

the United States has been carefully reviewed by the undersigned and it is believed that the average objective reader of the report would be struck by the dictatorial recommendations, the vagueness of many charges and the bias whereby the Committee making the report to the President clearly shows that it is willing to go to any limit to insure integration in its most complete degree and this without regard to the effects that it may have on the balance of the Armed Forces which constitute between 85 and 90 percent of our military services.

"II. Outstanding characteristics of the report

"1. It proposes to deny essential information to promote boards in the military services (pp. 24 and 25, photographs).

"2. It demands in the name of 'equal opportunity' a higher percentage in Negro promotions rather than education, age in service, and the more fundamental consideration of merit (p. 20).

"3. It seeks integration 'for the amalgamation of the races' and not merely to secure equal opportunity and use of skills (see pp. 34 and 35).

"4. It invokes responsibilities and makes demands on post and area commanders by coercive methods to force integration on civilian communities by 'threat and blackmail.'

"5. It encourages and recommends the establishment of an agency whereby accusation of 'discrimination' may be made by secret testimony without the person accused being given the source of the accusation.

"6. It quotes injustices repeatedly but at the same time admits that the Committee verified very few and many times none of the facts.

"7. It draws many inferences loosely and in general terms, even to the extent of challenging the integrity of responsible military leaders.

"8. It does not envisage a real evaluation of the individual Negro based on merit but repeatedly speaks of opportunities and 'latent' skills inherent in the Negro.

"9. It recommends a 'spy system' to be called monitoring with an especially sympathetic monitor throughout the range of troop levels in order to report on responsible commanders as to how they carry out their functions.

"10. It strongly recommends that those responsible for integrating Negroes among white elements of commands be given to understand that such accomplishments will redound to the credit of the author of such plans for the purposes of furthering his promotion.

"11. It emphasizes repeatedly that Negroes should operate without reference to race and that there should be no record of blood or race on the Negroes' record of services. Later on in the report it complains of the inability to determine what cases there are which have been committed against the Negroes, since it has no way of determining from the military record whether the individual is a Negro or not. It goes on further to claim that the absence of such a record has cost untold time and money to accumulate such information for the purposes of the report.

"12. Signers of the report are: Nathaniel S. Colley; Abe Fortas; Gerhard A. Gesell, chairman; Louis J. Hector; Benjamin Muse; John H. Sengstacke; Whitney M. Young, Jr.; Laurence I. Hewes III, Committee counsel.

"Three of the members of this Committee are Negroes and the other four have a long career as racial agitators working with the ADA, ADL, and the NAACP. Not a single member appears to have a practical and objective approach to the subject of integration. From some of the recommendations made, it is apparent that the Committee is willing to go to any length to discredit the commander who does not meet the integration criteria that the Committee sets up and to institute a spy system which places the post commander in a thoroughly discredited position.

"13. The immaturity of this Committee is established by its reference to the several Inspector General's Departments of the Armed Services, which have been known for careful analyses and unblemished integrity since the beginning of the organization of all of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; this report would dispense with the Inspector General handling anything that has to do with integration and would set up a monitoring service with a special appointee who would handle such cases. The Communist Soviets have such a system and have had since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917. He is known as a 'political commissar,' whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on their manner of performance of duty. The effrontery of this Committee to propose such a departure from the system of integrity of such long standing in the military services is shocking and revolting.

"14. This whole report is reminiscent of the experiences of the undersigned when he was the commander of the 92d Division and had so many problems to confront him in various phases of training and in combat from the period of September 1942 to August

1945. One of the most notable problems was that of promotion. Negro advocates of rapid promotion had no hesitancy in recommending that a percentage of Negroes comparable to the Negro population strength of the United States should obtain in all promotions in the 92d Division. They complained bitterly when white officers who had commanded companies in training for as much as a year were promoted to the next grade and Negro lieutenants who had just joined the unit or had had only 3 or 4 months' service were not promoted percentage-wise.

"15. Needless to say, such complaints were taken with the validity that they deserved but this, instance is cited to show that nothing has changed in the nature of those who are determined to integrate the Armed Forces and determined to secure what is called 'equal rights and opportunities' for skills and abilities. It seems never to have occurred to the authors of such projects that there may be a slight difference between the average white and the average Negro in his ability to absorb information and to deliver a satisfactory performance. It is a known fact that during World War II it required in training 3½ to 4 times as much ammunition expenditure on the part of Negroes as compared to whites in order to secure a reasonable comparison of weapons performance in firing.

"16. The undersigned has interviewed three different post commanders since reading this report and the meddlings and directives and complaints that are foisted upon post commanders are little short of tragic. This report if put into effect will do more to damage the morale of the military services than anything that could be devised.

"EDWARD M. ALMOND,
"Lieutenant General,
"U.S. Army (Retired)."

While the foregoing indicates my strong feeling in regard to the problem of civil rights and the expression of the feeling of all Alabamians, I have on other occasions joined with the entire Alabama delegation in the Congress to express my total opposition to various actions of the administration in connection with this matter.

I shall, as long as I am privileged to represent the fine people of Alabama, speak out on every occasion and voice my objections to any action proposed by the Congress, the judiciary or the executive branch of the Government that is contrary to our belief.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

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

Rev. Joseph J. Matutis, pastor, St. Casimir's Catholic Church, New Haven, Conn., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: O God of our fathers, pour down Thy blessing on this land, these United States, and upon the citizens who dwell therein.

In particular, today, we beseech Thee, O God, to be mindful of the Lithuanian

nation, whose independence, proclaimed 46 years ago, is but a sorrowful commemoration at the present time. In your kindness, hear our prayers for our brothers of the "Church of Silence" who on the amber shores of the Baltic Sea to this day bear witness to the unquenchable thirst for freedom in the soul of man.

In the past, because of its heroic and religious trust in Thee, Thou didst sustain the Lithuanian nation through centuries of oppression. It is oppressed again, Lord. Grant its people courage and strength and the fortitude necessary to go the way of life until they find again the precious pearl of pearls—their freedom, for, as Thy people have placed their trust in Thee, we pray Thou wilt not forsake them. Grant to us, their American descendants, the same dedication in the pursuit of the same ideals.

Teach us, the free children of the United States, to cherish the precious jewel of freedom that is ours, so that we may be worthy to defend everything we hold dear against the enemy that would oppose us. Deign so to inspire the leaders of this Nation and those of all other nations that in the affairs of the brotherhood of nations, the need of justice may prevail as they escort us along the paths of noble ideals.

At the last, Heavenly Father, we beseech Thee to bless this august body of legislators who serve this land. Enkindle within their hearts a flame of unwavering devotion to duty, that they may never be found wanting in the qualities of spirit and mind which alone can preserve hearth, home, and the peace of our Nation and the world.

We beg this blessing of Thy providential love through Christ, our Lord. 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 February 11, 1964, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

REPORT UNDER COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 225)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 201(a) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 directs the President of the United States to "aid in the planning and development and foster the execution of a national program for the establishment and operation as expeditiously as possible of a commercial communications satellite system."

The year 1963 has been a period of major accomplishment toward the objectives established by the Congress in the Communications Satellite Act. The Communications Satellite Corp. has been organized, established, has employed a competent staff, and is implementing plans for a commercial communications satellite system. All agencies of government concerned have contributed wholeheartedly to the furtherance of the objectives of the act.

As required by section 404(a) of that act I herewith transmit to the Congress a report on the activities and accomplishments under the national program.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1964.

REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ON HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 230)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Under the provisions of title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, I am sending to the Congress the Eighth Annual Report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 17, 1964.

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. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7356) to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, 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 (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I request that House bill 7152 be read the first time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read the first time.

The legislative clerk read the bill (H.R. 7152) the first time by title, as follows:

An act (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object to the second reading of the bill today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the second reading of the bill will not take place until an adjournment has occurred and another legislative day has happened?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is correct; that is the case, under the rule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for the purpose of making two statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the civil rights bill has now arrived from the House. In the near future, the leadership will propose to the Senate that this measure be placed on the calendar, without referral to committee, and that, subsequently, the Senate as a body proceed to its consideration.

The procedures which the leadership will follow are not usual, but neither are they unprecedented. And the reasons for unusual procedures are too well known to require elaboration.

The substance of the bill has been discussed and debated, not for a week or a month, but for years. President Johnson has prescribed for civil rights legislation an urgency second to none. Three committees of the Senate have inquired extensively into its features, during the current Congress. Two have completed work on Senate bills which dovetail with principal segments of the House legislation. Whatever any Senator may lack in understanding of the substance of the bill will, I am sure, be made up in extensive discussion on the floor of the Senate. In one respect, at least, it would appear to me that this approach is to be preferred in connection with a bill of such wide ramifications, for, in fact, the substance of the civil rights legislation falls with almost equal validity within the purview of several committees.

This consideration, together with the procedure which will be followed in bringing the bill directly from the House to the Senate as a whole, has prompted the creation of a special arrangement for the steering of the legislation on the floor of the Senate. It is my intention to have the majority whip, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], together with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], assume direct responsibility for the handling of this legislation on the floor. They will be ready to state the case for this bill and to answer the questions to which it may give rise.

Since the 1948 Democratic Convention, the Senator from Minnesota has been one of the Nation's leading advocates of Federal action in the field of civil rights; and his knowledge of this highly complex issue is as broad and deep as that of any other leader in public life today. And each of the other Senators who will work with him in this connection—the Senator from Washington

[Mr. MAGNUSON], on public accommodations; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on fair employment practices; and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], on judicial matters—is highly knowledgeable in regard to one or more aspects of this measure.

The civil rights bill, Mr. President, is in good hands, in the hands of this quadrumvirate. I have every confidence that before the debate has run its course, they will have clarified any reasonable doubts or uncertainties which any Member may have with respect to this measure. A committee or a committee chairman could do no more. They will do no less.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, let me say at the outset that I should have preferred it had the civil rights issue been resolved before my time as a Senator or had it not come to the floor until afterward. The Senator from Montana has no lust for conflict in connection with this matter; yet this question is one which invites conflict, for it divides deeply. It is approached not only with reason, but also with passion, by Members on both sides of the issue and on both sides of the aisle; and since the Senator from Montana holds the Members of this body on both sides of the issue and on both sides of the aisle in affection and respect, he is frank to state that he would have preferred it had the civil rights issue been resolved before his time or had it not arisen until later.

But, Mr. President, great public issues are not subject to our personal timetables; they do not accommodate themselves to our individual preference or convenience. They emerge in their own way and in their own time. We do not compel them; they compel us.

We look in vain if we look backward to past achievements which might spare this Senate the necessity of reaching difficult decisions on the civil rights question. We hope in vain if we hope that this issue can be put over safely to another tomorrow, to be dealt with by another generation of Senators.

The time is now. The crossroads is here in the Senate.

To be sure, the issue will not be fully resolved by what we do today. Its resolution depends also on what is done tomorrow and on many tomorrows. Nor will the issue be fully resolved by the Senate or the Congress. Indeed, it will involve all Americans and all the institutions—public and private—which hold us as a society of diversity in one nation and it will involve all for a long time to come. In truth, it is a universal issue which, for this Nation, having begun with the Declaration of Independence and persisted through the decades will hardly dissolve in the Senate of the 88th Congress.

Nevertheless, at this moment in the Nation's history it is the Senate's time and turn.

Individually, each Senator will consult his conscience and his constituency on this issue as on any other. It is for each Senator to determine whether he is prepared to ignore, to evade, or to deny this issue or some aspect of it. The Senator from Montana will do the same.

But insofar as the majority leader is concerned he must state to the Senate that it would be a tragic error if this body as a whole were to elect the closed-eyes course of inaction. That course, Mr. President, would disclose a cavalier disinterest or a legislative impotence on this issue and either would be completely inconsonant with the serious domestic situation which now confronts us.

It is bad enough to evade decision on any major proposal of any President. It is inexcusable in this issue which has drawn a curtain of uncertainty and insecurity over the entire Nation and over which blood has already run in the streets.

In these circumstances, I cannot believe that this Senate will abdicate its constitutional responsibilities. The Constitution, Mr. President, charges the Congress and the Senate as a part of it—no less than the President and the courts—with the achievement of its fundamental objectives. It is our duty no less than the duty of others to share in the perfection of the unity and the maintenance of the tranquillity of all the people of the United States. It is our duty no less than the duty of others to share in securing the equity of the rights and in advancing the welfare of all the people of the United States.

At this critical moment, the majority leader, for one, is not prepared to say to the President and to the courts: "Resolve this present manifestation of the divisive issue of civil rights as best you can. We wish you well or we wish you ill. But most of all, in the Senate, we wish no part in the process."

If the Senate were to choose such a course at this time, Mr. President—the course of evasion and denial—we would leave this body a less significant and less respected factor in the Government of the United States than it was when we entered it.

I implore the Senate, therefore, to consider deeply the consequences of such a course, not only to the Nation but also to the reputation of the Senate, as one of the great institutions upon which the Nation rests. And may I say, Mr. President, that when we have considered deeply, I do not believe that this Senate will choose the course of evasion and denial.

In so stating, Mr. President, let me make clear that I am not prejudging what the Senate ought to do or what it will do in the days, the weeks, and in the months ahead. I daresay that there are almost as many views of what ought to be done with respect to civil rights as there are Senators. That is a condition not to be deplored. Certainly, the majority leader does not deplore it. A diversity of viewpoint on significant issues is a hallmark of the Senate and of its continuing institutional validity and vitality in a dynamic nation.

In this profound issue of civil rights, we have before us the President's views and the views of the Department of Justice on civil rights. We have views from individual Members of the Senate in the form of bills introduced. We have views from Cabinet members and other per-

sonnel of the executive branch. We have an immense documentation of public and private views which has accumulated over the years. We have, finally, the bill which the House of Representatives has brought to the highest point of perfection of which it is capable. The majority leader hopes that this measure substantially as is will prevail. But whether or not such will be the case rests with the Senate as a whole to decide.

The majority leader will do whatever he can to facilitate the process of decision in order that the Senate may reach a point of final judgment as promptly as possible. But I am compelled to remind the Senate again, as I did in the Telstar debate last year, that the Senate rules provide the majority leader with no special or unique powers. He has the same rights as any other Member of the Senate, no more, no less. He may propose. He may debate. He may cast one vote. Every other Member of this body may do the same. And even as rights are equal in this body, so too are the responsibilities. The majority leader will propose in procedural matters but it will rest with the Senate to dispose. And I say in all bluntness if we are to reach a point of decision in this matter, in the last analysis, it will be not because of what the majority leader alone does or the majority leader and the minority leader jointly do or fail to do. It will be because the whole membership is prepared to look at the world and at the Nation as it is, not as we may wish for it to be. It will be because the Members of this body are ready to face this decisive moment in the Nation's history and the Senate's history. It will be because the Members of this Senate, all the Members, on both sides of the aisle, are prepared to assume full responsibility, along with their rights in the Senate, full responsibility for writing an honorable chapter in both histories, irrespective of what their views may be on this particular issue. We will not write that chapter, Mr. President, if we dawdle, if we evade. And we cannot write that chapter on the basis of the Senate rules. We can write it only by facing the substance of the issue itself, by debating it and by voting on it.

The majority leader has no suave parliamentary tactics by which to bring legislation to a vote. He is no expert on the rules and he is fully aware that there are many tactics which can forestall a vote. That such is the case was evident in the Telstar debate in 1962, when the brilliant parliamentary tacticians in opposition to the measure tied up the Senate for weeks. A vote on the measure came not because of the parliamentary skill of the majority leader but because Senators—two-thirds of this body—were prepared to put aside their reluctances to end discussion, their understandable reluctance to apply the cloture rule of the Senate. It was no trick, Mr. President; it was no suave tactic. It was a preponderance of the Senate rising to its responsibilities irrespective of their feelings about the particular issue involved.

Even if there were parliamentary tricks or tactics, Mr. President, the majority

leader would not be inclined to employ them. I can think of nothing better designed to bring this institution into public disrepute and derision than a test of this profound and tragic issue by an exercise in parliamentary pyrotechnics. For the truth is that we will not find in the Senate rules book even the semblance of an answer to the burning questions which now confront the Nation and, hence, this Senate.

We, Mr. President, Senators would be well advised to search, not in the Senate rules book, but in the Golden Rule for the semblance of an adequate answer to this issue.

Or let them search, if they will, in the long and tortuous history of human liberty. Let them search in the Constitution and in the documents of freedom which we have enshrined.

Let them search among the fears and the hopes of a whole people—all the American people. And let them search in the dark chasms of ignorance and arrogance which divide, and among the slender bridges of understanding and humility which unite.

Even then, Mr. President, even then the answers which we shall find will be tentative, uncertain, and inadequate. And we should delude neither ourselves nor the people of the Nation that they will be anything else. An issue of this magnitude carries the accumulated action and neglect, the accumulated achievements and failures, the accumulated commissions and omissions of generations of Americans. And it will take, for many years, the combined contribution of all the sources of reason and unity within the Nation to bring the issue to adequate resolution.

The Senate's role, then, Mr. President—this Senate's role—is neither everything nor nothing. It is the role of a leading participant, an essential and active participant in shaping the continuing process of equalizing opportunities, that all Americans may share fully in the promise of the Constitution.

We shall not fulfill that role, Mr. President, if we calculate its dimensions with the slide rule of political expediency. To act on this issue on the basis of the white or black vote, the North, the South, East, or West vote, is as illusory as it is cynical. There is no political profit for anyone in this issue. At least there is no political profit which can be realized except at the expense of the Nation's unity and welfare. If history teaches us anything, it teaches us that such profits are short lived even to those who reap them and that their heavy costs are paid, in the end, by the whole Nation.

Nor shall we fulfill the role in which we are cast at this moment in the Nation's time, if some Members choose the occasion to display an arrogance of moral righteousness. I would devoutly hope that no Senator will cast the first stone. I would devoutly hope that no Senator will assume for his State a superior enlightenment on this issue. There are stones enough to be thrown by all and targets enough for all the stones that can be thrown. There are inadequacies enough and to spare for all. There is moral perfection on this issue in none of

us and in no place—North, South, East, or West—in the land.

And, so, Mr. President, as we approach this issue, I appeal to the Senate to put aside the passions, the sectionalisms, and the inertia which may plague us. I appeal to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], whose patriotism has always taken precedence over his partisanship, to join with me—and I know he will—in finding the Senate's best possible contribution at this time, to the resolution of this grave national issue. I appeal to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], whose many years of outstanding and exceptional service have given them a deep perception, not only of the needs of their States but of the needs of the Nation's progress. I appeal especially to the Senators from those States where this issue is not necessarily acute at the moment, to the Senators of many of the Western and Central States. I appeal to them to provide an active and objective participation, if not in terms of the future problems of their States, then on behalf of the Senate itself and on behalf of the Nation of which their States are an inseparable part. I appeal to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the distinguished Senator from the State of Lincoln, to lend us not only of his profound convictions on human freedom but of his warm and compassionate nature to help close the wounds of division. And I appeal to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], not as the leader of any bloc, not as an outstanding legislative tactician, but as the great American and the great Senator which he is, and I beseech him to give us not only of his immense parliamentary capacity but even more of his legal wisdom and of his heart in order that this Senate will be remembered, not for what it did not do, but because of what it did for the Nation.

And, finally, Mr. President, I appeal to every Member of this body to bring to this issue, when it is before the Senate, all their resources of wisdom, courage, perseverance, and understanding, so that we may, with mutual restraint and in all humility, fashion a contribution to the freedom, order, and well-being of American life which is worthy of ourselves, of the Senate, and of the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust that the time will never come in my public career when the waters of partisanship will flow so swift and so deep as to obscure my estimate of the national interest. If and when that time comes, then perhaps I shall have lost whatever talent and justification I have for public service and should make an exit and make way for others to carry on the responsibility I presently hold.

Last week we observed the anniversary of a wise and prescient man who probably was confronted with the greatest crisis that ever confronted the country. He observed that the occasion is piled high with difficulties, and that we must rise with the occasion. As our cause is new, so we must think and act anew. We must first disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save the Union.

I have pondered those words of Lincoln for some time. In an hour of crisis, if this challenge can be called a crisis, I trust I can disenthral myself from all bias, from all prejudice, from all irrelevancies, from all immaterial matters, and see clearly and cleanly what the issue is, and then render an independent judgment.

When I reached my desk this morning, after a week in the hospital and another week of convalescence, I found a number of clippings, some of which indicated that my native State, my office, and any other place where I may hang my hat will probably be picketed by an organization known as CORE.

Mr. President, I have been picketed before. On one occasion last year, I was picketed at O'Hare Airport. My office was picketed by those who marched with banners, and when I reached the hotel where I was to deliver a dinner address, I was picketed on the other side of Michigan Avenue; while inside, in the lobby, the place was fairly packed with people, because I had agreed to see 10 civil rights leaders and give them 15 minutes and very freely make a statement and answer questions.

Never have I been reluctant or hesitant with regard to the right to petition and assemble of any person or a group of persons who have a grievance they believe should be redressed.

I am delighted to see them; but always I must clutch unto myself the responsibility as a U.S. Senator, which requires that I give to the people of the country, and to the State I represent, the greatest service I have to offer, and that is always to render an independent judgment.

If the day ever comes when, under pressure, or as a result of picketing or other devices, I shall be pushed from the rock where I must stand to render an independent judgment, my justification in public life will have come to an end.

So I assure the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], with whom it is such a pleasure to work, that I shall cooperate in every possible way, consonant always with the duty to render an independent judgment, and consonant with my constitutional duty not merely to one segment of our people, but to all the people of the United States.

Sometimes we set apart a group, a tenth of the population, and because of the noise and the demonstrations that take place, their interest moves out of perspective and out of focus. Sometimes we are likely to forget that there are millions of other people in the country who also have an interest in the whole question of civil rights and who wish to see those rights maintained.

I trust the time will never come when my perspective is so narrow or becomes so diminished in scope that I cannot see the problem which is now on the doorstep of the country in the larger perspective of all the people of the United States.

It is fortunate indeed, as the bill comes today from the House and takes its place for a moment on the desk, that by virtue of the wisdom of the Founding Fathers we have a balanced government that has been responsible for our survival. In the

framing and structuring of the Constitution of the United States, we sometimes forget how wisely the framers really wrought. One needs only to look at the interesting balance in our Government to realize it. We are a part of a coordinated branch of government, invested with the exclusive lawmaking functions within the framework of government, and we divide that responsibility with the House of Representatives. Members of the House are selected on the basis of population. They serve a 2-year term. Under the Constitution, they are entrusted with the power to originate all revenue-producing bills and, by custom, all appropriation bills. That is a wise balance. The Constitution-makers knew that if, perchance, the authority to impose onerous and burdensome taxes upon the people should be unwisely used, with a 2-year term Representatives could be quickly turned out of office.

Senators are entrusted with a 6-year term. They are given the power to confirm the nominations of ambassadors and other appointees, and to advise and consent in the treaty-making process. But no legislation can reach the books unless it has the concurrence of both Houses in the coordinate branch of Government. When we have impressed our will upon a piece of legislation, it is engrossed, and finally on parchment it finds its way to the President of the United States, to sign or not to sign, as he sees fit. That still is a part of the balance. But if the President undertakes to veto a bill, it is still given to this branch of the Government, by a two-thirds vote, to override the veto. All this is a part of the astonishing balance in Government.

It might well be that Congress and the Executive could conjoin, in an unhappy moment, to place upon the statute books a law that was not in the national interest, but the Constitution has also provided for a judicial branch, with authority to strike down, as in contravention of the Constitution, that which the President and both branches of Congress may have so unwisely wrought.

So we have a balanced government; and today, from one branch in the coordinate part of the Government, comes a bill for further consideration. It can never reach the statute books unless it first has the approval of the Senate, and the differences are ironed out in the third body, known as the conference committee; it then goes to the White House for signature.

I have never seen the time in any crisis when the Senate has not sagaciously worked its will and risen to its responsibilities as a part of the deliberative branch of government. That has been true in every generation. To be sure, there have been times when it has failed. There may have been times when it has been frivolous, but always when, in the language of the day "the chips were down," the Congress—and particularly the Senate—has been equal to every challenge that has thus far confronted the country, and I apprehend that the situation will be no different on this occasion.

I expect to give this measure considerable attention. I expect ultimately to render an independent judgment. To do otherwise would be to betray the confidence of the people who sent me, first to the other end of the Capitol, and then to this end of the Capitol to serve them, within the limits of my talents and energy.

Therefore, I assure my distinguished friend the majority leader, the proposal will have considered attention; it will have earnest attention. One of the things which occupied a part of my time in the hospital was taking the bill as submitted and the bill as finally enacted by the House, and spelling out every word, every phrase, every line. Already, some amendments have occurred to me. I shall try to shape them. I shall try to put them in form. If I think they have merit, I shall offer them.

All the picketing that may be done in my home State, and all the picketing that may be done here with respect to the minority leader, I shall consider as nothing more than a form of unjustified duress, in order to obtain a judgment that is a departure from the convictions I hold.

When the day comes that picketing, distress, duress, and coercion can push me from the rock of conviction, that is the day, Mr. President, that I shall gather up my togs and walk out of here and say that my usefulness in the Senate has come to an end.

So I make an appeal to my fellow Senators to consider this issue in the light of the national interest. It is a phrase that came close to the late President Kennedy. It is a phrase that comes close to our former majority leader, who now occupies his exalted position.

I want to do what I think is in the interest of the present and future well-being of probably the only real, true free republic that still remains on God's footstool.

I shall cooperate. I shall do my best. When the time comes, when the deliberations are at an end, and all facets of the matter have been carefully considered and discussed, I shall be prepared to render judgment, and I shall have no apology to make to any man or any group anywhere, any time, for the course that I shall ultimately pursue.

I am grateful to my distinguished friend the majority leader, a man of grace and humility, who has wrestled with this problem, and who is confronted with it now by virtue of his exalted and dignified position in this body. I shall cooperate as best I can within the limitations of the convictions that I hold.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I realize, in the excitement and pressures of the day, that if I were to say anything that might be construed as being complimentary to the Senator from Illinois, or any other Senator, it might do him much more harm than it could possibly do him good.

I regret that I was not able to hear the statement which was made by the majority leader, nor all of the statement made by the minority leader.

I am quite sure that as the day and hour approach for the spectacular pres-

entation of the misnamed and misbegotten legislation that is called the civil rights bill, I shall be arrayed against both of them. On many aspects of the matter, I am sure, I shall find my views to be contrary to theirs.

However I cannot refrain, even if it does harm to the Senator from Illinois, from expressing to him my great admiration for his political courage. He lives in a State where great courage is required to make the statement that he has made.

Many of the principal advocates of the so-called civil rights legislation come from States which may have among their population only four-tenths of 1 percent of the people whom the proposed legislation is supposed to benefit. It will not benefit them; and it can not benefit any American, of any race, creed, or color, to make the massive assault on our constitutional system that this bill proposes to make. Some of our friends from States which have 1 percent or 2 percent of that population have an opportunity to obtain a free or cheap political ride by being very vigorous in their advocacy of this legislation.

These supporters of the bill will not get the free ride from those who are supposed to be benefited directly by the legislation, for their numbers are not large enough in a great many States. Rather, they will derive it from the support of the so-called liberal blocs throughout the United States, and from many who have been misguided into supporting this legislation.

The Senator from Illinois displays high courage when he says that more than picketing will be required to make him surrender his convictions. Convictions often seem to be few and far between when we get into this particular area.

That is unfortunate, Mr. President. I have seen times when men of great substance—men who ornament the Senate—but who, when legislation of this character comes over from the other body, fall and refuse to study it in detail. They do not seek to analyze its affect on our constitutional system, particularly on the rights of private property under our free enterprise system. Instead, they walk into the Senate, figuratively, with the rule book in one hand and the Constitution in the other, but when someone says, "Here is a bill bearing the label 'civil rights,'" they proceed to throw the rule-book into the trash can and the Constitution out the window, and say, "Here am I, ready to vote for anything that is proposed under the title 'civil rights.'"

Therefore, the Senator from Illinois, who comes from a State that is very highly charged in this area, displays a high degree of courage in making the statement he has made.

As we proceed further in the debate, I shall probably be greatly irritated by my friend from Illinois for supporting many portions of the bill which to me are very bad.

However, it gives one hope for the future of the Republic to see a man who has convictions and the courage to sustain them even though it may endanger his seat in the Senate. With the profound hope that it will do him no harm,

I salute the Senator from Illinois as a man of the deepest convictions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized, notwithstanding the fact that the rule of germaneness is now in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from California is recognized, notwithstanding the fact that the rule of germaneness is now in effect.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over the years it has been my privilege to sit in the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle, under the leadership of a great U.S. Senator from Illinois. Over those years, I have seen him demonstrate, on many occasions, complete courage.

Mr. President, when a small segment of his own party were denouncing the position taken by the Democratic administration with respect to a loan for the United Nations who proceeded as an American patriot to do his duty as he saw it, and thus was instrumental in securing support for that proposal, which otherwise would have been lacking? Mr. President, who was that distinguished Senator? It was the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Republican leader in the Senate.

Mr. President, when the nuclear test ban treaty, as then proposed, was being denounced by some Members of both political parties, who was it who made up his own mind and was instrumental in securing that treaty—which incidentally was advocated in the Republican platform of 1960, adopted in his own city of Chicago—overwhelming passage? It was the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Republican leader in the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I would be recreant to my own sense of duty if I did not rise now on this floor, as one who has always supported civil rights legislation, who believes in it, and who has joined in supporting, as a minimum, the House version of the bill which has just come to the Senate, to say that I think it is a tragedy that any group in this country would, by picketing or otherwise, try to push or prod, a great American, the Senator from Illinois, in regard to making up his mind on any basis other than the one basis on which he intends to make it up; namely, the rule of reason.

Today, civil rights legislation rests on the statute books of the United States, in great part because in 1957 and 1960 overwhelming majorities of Republicans, under the leadership of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had a hand in writing it, I know, for I was here, and I listened to the junior Senator from Illinois, the Republican leader, on many occasions indicate that he favored most of the civil rights legislation in this field.

And now, as some changes have been made in some of the other sections, he intends to study them. The way to appeal to a U.S. Senator should not be by the picket line but by the rule of reason. Certainly that is the way one appeals to the Senator from Illinois.

So I simply do not wish to remain silent on this occasion. Instead, I rise to salute the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as one of his fellow Republicans and as one—I repeat—who intends to do his part to see that the Senate improves, if possible, but passes at a minimum the version of the bill which has come over to us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to address myself for several minutes to the statement made by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Notwithstanding the fact that the rule of germaneness is now in effect, the Senator from Kentucky may, without objection, proceed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is the rule of germaneness now in effect?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me ask how long the Senator from Kentucky wishes to speak.

Mr. COOPER. For not to exceed 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed, notwithstanding the fact that the rule of germaneness is now in effect.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I had begun to state, I wish to refer briefly to the statement made today by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] respecting civil rights legislation, which may be laid before the Senate shortly.

The majority leader's statement, asking the Senate to give the fullest consideration to the proposed civil rights legislation which will soon be before the Senate, was a fine statement, noble in its concept and spirit. And I agree with the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] that such consideration is not compatible with attempts at duress or coercion.

The statement of the majority leader implies that we ought to finally come to a decision and vote upon the bill which has come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. He is right, for the questions involved in the bill are not new. They have been before us for many years. They are the subject of emotion, of strong convictions, and also, we must say, they are the subject of bias. Nevertheless they are not new, and the issue must be resolved.

Coming from a border State, in which strong convictions came into being during the Civil War, I have often seen reflected those convictions and emotions. But 100 years ago a Kentuckian, Abraham Lincoln, who later moved to Illinois, knew that the question which was before the country at that time had to be settled—and he acted on that conviction.

I believe that the issue now before the Senate must be settled. It is a constitutional issue. It is a moral issue, and

it involves the very nature of our country and its system.

I have not supported every version of every civil rights bill that has been introduced. But as one who in the past has authored bills and joined in the sponsorship of other bills, and more importantly, as one who holds the belief, as many of us do, that our country must come to grips with this issue and that it must be settled to give equal rights under the Constitution to all of our people, I know and believe that we shall enter into the debate with seriousness and deep purpose.

After 100 years we must come to grips with the issue. To say nothing of the moral concepts that are involved, we must give to all the people of our country their equal rights under the Constitution.

MANSFIELD'S FINE APPEAL ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished majority leader made an impassioned and eloquent plea to all Senators in both parties for their tolerance and forbearance in the coming debate on civil rights. This was a persuasive and significant speech by the majority leader. There is no question that there is no more important issue before the American people than civil rights. There is no more important principle—no more important unfinished business—than to provide that all Americans, regardless of color, creed, or race, shall be treated equally under the Constitution, as we all know so well they are not now treated.

Unfortunately, I suppose, there will be allegations in the debate that certain Senators are making political profit or political gain by the position they have taken in the civil rights debate.

The most moving part of the majority leader's fine address was the plea that there be no moral righteousness or superiority; that Senators not say that certain of their colleagues are for the bill because they will gain votes as a result, or that certain Senators will vote against the bill because they will gain votes by so doing. Instead, the majority leader said that, instead of attributing opportunism motivations, Senators should confine themselves to the merits of this great, vital, and important issue. It was an appeal to the best that is in the Senate, in the best traditions of the Senate. As the majority leader said, Senators should proceed with wisdom, courage, perseverance, and understanding.

I am proud, as a member of the Democratic Party, to support the distinguished majority leader for his excellent speech.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, perhaps what I am about to say can be considered somewhat collateral to the discussion that has taken place during the past few minutes.

On Saturday, February 15, 1964, Drew Pearson, in his column sponsored by the Washington Post, discussed some activi-

ties concerning the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Carl Rowan to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent parts of the column referring to that subject and to some statements alleged to have been made by me be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

Clark Mollenhoff, redoubtable and indefatigable Des Moines Register correspondent, is waging a one-man crusade against the Senate confirmation of Johnson's No. 1 Negro appointee, Ambassador Carl Rowan, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency, replacing ailing Edward R. Murrow.

It happens that Rowan and Mollenhoff used to work for the same journalistic combination—the Cowles Bros. publications in Des Moines and Minneapolis. They fell out when Rowan made a speech in New York stating that some newspapermen were genuinely interested in free news dissemination by Government; some were "merely interested in earning a buck."

Rowan, then working in the State Department, says Mollenhoff called his then chief, Roger Tubby, in protest, apparently wanting him relieved of his job. Rowan then phoned Mollenhoff, told him: "Any job you can get I don't want."

Mollenhoff's move to defeat Rowan as Director of USIA is being carried on through Senator BURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has told other Senators that no Negro is qualified to tell the story of the United States abroad; he's not objective.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, Mr. Pearson alleges that Clark Mollenhoff, a well-known and seasoned reporter of the Washington press corps, is engaged in some sort of feud with Mr. Carl Rowan, who, along with Mr. Mollenhoff, at one time worked for the newspaper publications of Cowles Bros. in Des Moines and Minneapolis. Mr. Pearson, in the column, alleges as follows:

Clark Mollenhoff, redoubtable and indefatigable Des Moines Register correspondent, is waging a one-man crusade against the Senate confirmation of Johnson's No. 1 Negro appointee, Ambassador Carl Rowan, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency, replacing ailing Edward R. Murrow.

It happens that Rowan and Mollenhoff used to work for the same journalistic combination—the Cowles Bros. publications in Des Moines and Minneapolis. They fell out when Rowan made a speech in New York stating that some newspapermen were genuinely interested in free news dissemination by government; some were "merely interested in earning a buck."

In the second paragraph following what I have read, Mr. Pearson writes:

Mollenhoff's move to defeat Rowan as Director of USIA is being carried on through Senator BURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has told other Senators that no Negro is qualified to tell the story of the United States abroad; he's not objective.

Mr. President, normally I do not engage in quarrels with newspapermen. Over the years, from time to time, I have been subjected to complete distortions of the record, complete falsifications of the record, and charges that had no

foundation; but, as a rule, I do not write letters to newspapers. I let those things go, because the record itself and history will take care of them. Anyway, a newspaperman has the last word in what are often rather futile discussions. But I cannot let this false and completely unfounded statement by Mr. Pearson stand.

First, I do not know that Mr. Mollenhoff is engaged in any feud with Mr. Rowan. Their personal attitudes are their own business. I do know Mr. Mollenhoff. I have known him for a good many years. He is one of the outstanding newspaper reporters of the country. I will say for Mr. Mollenhoff that I have never known him to print a false statement in any article he has ever written. I know that many times he has written statements that have caused a considerable amount of investigation in the Capitol. In any event, I have nothing to do with that. I know that Mr. Mollenhoff does not mean to say that I tell him what to do or that he tells me what to do. He has no more to do with telling me how to vote or act in the Senate than I have to tell him what he should or should not write as an independent newspaperman in carrying out his duties. I have the highest personal respect for his vigor and integrity, although he and I do not always agree, according to some of the articles he writes.

In his column, Mr. Pearson says:

Mollenhoff's move to defeat Rowan as Director of USIA is being carried on through Senator BURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican of Iowa, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee * * *

I have no knowledge of that and am not aware of any participation in a move being conducted through me to carry on or not carry on any activity of that kind. Mr. Pearson said, referring to me:

Mollenhoff's move to defeat Rowan as Director of USIA is being carried on through Senator BURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican of Iowa, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has told other Senators that no Negro is qualified to tell the story of the United States abroad; he's not objective.

All I can say is that that statement is an utter falsehood. It is without foundation in fact. I have never made such a statement to anyone. I do not know where Mr. Pearson claims to have obtained his information. He did not have the courtesy or decency to say, when he said "who has told other Senators that no Negro is qualified," what Senators he alleges I have told. That cannot be a truthful statement, because no Senator can truthfully say that I ever made such a statement. The fact is that I hold no such belief.

Parenthetically, besides making that inaccurate statement, Mr. Pearson did not spell my first name correctly. I am a little disturbed about that, because I still follow the old idea that "I don't care what you say about me, so long as you spell my name correctly." Mr. Pearson failed to do that in his column.

I do not know where he obtained his alleged information, but I say now, publicly, for everyone to hear, that what Mr. Pearson said is utterly false and utterly

unfounded, and is an utterly dishonest statement, regardless of the source. It is entirely possible that Mr. Pearson obtained it from some special pleader; I do not know. But I do say that statements of this kind, unsubstantiated and unjustified, contribute to friction and ill feeling.

If there is such a thing as a hate crusade in this country, statements of the kind that Mr. Pearson has made can inflame the people and foster the hatred that many people think should be quelled.

I regret the publication of such a statement. Normally, I do not get into rumpuses with newspapermen. One cannot win by engaging in that kind of activity. I have long since learned that one might as well "take it on the chin." Many false statements have been made about me from time to time, probably with the best purpose in the world, and perhaps by those who thought they had correct information, information that nevertheless was wrong. But we are about to engage in debate on an emotional issue that confronts the people of the United States. The statement by Mr. Pearson contains utter falsehood, and can do nothing but inflame those of the Negro race to whom it is referred, and irritate at least those of us who have a decision to make.

I have never drawn the issues of color or race; but I do expect to examine all of these appointments and all other matters on the basis of ability and service to this country.

In closing, Mr. President, I will say that up to this time, at least, I have not examined into the background of Mr. Rowan; I have not examined into his background with anything near the thoroughness that I have examined into the background of some others who heretofore have been recommended for the job of Director of the U.S. Information Service; and I expect to look into this appointment or into any other that comes before the Foreign Relations Committee, without regard to color, but based only on ability and service to the country, and whatever I do or do not do will not depend upon color.

There are countless highly able Negroes in this country, and there are also in this country countless highly able white persons and persons of other races.

Mr. President, hate-generation statements of the kind to which I have referred—unjustified though they may be, false though they may be—only add fuel to the fires which already have been burning in this country.

I believe this is about all I have to say about this matter, except to state that I sincerely regret this incident; and I regret it for Mr. Rowan, who, in my judgment, is a very able man. I do not know that I agree with all the attitudes taken by Mr. Rowan on every subject, but I can agree with many on one subject, and that is that Mr. Rowan is a man of ability and of high intellectual accomplishments.

Again, Mr. President, I assure Senators and everyone else that regardless

of any outside influences or any comments of the sort to which I have referred, I shall continue to approach my responsibilities based upon the best interests of our country, and without regard to color or race or any other consideration of that kind.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate Resolution 275, Calendar No. 842.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 275) providing additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The germaneness rule is now in operation.

Mr. DODD obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield briefly to me, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 10, 1964, and Thursday, February 13, 1964, was dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield briefly to me?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in yielding to me, the Senator from Connecticut shall not thereby lose his right to the floor.

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

The Chair reminds the Senator from Connecticut that the germaneness rule is now in effect.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for recognition at

this time, notwithstanding the fact that the germaneness rule is now in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Connecticut is recognized, notwithstanding the fact that the germaneness rule is now in effect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that the morning hour has not been concluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate convened today following a recess; therefore, there is no morning hour today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate that information from the Chair.

Mr. President—

Mr. DODD. I yield.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF INSURED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this morning our distinguished colleague, the very able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, made a speech before the National League of Insured Savings Associations. He was introduced by the president of that association, Mr. Robert S. Messersmith, the president of the Westfield, N.J., Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Mr. Messersmith made a very fine introduction of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, as he well deserves.

In his address to the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Senator from Virginia discussed the fiscal situation in light of certain pending legislation. I am sure not all Senators will agree with everything he said; but certainly his speech is full of statements based on provocative thinking, and is a very thoughtful and strong one. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD both the introduction and the speech delivered on that occasion.

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

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE A. WILLIS ROBERTSON BY MR. ROBERT S. MESSERSMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF INSURED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AND PRESIDENT OF THE WESTFIELD FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION, WESTFIELD, N.J.

At this time, ladies and gentlemen, it is my distinct honor and privilege to present to you one of the great statesmen of our time. I refer, of course, to Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senator ROBERTSON is well known to the savings and loan business. Indeed, his efforts as the chairman of the Banking Committee have affected the entire financial community in one form or another. In the Senate, I think it is fair to say that Senator ROBERTSON is the acknowledged leader and expert in the field of financial legislation. No Senator has worked as hard or as per-

sistently to secure good financial legislation as our distinguished guest today.

In many ways, Senator ROBERTSON reflects the views and wisdom of another great Virginia statesman, Carter Glass, who was the father of the Federal Reserve Act and Senator ROBERTSON's predecessor in the Senate. Fortunately for the Nation, Senator ROBERTSON has drawn upon such illustrious leaders of the United States as Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson for principles of government which have always guided him in his public career. Perhaps that is why Senator ROBERTSON rolled up more votes than any candidate in any election in the history of Virginia when he last ran for reelection in 1960.

Senator ROBERTSON has never lost an election. This truly remarkable record is especially significant when you consider that he will have completed more than half a century of public service in 1967.

It is only natural that A. WILLIS ROBERTSON should give so much of himself to public service. His family roots trace back to the first settlement in Jamestown, in 1619. His father's grandfather was surgeon to the troops brought over for the protection of the struggling colonists. His mother's grandfather was James Gordon of Orange, a delegate to the Virginia Convention of 1788 that ratified the Philadelphia Constitution.

What is the secret of this gentleman from Virginia who still has more spring in his step, and zest for living than most men half his age? He has said that his formula consists of starting every day with a few minutes of vigorous exercise, a brisk walk, and a hearty breakfast.

Our honored guest tackles every day with the same enthusiasm that he displayed in Richmond College when he was tennis champion, star tackle of the football team, and hammer-thrower who still holds an unequalled record for distance. His scholarship was equally outstanding, and he is a member of leading scholastic honorary societies, was admitted to the bar in 1908, and holds honorary degrees from numerous universities.

His interest in outdoor life began when his father, a Baptist preacher, took him to Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show when he was 9; he marveled at the shooting ability of Annie Oakley. Young ROBERTSON soon had his own rifle and became an expert marksman.

He still thoroughly enjoys a tramp through fields for game birds, or the opportunity to fish for trout in the mountain streams of the Commonwealth. His interest in conservation and better game laws was translated into legislative action in 1916 when he became a member of the Virginia State Senate. He sponsored a plan for establishing a State game department with game wardens and strict laws covering hunting, fishing, and stream pollution.

While in the State Senate, he was a patron of the bill which created the Virginia State Highway Department, he was a member of the commission that laid out the State highway system, and he was instrumental in writing the Robertson Act which gave the first \$14 million for State highway improvements.

In 1926 Senator ROBERTSON was named to head the newly organized Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries. Today, Senator ROBERTSON says that he would like to be remembered most for his legislative contributions in connection with conservation.

After Senator ROBERTSON had served 6 years as chairman of the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, he decided to run for a vacant seat in the House of Representatives. He won the election and served 14 years as a Representative of the Commonwealth. In this post, he was soon regarded as a tax expert. His major assignment for 10 years was on the Ways and Means Committee—

which, as you know, is the most important committee in the House. Here he helped write 12 tax bills, including many that were required to meet the demands for increased revenue during World War II.

In 1943, it was his good work that resulted in the Robertson-Forand bill which established the pay-as-you-go basis for Federal income taxes. As spokesman for the committee, this Jeffersonian Democrat led recurring fights to advocate the concept of mutually beneficial foreign trade, as proposed in the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program.

In 1946, the Virginia Democratic convention chose Senator ROBERTSON as the man to complete the term of the late Senator Carter Glass. Senator ROBERTSON completed the term and has since been elected three consecutive times, for 6-year terms.

We know of the Senator's monumental work on the Financial Institutions Act of 1957. It has provided the guidelines for much financial legislation, including the amendment to the Small Business Investment Act in 1958; a series of 1959 laws dealing with the Federal Reserve Member Bank reserve requirements, and new legislation for savings and loan associations.

Senator ROBERTSON was one of the leaders of the movement for private investment abroad, and for loans from international funds handled on a sound basis.

The Senator's basic political philosophy was detailed in an article entitled "What Are We Being Spent Into?" which appeared in Reader's Digest 15 years ago. His conclusion is perhaps more valid today than it was in 1949. He said, "There is probably not a single item in the whole list of Federal spending projects where the test of necessity, if honestly applied, would not produce confidence-inspiring savings."

"Two facts vitally affect the income, the savings, and the future of every American. The first is the increasing rate of speed at which the Government spends what we make. And the second is the Government's plans to spend not less than we make, but vastly more."

Five years ago this month, Senator ROBERTSON became chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. And all of us hope that he will be there for many years to come.

Senator ROBERTSON is probably better known on Capitol Hill as a man of action. He does not indulge in endless speechmaking, but confines his public statements to situations which require informed comment.

We are, therefore, doubly privileged to have the Senator with us today to discuss with us the problems of thrift and home financing in the United States. And I am greatly honored to present to you now the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

SOUND MONEY—REMARKS OF SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF INSURED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

This opportunity to address the annual legislative conference of the National League of Insured Savings Associations is appreciated. In addition to greeting friends among your members and your staff, I welcome the opportunity to compliment the National League and the savings and loan industry on the fine job you have done for the housing industry on the one hand, and for the Nation's savers on the other hand.

Your \$100 billion of assets is a vast figure, but its real significance can be measured only when this overall figure is translated into the thousands of your shareholders and the houses and other dwelling units

which you have financed. Your new savings of more than \$30 billion a year, with net increases in the neighborhood of \$10 billion a year, make you a major factor in the economic life of the Nation.

You have achieved these accomplishments through private enterprise and private initiative within the framework of American constitutional liberty. The insurance provided by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has helped, and benefits have been derived from the Federal Home Loan Bank System. However, these governmental activities were not what made your assets grow from about \$6 billion in 1935 to more than \$100 billion today. Rather, it was the way in which you were able to participate with private builders in the housing upswing which started at the close of World War II. You were able to earn good returns on the savings placed with you through participation in the housing expansion, and you were thereby able to offer an attractive rate of return on savings entrusted to your care.

This meeting of the legislative conference of the National League will, I am sure, help to develop a legislative program designed to enable the industry to continue to give service to the American public—both as savers and as borrowers. As you know, many proposals dealing with savings and loan associations are being discussed in Washington. I am sure your association will review them carefully. We want to know what you think of these proposals.

With reference to the legislative outlook, I should like to make two points. First, I do not think it probable that much substantial legislation relating specifically to savings and loan associations or other financial institutions will become law this year. Second, I think the most important legislative matters with which savings and loan associations and all other financial institutions should be concerned this year are those relating to sound money.

The Administration and Congressional leaders are giving priority to tax legislation, civil rights legislation, and appropriation bills. This is an election year when the President, the Members of the House of Representatives, and one-third of the Senate will be running and adjournment before Labor Day is planned. Consequently, I do not think that we will be in a position to reach final conclusions on major legislation relating specifically to financial institutions. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the Administration has not taken a firm position on much of this legislation, and I think it can also be said that the financial world, as a whole, has not yet reached clear positions on many of the pending issues.

While major legislation relating specifically to financial institutions does not seem probable, savings and loan associations, like all other financial institutions that deal in money, have a vital interest in the maintenance of sound money and in preventing the adoption of unwise fiscal policies. Nothing could hurt an industry dependent on the savings of the public more than lack of confidence in the soundness of the dollar.

I agreed entirely with President Johnson when he said last month:

"I have pledged that the executive branch will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality; that the Government will get a dollar's value for a dollar spent; and that the Government will set an example of prudence and economy."

He went on to urge Government officials: " * * * to seek the advice of committees of the Congress and of private organizations and individuals, in finding ways to do the public business more economically."

And he concluded: " * * * we must work hard to reduce the costs of government, not only for the sake of the savings to be made,

but also in the interest of vindicating the people's confidence in the institutions of democracy."

To help President Kennedy reduce the cost of government, I recommended last March reductions totaling \$5.9 billion in the spending authority requested in his budget for fiscal 1964. I am pleased that the Congress made reductions totaling \$6.3 billion. The importance of these reductions can be shown by the fact that even after they have been made, it is expected that there will be a deficit of \$10 billion for fiscal 1964.

In turn, this \$10 billion deficit for fiscal 1964 underscores the need for careful review of the \$4.2 billion supplemental appropriation recently requested for the 4½ months left in the current fiscal year. Certainly, we can eliminate most, if not all, of the proposed \$1.4 billion for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the \$400 million for "contingencies," and the \$141 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's manned lunar space flight which we have already considered.

On January 22, I made the following remarks in the Senate about the budget for fiscal 1965:

"The budget proposals of the President of the United States for the fiscal year 1965 reflect a major shift of emphasis in Federal fiscal policy. They represent a gratifying move toward fiscal sanity at the Federal level which I am glad to support. On the basis of such constructive spending reductions, I feel justified in voting for a tax cut."

"I am glad not only to support, but to accelerate this historic move to fiscal soundness on the part of President Johnson. It is my view, based on preliminary estimates, that the fiscal 1965 spending estimates of \$97.9 billion can be reduced by as much as \$2 billion more without jeopardizing the public welfare or the national defense. I think foreign aid could be cut \$500 million and the shot to the moon \$500 million. While I am not prepared at this time to itemize other reductions, I shall do so at a later date."

On February 7 of this year I voted for the administration's \$11.6 billion tax cut bill. As I said on January 22, the passage of this bill makes it imperative to do everything we possibly can to reduce the budget for next year, even beyond the reductions the President has proposed, and even beyond the \$2 billion I suggested on January 22.

The President's budget is so vast and so complicated that I have been unable to make an analysis of all the details. I hope careful study will disclose safeguards against inflation beyond those I shall recommend today.

On the basis of the brief analysis I have been able to make since the budget was presented, I take the liberty of suggesting the following cuts in new spending authority, totaling about \$4.1 billion.

Recommended cuts in new spending authority

[In millions]

Program:	
Aid to education.....	\$700
Military budget.....	500
Foreign aid.....	500
Attack on poverty.....	500
Area redevelopment.....	222
National Science Foundation.....	200
Youth employment.....	160
NASA (shot to the moon—ADP equipment purchase program—educational grants).....	620
Farmers Home Administration.....	100
Housing for elderly.....	75
Additional public housing.....	46
Other housing programs.....	50
Contingencies.....	500
Total.....	4,173

I should, of course, emphasize that these suggested cuts are made on the basis of a quick preliminary survey of the budget. No doubt it may prove impossible to cut quite so deeply into some of these programs. And no doubt it will prove possible to cut even deeper into some of these or some other programs. It is my aim, however, to attempt to reduce the proposed spending authority in the 1965 budget by about \$4.1 billion, in addition to keeping the 1964 \$4.2 billion supplemental request from further unbalancing the 1964 and 1965 budgets.

While I am prepared to do so, it would take too long to discuss individually each of the cuts I have proposed. All are practicable and, in general, they are designed to cut the 1965 budget back to the level of the 1964 budget. In other words, most of these reductions would merely preserve the present level of activity.

This is going to be the most prosperous year in our history, with both gross national product and national income reaching all-time highs. In such circumstances, if this Congress be unwilling to put a brake on deficit financing, it means deliberate and planned deficits until, like Brazil, we have ruinous inflation.

A preliminary review of the huge Department of Defense budget, which includes requests for \$50.8 billion of new spending authority, reveals reductions of some \$500 million that can, in my opinion, be made without adverse effect on our military posture. It is possible that a thorough review of the military budget will reveal other areas where substantial reductions can be made.

However, I want to point out that there are three areas where I would consider supporting increases in the military budget if hearings indicate that they can be wisely used. These are:

1. Anti-ballistic-missile defense;
2. Defense against submarine-launched missiles; and
3. Development of a new manned strategic system (manned aircraft).

The \$500 million cut that I would recommend would be in the following items:

Program (budget request for new spending authority)

[In millions]

Suggested reductions

Operation and maintenance (\$12,396,000,000) ¹ -----	\$25
Research and development (\$6,722,000,000) ² -----	50
Military construction (\$1,168,000,000) ³ -----	100
Military family housing (\$711,000,000) ⁴ -----	50
Civil defense (\$358,000,000) ⁵ -----	200
Military assistance (\$1,000,000,000) ⁶ -----	75
Total-----	500

¹ This reduction could be applied to "training and education" and "communications" activities.

² The budget includes \$1,474,100,000 for Department of Defense space projects, many of which have little or no military significance.

³ The budget proposal is excessive in view of recent deactivation of a number of military installations and the announcement of more deactivations in the near future.

⁴ The budget includes an increase of \$74,000,000 over the current level. An increase of \$24,000,000 will be adequate to meet critical needs.

⁵ The budget includes \$265,600,000 for the shelter program. The need for such a vast program has not yet been proved.

⁶ Even though this budget request is substantially lower than the requests in recent years, a reduction of \$75,000,000 can be made. Unexpended balances of prior year funds in the amount of \$1.7 to \$2 billion will be available in fiscal year 1965.

Of necessity, you are interested in the new housing bill because it is a serious threat to private enterprise in the housing field. It is the biggest and vaguest and most dangerous housing bill which has ever been presented to the Congress. I feel sure that the President, with his concern for economy and efficiency, could not have known what Dr. Weaver wrote into this 92-page bill, which involves obligatory authority in the magnitude of \$9 billion. The HHFA's section-by-section analysis alone takes up 38 legal-sized pages, single spaced in small type. You can be sure that the Congress will go over this bill carefully, and I urge you to study it.

I have not included, in my list of proposed cuts, very many which come out of this housing bill. The Farmers Home Administration, housing for the elderly, additional public housing, and other programs together total only \$271 million. But this is no measure of the significance or effect of the bill. Most of the bill's cost would come in later years. To take a single example, the bill would increase the amount of annual contributions authorized for public housing by \$46 million a year, enough for an estimated 60,000 additional units of low-rent housing, including 35,000 new units, 15,000 purchased and rehabilitated units, and 10,000 leased units. The \$46 million which I recommended deleting from the 1965 budget is only the first instalment in a 40-year program, the total cost of which over 40 years would run to \$1.84 billion. In addition, the construction of 35,000 new units in the next year or so, even at a modest \$14,000 per unit cost, would involve construction expenditures amounting to \$490 million. While this expenditure would not be directly financed by the Federal Government—only underwritten by the Government—we must keep in mind the inflationary effect of a federally sponsored building program of this sort.

Surveys of the public housing program clearly indicate that it is not helping those most in need of such housing. To reach that income group would involve a public housing program of \$100 billion. Of course, long before such a program could be carried out, private investment in housing would be ended. Private enterprise can and should do this job, and we need not and should not turn to this socialistic housing program.

Another program which in the long run involves huge sums of money, though not having a great effect upon the 1965 budget, is the proposed increase in the urban renewal program. A new authorization for \$1.4 billion for the urban renewal fund for 2 years is being sought. This would be on top of the \$4 billion figure provided in the 1961 act, which itself was an increase of \$2 billion.

Special attention should be given to the amendments proposed in four programs—housing for the elderly, urban planning assistance, open space land grants, and public works planning assistance. The bill would remove the present dollar ceilings on these programs so that in the future there would be no limit whatever to the amount of the appropriations. The 1965 budget calls for appropriations of \$125 million for these programs, but since there is no limit in the authorization, we can be sure that over the next 5 or 10 years, these programs will grow even faster than most housing programs grow. There is no end to the amounts which might be spent for open space land grants if the Federal Government is to provide parks and open space for every community in the country, and there is no end to the amounts which could be spent for housing for the elderly if the Federal Government is to make low-interest loans to every person over 65.

This housing bill would make startling changes in the Federal Housing Administra-

tion's insurance program, changes which would put FHA into a new field, full of financial risks and even more full of danger of pressure and improper activities. It would authorize community mortgages up to \$50 million for each new community dreamed up by HHFA, without limit as to the number of such communities, and it would authorize \$2½ million subdivision mortgages also without limit as to number. These communities and subdivisions would, of course, have to be developed in accordance with the standards of HHFA.

I will not attempt to go into further details. The examples cited will be enough to show you the breadth and scope of this vast new housing bill.

My objection to the bill is not solely because of the amount of money involved. Just as important is the extent to which this bill would extend the Federal influence and the Federal controls which always accompany Federal money. When HHFA approves a \$50 million mortgage on a new community, it will have to review and approve the location of stores, the location of schools, the location of churches and other places of worship. And the extensions of existing programs—public housing, urban renewal, housing for the elderly, and so on, would also involve increasing Federal controls over an increasing area of the American economy and American life.

In conclusion, I want to urge the savings and loan industry to use every effort to maintain a sound and stable economy—to avoid inflation and to prevent fiscal and monetary policies which will seriously injure all financial institutions. I urge the savings and loan industry to do its utmost to have eliminated from the budget unnecessary and inflationary expenditures and all new programs which spread the power and influence of the Federal Government into individual, local, and State affairs to the detriment of the country's economy and to the detriment of our personal freedom.

The late Justice Robert H. Jackson, in his book, "The Supreme Court in the American System of Government," has expressed vividly the danger to the Nation from the power to tax and spend which are inherent in all spending programs:

"Two of the greatest powers possessed by the political branches, which seem to me the disaster potentials in our system, are utterly beyond judicial reach," he said. "These are the war power and the money, taxing, and spending power, which is the power of inflation. The improvident use of these powers can destroy the conditions for the existence of liberty, because either can set up great currents of strife within the population which might carry constitutional forms and limitations before them."

"No protection against these catastrophic courses can be expected from the judiciary. The people must guard against these dangers at the polls."

THE FIRST 25 YEARS OF THE UNITED NATIONS—ADDRESS PREPARED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under the same unanimous-consent order:

The Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, had prepared for delivery as the Dag Hammarskjöld memorial lecture to be delivered at Columbia University, a very fine and very thoughtful address with reference to the United Nations and some of the things which should be done in order to make that organization properly reflect what was in the minds of those who formed it. The address was prepared for delivery at Columbia

University; but because of developments in the world situation, the Secretary of State was prevented from delivering the address in person; and on January 10, at Columbia University, his address was read by Hon. Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that this address by the Secretary of State be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

THE FIRST 25 YEARS OF THE U.N.—FROM SAN FRANCISCO TO THE 1970'S

I

I regard this event as a welcome opportunity—and a command performance. Any invitation bearing the name of Dag Hammarskjöld is compelling for me.

In my job, I often think of Hammarskjöld's reply to a newsman who asked about his interest in mountain climbing: "What I know about this sport," he said, "is that the qualities it requires are just those which I feel we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it and . . . the safest climber is he who never questions his ability to overcome all difficulties."

Dag Hammarskjöld was an intensely practical idealist; and I think this is why his name will live. He never wore his devotion to world peace as a personal adornment. Instead, he worked for peace through action. It was selfless and tireless action—and for this we honor the man. But it also was rational, considered, calculated action—and for this we respect his method.

During the regime of Dag Hammarskjöld the United Nations found its capacity to act and to grow. As the institution grew in stature, so did he. But he never subscribed to the idea that any man was indispensable to the United Nations; he knew that what counts is the creation and use of the machinery and procedures for peaceful settlement and peaceful change. He helped build that machinery and passed it on to the world when death met him on a mission of peace.

My assignment—to talk about the first 25 years of the United Nations—is unusual punishment for a Secretary of State. It is difficult enough to be a reasonably accurate historian of world affairs years later, after all the evidence is in. It is nothing short of foolhardy to foretell the future—especially when you are trying to tinker with the future to make it come out the way you think it should.

However, the punishment is self-inflicted—for the hazards of my situation tonight I have only myself to blame. Andy Cordier gave me a free choice of topic. And I decided to try to look ahead as well as to look back. For, if we are to act wisely in world affairs, we must have some sense of direction, some conviction about the way human events are moving, some expectations about the forces and counterforces just over the horizon. I do have some expectations for the United Nations over the next 5 or 10 years, and I might as well state them straightaway.

I believe that the influence of the United Nations will be even greater in the 1970's than it is today.

I believe also that the executive capacity of the United Nations to act in support of the purposes of the Charter will be greater in the 1970's than it is today.

I hold these convictions despite valid cause for concern and some necessary reservations. I shall try to explain why.

II

Let me begin by observing that it means little to study the performance of an institution against abstract standards without reference to the realities—and even the illusions—of the total environment in which it must operate. In that context, the first thing that strikes one about the United Nations is that international organization is a plain necessity of our times. This is so for both technical and political reasons.

The technical reasons stem, of course, from the headlong rush of scientific discovery and technological advance. That process has overrun the hypothetical question as to whether there is to be an international community that requires organization. It has left us with the practical question of what kind of international community we have the wit to organize around the scientific and technical imperatives of our time. In the words of Ogden Nash:

"When genuses all in every nation
Hasten us towards obliteration,
Perhaps it will take the dolts and geese
To drag us backward into peace."

World community is a fact because instantaneous international communication is a fact; because fast international transport is a fact; because matters ranging from the control of communicable disease to weather reporting and forecasting demand international organization; because the transfer of technology essential to the spread of industrialization and the modernization of agriculture can be assisted by international organizations; because modern economics engage nations in a web of commercial, financial, and technical arrangements at the international level.

The advance of science, and the technology that follows, create an insistent demand to build international technical and regulatory institutions which lend substance to world community. Few people seem to realize just how far this movement has gone. The United States is now a member of 53 international organizations. We contribute to 22 international operating programs, mostly sponsored by these same organizations. And last year we attended 547 international intergovernmental conferences, mostly on technical subjects. We do these things because they are always helpful and often downright essential to the conduct of our national and international affairs.

It is obvious that in the 1970's we shall require more effective international organization—making for a more substantial world community—than we have today. We already know that in the next decade we shall become accustomed to international communication, including television, via satellites in outer space. We shall travel in aircraft that fly at speeds above 1,000 and perhaps above 2,000 miles per hour. Industrialization will pursue its relentless course. Cities and their suburbs will keep on growing. The world economy will become increasingly interdependent. And science will rush ahead, leaving to us the task of fashioning institutions—increasingly on the international level—to administer its benefits and circumscribe its dangers.

So while nations may cling to national values and ideas and ambitions and prerogatives, science has created a functional international society, whether we like it or not. And that society, like any other, must be organized.

Anyone who questions the need for international technical organizations like the United Nations agencies dealing with maritime matters, civil aviation, telecommunications, atomic energy, and meteorology simply does not recognize the times in which we live.

In a world caught up in an urgent drive to modernize areas containing two-thirds of the human race, there is need also for the

United Nations specialized agencies dealing with health, agriculture, labor standards, education, and other subjects related to national development and human welfare. A massive effort to transfer and adapt modern technology from the more to the less advanced areas is a part of the great drama of our age. This sometimes can be done best through, or with the help of, the institutions of the international community.

And the international organizations concerned with trade and monetary and financial affairs are important to the expanding prosperity of the world economy.

III

The need for political organs at the international level is just as plain as the need for technical agencies.

You will recall that the decision to try to form a new international organization to preserve peace grew out of the agonies of the Second World War. The United States took the lead in this enterprise. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull sought to avoid repeating what many believed to have been mistakes in political tactics which kept the United States from joining the League of Nations. They consulted at every stage the leaders of both political parties in both Houses of Congress. They insisted that the formation of this organization should be accomplished, if possible, before the end of the war. Most of our Allies readily endorsed this objective and cooperated in achieving it. You will recall that the charter conference at San Francisco convened before the end of the war against Hitler and that the U.S. Senate consented to ratification of the charter in July 1945 before the end of the war in the Pacific. The vote in the Senate was 89 to 2, reflecting a national consensus bordering on unanimity. The significance of that solemn action was especially appreciated by those of us who were in uniform.

The commitment of the United States to the United Nations was wholehearted. We threw our best efforts and some of our best men into getting it organized and moving. We set about binding the wