the administration is considering military cuts for the next fiscal year that may total $1.5 billion.

This will still leave us with a military budget well in excess of $50 billion.

Mr. President, as long as I am in the Senate, I am going to do everything in my power to protect and secure for my State necessary Government installations and payrolls. But I do not think it would serve the interests of my State or the Nation to fight for unneeded Government plants that waste our resources, our taxes, and our manpower.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting legislation I introduced on October 31, the National Economic Conversion Act, to ease the transition from military to civilian production. This Nation need not fear the phaseout of unnecessary military spending, provided we plan now to direct the dislocated manpower and investment into other useful tasks. Our able colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART] is the sponsor of another proposal to meet the changing requirements of our technology.

I am today urging the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] to request early reports on my bill so that hearings can be held in the near future. Hearings on Senator HART's bill have already been held by the Manpower Subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I am also seeking administration counsel to determine whether or not the basic objectives of conversion planning in my bill could be largely accomplished by Executive order without legislation.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that needless military spending serves the national interest. I cannot believe that we want to shackle our highly able Secretary of Defense in his efforts to eliminate waste from our defense budget. I cannot believe that there is any American worker who can really be satisfied in devoting his labor to unneeded tasks at the expense of his fellow citizens.

Instead, let us get on with the urgent tasks of building needed schools for our children, clinics and hospitals for our citizens, better housing and transportation in our cities, wholesome outdoor

recreation facilities and development projects in our rural communities, let us also use some of the proposed reduction in defense costs to relieve the burden of taxation on our businessmen and our citizens in general.

Communist critics have long contended that the United States has to maintain a high level of military spending to keep our economy from collapsing. I do not believe that. I think we need a powerful Military Establishment to protect us so long as dangerous tensions exist in the world, but neither our defense nor our economy is served by wasteful military spending or surplus defense installations.

I have great faith in the capacity of the American economy to expand and flourish when geared to peacetime purposes. We demonstrated the glory of our economy and the vision of our citizens at the end of World War II. We can do it again.

I hope that my colleagues will not unduly hamstring the efforts of President Johnson and Secretary McNamara to give us a more economical and more efficient defense program. Instead, let us concentrate our efforts on smoothing the transition to vitally needed expansion of our peacetime economy and to the early enactment of the President's tax reduction bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that news articles from the Washington Post of yesterday and today on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1963]

UNITED STATES MAY DROP 30 BASES, 75,000 JOBS—PENTAGON'S PLAN AFFECTS 16 STATES

Congressmen of five States were informed yesterday of Defense Department decisions to cut back U.S. military installations.

Congressional sources said Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara will spell out the cutbacks in detail today. One, Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York, said New York Congressmen were informed that more than 30 installations in 16 States will be closed or reduced, affecting some 75,000 civilian employees.

PIRNIE said 7 New York installations with a total of 11,000 employees would be affected by the cutback.

Representative DELBERT L. LATTA, Republican, of Ohio, said some Ohio Members of Congress were told there would be a cutback announcement today. He said Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance told the Ohioans that the Army Supply Center at Port Clinton would be phased out over a 3-year period, along with other unspecified installations across the Nation.

LATTA said the cutback could affect some 1,750 civilian employees at Port Clinton.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, accompanied by Vance and Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, broke the news to the New York congressional delegation.

Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York, described the meeting as a "furious session." He along with Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, confirmed what PIRNIE reported but said they understood 17 States would be affected.

STRATTON said Gilpatric and the others told them the bases would be closed down over a period of 3 years, but that the New Yorkers were not given any specific timetable.

TELEGRAM SENT JOHNSON

The Congressmen said they have sent a telegram to President Johnson asking for a meeting with him and are urging the House Armed Services Committee to seek the basis for the decision.

Meanwhile Congress Members from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California reported that a naval survey board had recommended immediate closing of naval shipyards in Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco.

Later, however, informed sources said the decision was not final, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, reported last night that the Pentagon had informed him the Boston shipyard would remain open.

"NO COMMENT" AT PENTAGON

To all of the reports a Pentagon spokesman replied with a "no comment."

It could not be learned immediately what other States or installations might be affected.

The closing of military bases considered surplus to military needs is not a new program.

Secretary McNamara announced the start of a continuing effort of this sort on March 30, 1961, a little more than 2 months after the Kennedy administration took office.

At that time, there were about 6,700 defense installations, about two-thirds of them in the United States and the rest abroad.

The Pentagon reported early this week that more than 400 installations have been closed or reduced in scope since March 1961 at an estimated annual saving of $316 million.

McNamara, testifying before Congress last January, said a review of the need of various bases would be made annually, apparently in connection with the preparation of the following year's defense budget.

The question of Navy-owned yards also has been a perennial one. Last June, the Defense Department made public a study comparing costs in private and Navy shipyards. It showed, in general, that costs were considerably higher in naval shipyards.

The report, made by a public accounting firm under contract to the Navy, said fringe benefit costs represented the most significant factor in the higher average overhead rates at naval yards.

The Navy now maintains 11 shipyards. For the most part, they handle overhaul and modernization work.

Private shipyards now account for about 80 percent of new naval ship construction, Navy sources said.

The Navy generally would like to hold onto its shipyards because they are geared for its needs and are ready on short notice for repair jobs and other work.

Two years ago, a Pentagon staff recommendation called for closing all the Boston, San Francisco, and Philadelphia yards but President Kennedy then ordered that they remain open.

Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu told him Tuesday the board had recommended gradually closing down six yards by October 1966, but later said the board had asked for immediate action on the Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco yards.

It was estimated that shutdowns at those three yards would involve nearly 25,000 civilian jobs—8,202 at Boston, 9,032 at Philadelphia, and 7,124 at San Francisco.

O'NEILL said House Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, had already protested to the White House on the reported closing of the Boston yard.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, sent a letter to President Johnson asking for an appointment to discuss the San Francisco facility.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said he had sent telegrams to Mr. Johnson, McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze "expressing my strong belief that the Philadelphia Navy Yard is vital to our defense posture and must remain open."

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

MCNAMARA SEES MORE REDUCTIONS—PROTESTS HEARD FROM AREAS IN NEW YORK, OHIO

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara announced yesterday that 33 military bases will be closed as an economy move and predicted that base surveys now underway will bring further reductions.

His announcements of the move, which will eliminate 16,000 jobs and save an estimated $106 million a year at 26 domestic and 7 oversea installations, brought mounting opposition in Congress.

Shortly after McNamara disclosed his action at a news conference, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, introduced legislation designed to block any shutdown in an economically depressed area.

Another irate New Yorker, Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, a Democrat, promised to turn the Pentagon "upside down" before accepting the shutdowns. His district is losing the Schenectady Army Depot, one of seven bases to be closed in New York State.

But there was little or no chance of stopping the base closures, in light of the congressional and Administration economy drives. Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of a House Armed Services Subcommittee that long has been investigating military waste, said he would not protest the closing of Camp LeRoy Johnson and the Army Overseas Supply Agency in New Orleans.

"I've been preaching economy for all these years and I'm not going to start screaming now just because they shut down something in my backyard," he stated.

Others in Congress were worried about subsequent closures, in light of McNamara's prediction and earlier reports that the immediate shutdowns were to include the big naval shipyards at Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. The 16,000 personnel cut resulting from all the closures includes 7,800 military billets.

MORE STUDIES

There were reports that last-minute congressional appeals to the White House caused the shipyards to be removed from the closure list, but McNamara denied that there had been any such "reprieve."

He said, however, that "there is no question but that we have excess capacity" at the 11 major shipyards, and intensive Pentagon studies of these and other bases undoubtedly will show that "further reductions" should be made.

McNamara said these studies will be completed "sometime in the next 12 months"—raising a question whether their consideration might not be put off until after the November election.

The defense chief was asked whether President Johnson personally had approved the list of base closures and whether it stemmed from the late President Kennedy's actions or those of Mr. Johnson.

He replied that the "decision was mine" but reflected his instructions from both. Such economies, he said, conform to President Johnson's emphasis on making all possi-

ble savings to secure support for passing the tax bill.

MAJOR HIRING FREEZE

McNamara stressed that under plans worked out by the Pentagon, all employees affected by the closures will have Government jobs offered them elsewhere.

There will be a major freeze on new hiring by the Armed Forces, and the bases cut back will be phased out, in some cases over 3½ years. Where employees are offered new jobs in another locality, the Government will pay the cost of moving, and will retrain personnel for such jobs if necessary.

McNamara would not list the seven bases to be closed in foreign countries, pending negotiations with the governments involved. News reports from Japan said there would be reductions of Japanese civilian employees there, plus the withdrawal of 3,000 American military personnel.

Besides the 7 bases in New York, 13 other States will lose bases. Four will be closed in California; two each in Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, and one in Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Ohio.

* * * * *

SURPRISE AND ANGER

Included are 14 Army, 7 Navy, and 12 Air Force installations.

Defense officials said three are in areas classified by the Labor Department as economically depressed—with unemployment 6 percent or higher. They are: the San Diego, Calif., Naval Repair Facility; the Stockton, Calif., Navy Storage Annex; and the Rome, N.Y., Air Force Air Materiel Supply Mission.

There was sharp reaction from the Rome-Utica area in New York, where civic leaders and military employees expressed anger and surprise at the news.

At Port Clinton, Ohio, where the Erie Army Depot will be shut down, the order was called the "worst economic blow we've ever had" by James A. Wolf, president of the chamber of commerce. The depot is a mainstay of the local economy.

CLOSE TO GOAL

McNamara noted that the new list of base closings was a continuation of a program he initiated in early 1961. After sharp political reaction to his first publicized move, the Pentagon made only local announcements of the addition of smaller scale closures that followed.

Yesterday's list brought total annual savings from the shutdowns to $442 million and personnel economies to 70,000 jobs, close to the goal set in 1961, the Secretary said. It has been reported that President Kennedy turned down earlier McNamara proposals for closing shipyards and other major bases.

The Secretary said yesterday that he was raising his goal, under the new economy drive, to $600 million a year savings and suggested another 125 to 150 bases could be closed. The total number of defense installations, however, remains at about the 1961 total—6,700—because of the activation of new radar and missile sites, the Pentagon said.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AFFECTED BY MCNAMARA CUTBACK

(By the Associated Press)

The military installations affected by the economy announcement of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the kind of cutback to be made are:

ALABAMA

Mobile: Theodore terminal of the Army, excess in July 1964.

Air Force Reserve troop carrier operations at Bates Field, transferred to Brookley Air Force Base by December 1964.

ARIZONA

Litchfield Park: Naval air facility, excess by June 30, 1967.

ARKANSAS

Army's Fort Chaffee at Fort Smith, inactivated by the end of June 1965.

CALIFORNIA

Mira Loma Air Force station at Ontario, closed by December 1964.

San Francisco: Army oversea supply agency, closed by July 1964.

San Diego: The naval repair facility, shut down by January 1965.

Stockton: Navy storage at Stockton annex, inactivated by December 1965.

GEORGIA

Byron: Navy forms and publications supply office, moved to Naval Supply Depot, Philadelphia, by September 1964.

ILLINOIS

Chicago: 5th Army headquarters, relocated to Fort Sheridan, Ill., by June 1966.

LOUISIANA

New Orleans: Army's Camp Leroy Johnson, excess. Army's oversea supply agency, phased out by July 1964.

MISSISSIPPI

Greenville: Greenville Air Force Base, excess by June 1965.

NEVADA

Reno: Activities at Stead Air Force Base, reduced to Air Defense Command-SAGE operations, by June 1966.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Manchester: Air Force Reserve training at Grenier Field, transferred to Pease Air Force Base, N.H., by June 1966.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn: Army's oversea supply agency at Brooklyn Army terminal, phased out by July 1964.

Long Island: Army's Fort Tilden, inactivated except for Reserve Training Center. Nike sites relocated to Montauk Point (Camp Hero) and Lido Beach by December 1966.

New York City: Army's Fort Totten inactivated except for Reserve Training Center and family housing by December 1966.

Port Washington: Navy training device center, excess by December 1965.

Rome: Supply mission at Rome air materiel area relocated by June 1967.

Schenectady: Army's Schenectady-Voorheesville depot excess by December 1966.

Staten Island: Army's Miller Field inactivated by June 1965.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth City: Naval air facility excess by January 1965.

OHIO

Port Clinton: Supply and maintenance mission at Erie Army depot discontinued by December 1966.

TEXAS

Fort Worth: Fort Worth Army depot excess by December 1965.

San Marcos: Army's Camp Gary, now inactive, turned over to GSA for disposal by December 1964.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as previously ordered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Jan R. Dazcy.

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Thomas E. Langmann, Roger D. Williams, Stephen D. Csintyan, John A. MacDonald, David J. Bain, Cameron A. Hatfield

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Betty J. Parker, Axis, Ala., in place of J. T. Parker, deceased.

B. Kenneth Bennett, Grove Hill, Ala., in place of J. T. De Witt, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Roman A. Anthony, Scott, Ark., in place of C. M. Davis, retired.

Jesse H. Dills, Sulphur Springs, Ark., in place of M. E. Whaley, retired.

Lois M. Henry, Thornton, Ark., in place of C. M. Wise, retired.

M. Eugene Martin, Van Buren, Ark., in place of E. W. Deering, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Edith F. Turl, Five Points, Calif., in place of J. R. Edde, resigned.

Mary M. Seegers, French Camp, Calif, in place of V. S. Pambianco, retired.

Dolly S. Condo, Hinkley, Calif., in place of M. C. Gordon, resigned.

Gerald J. Stephens, Stirling City, Calif., in place of H. J. Martin, retired.

COLORADO

Ernest R. Alexander, Glenwood Springs, Colo., in place of W. H. Farnum, Jr., deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Elizabeth N. Bojarski, Hanover, Conn., in place of M. D. Neusse, retired.

James A. D'Amato, Morris, Conn., in place of L. F. Skilton, retired.

Helen D. Whitaker, Suffield, Conn., in place of M. H. Kennedy, retired.

GEORGIA

Maytrice M. Lindsey, Danburg, Ga., in place of J. M. Lindsey, transferred.

Louise D. Drury, Nahunta, Ga., in place of E. P. Dodge, deceased.

IDAHO

Eugene W. MacDonald, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of S. J. McMillan, retired.

Parlette W. Petersen, Rexburg, Idaho, in place of W. J. Lyman, retired.

ILLINOIS

Robert T. Elgin, Fairmount, Ill., in place of R. M. Hart, retired.

Carol C. Woiwode, Forest City, Ill., in place of L. E. Folkman, retired.

Alice L. Williams, Rockbridge, Ill., in place of R. W. Jacobi, retired.

INDIANA

Marvin D. Helmerick, Boswell, Ind., in place of W. H. Lynch, deceased.

Clair T. Albin, Greencastle, Ind., in place of R. R. Neal, retired.

Ellsworth G. Hartley, New Albany, Ind., in place of W. S. Darneal, retired.

Malcolm W. Menke, Westphalia, Ind., in place of R. H. Meier, resigned.

IOWA

Harry G. Powell, Jr., Troy Mills, Iowa, in place of Paul Wilson, retired.

KANSAS

F. X. Buche, Miltonvale, Kans., in place of E. E. Buche, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Maurice F. Foley, Rockport, Mass., in place of R. R. Wilson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Charles F. Collins, Flat Rock, Mich., in place of R. H. Smith, resigned.

MISSOURI

Warren H. Dial, Belton, Mo., in place of N. H. Mullen, retired.

MONTANA

Philip E. Pings, Augusta, Mont., in place of J. A. Manix, retired.

John J. McGlynn, Whitehall, Mont., in place of D. C. Bryan, retired.

NEBRASKA

Lorene M. Smith, Benedict, Nebr., in place of Viola Calhoon, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Willis A. Ober, New Hampton, N.H., in place of D. L. Moody, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Evelyn Burger, Quakertown, N.J., in place of P. P. Burger, deceased.

Samuel A. Van Sant, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.

NEW YORK

Louden Rampe, East Hampton, N.Y., in place of S. B. Cline, retired.

Francis J. Foote, Valois, N.Y., in place of J. E. Hawes, declined.

OHIO

Nelson E. Sundermeier, Cleveland, Ohio, in place of J. S. Frantz, retired.

Victor C. Ramus, Sherwood, Ohio, in place of W. W. Miller, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles C. Kerlin, Falls, Pa., in place of C. H. Freas, resigned.

John F. Walker, Leechburg, Pa., in place of J. E. Clark, retired.

Charles N. Moyer, Jr., Reinholds, Pa., in place of W. C. Brendel, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Darlene E. Meyer, Conde, S. Dak., in place of J. R. Kohlman, deceased.

TEXAS

Verna A. Vanderlip, Kemah, Tex., in place of A. M. Martin, retired.

Cecil O. Burton, Waxahachie, Tex., in place of E. H. McElroy, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cecil B. Niswander, Lesage, W. Va., in place of L. M. Galford, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Ronald L.
Austin, Henry W.
Breeding, Earle G., Jr.
Pinnick, James H.
Wylie, Moffatt F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Atteberry, George W.
Cavagnaro, Dennis A.
Rodgers, Robert F.
Villeneuve, David A.
Radzyminski, John T.
Elser, Thomas L.
Losey, James L.
Doane, Edward R.
Flynn, John G.
Culpepper, Warren A.
Whaley, Robert G.
Fritsch, John R.
Dupont, Delbert H.
Hoppmeyer, Herbert E., Jr.
Tremper, William F.
Babos, Robert L.
Powers, Allen L.
Gilliard, James D.
McKenzie, Benny M.
Bradfield, Richard C.
Kubik, Edward F., Jr.
Green, Edward L.
Jackson, Terry C.
Kennedy, Glenn O., Jr.
Reed, William C., Jr.
Feind, William J.
Crowley, James P.
Dentz, Joseph G.
Lathrop, Jerry L.
Fisher, Zane B.

The following-named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anthes, Fred W.
Ashe, Thomas D.
Bartlett, Robert O.
Beaver, Dale S.
Bode, Wichard H., Jr.
Bowden, Holland C.
Campbell, Wallace E. A.
Carter, Kenneth L.
Chavez, Lonnie S.
Church, Jorel B.
Clark, James A.
Curran, James E., Jr.
Demeo, Angelo C.
Duncan, Dorris A.
Faught, Robert J.
Franz, Howard A.
Girvin, Bobby G.
Golden, John J.
Gray, Edwin T.
Holbrook, Vernon J.
Incociati, Raymond F.
Jones, Robert E.
Joyce, Robert W.
Land, Carlton E.
Manco, Edward J.
McCurry, Kenneth D.
Merry, Bion E.
Mitchell, Robert L.
Mockenhaupt, Robert J.
Noe, Robert E.
Olson, Robert V.
Perry, Leon E.
Pitts, Thomas E.
Rickmon, James E.
Roberts, Morris R.
Robinson, Jean O.
Rodgers, John H.
Scaplehorn, William E., Jr.
Scott, Gerald E.
Simmons, Clyde M.
Smith, Clarence D.
Starzynski, Paul M.
Tanksley, Lawrence E.
Vangrol, Daniel P., III
Wieden, Clifford, Jr.
Yaeger, Richard A.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Reed-Hill, Robert E.
Welker, Daniel L.

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Armstrong, James H.
Beard, Norman W., Jr.
Benson, Stanley L.
Bledsoe, Vadney C.
Caskey, John B.
Chapman, Leonard F., III
Clark, Edward T., III
Cochran, Moncrieff M., III
Crell, John B., Jr.
Dematteo, Douglas A.
Dyke, Walter
Ebbecke, Vincent R.
Ernest, John F., Jr.
Gavin, James F.
Hitchens, Alan W.
Hodder, Mark L.
Huddleston, Gene K.
Jaye, Donald B.
Johnson, Donald P.
Lindholm, Hans W.
Manning, Gary L.
Mitchell, James E.
Miller, Michael R.
O'Buch, Warren J.
Pierce, Robert C.
Regan, Richard J.
Roe, Frederick S.
Rowe, John H.
Runstad, Harold J., Jr.
Sargent, George L., Jr.
Schmitt, James H.
Tucker, Gilbert A., Jr.
Ward, Joel D.
Weeks, Larry L.
Wilkins, James R.
Griffing, Darryl R.
Jaroch, Roger M.
Claxton, Sammy R.
Richards, Robert J.
Walke, Alfred J.
Schade, Dewey D.
Korte, James M.
Vetter, Lawrence C., Jr.
Peters, William J.
Baroch, Jerome P., Jr.
Vandam, Albert R.
Polyascko, Gerald J.
Reed, Don T.
Rick, Ronald A.
Dugan, James A.
Erickson, John R.
Shara, Robert L.
L'Heureux, Robert D., Jr.
Kenyon, William O.
Goldstein, Mark K.
Swallows, Jack E.
Corbett, David C.
Longan, Laird C.
Kennedy, Dennis M.
Fratarcangelo, Paul A.

The following named for permanent appointment to commissioned warrant officer CWO W-2 in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Johnson, Albert D.
Stevens, Glenn B.
Womack, Carl G.
Merrell, Edward L., Jr.
Turner, Roland L.
Newton, Orbin D.
Cusimano, Joseph
Cervin, Michael V.
Rose, William W.
Schultze, Edward W.
Steiner, Clifford D.
Dowell, Sidney C.
Young, Fred F., Jr.
Holman, Ottie P., Jr.
Campbell, Henry C.
Schwab, Charles F.
Lark, Scott E.
Dierickx, Phil A.
Hallet, James G., Jr.
Corriveau, Orval J.
McLaughlin, Melvin W.
McCue, Merrill W.
Pawlik, Mitchell W.
Baumwart, Eldon L.
Morrisey, Robert B.
Lane, Keary L.
Hershey, Rodger E.
Dixon, John C.
Voss, Bethel A.
Nichols, Bobby J.
Magaldi, Joseph M., Jr.
Kueker, William R.
Stevens, Jerome E.
Kent, Donald E.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 31: 1: *Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult the Lord.*

With all our military might, weight of wealth, allies and alliances, we recognize, O God, that we can be and indeed are weak and poor and alone until we look to Thee for guidance and consult Thee concerning decisions, direction, and destiny.

We humbly pray that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy grace and glad to do Thy will. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom, truth, courage, and nobleness those to whom, in Thy name, we entrust the authority of government, the President of these United States and the Members of Congress, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

Grant, O God, that this day and each succeeding day may bring us closer to a final victory, not of group over group or nation over nation, but of man over his own evils and weakness. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger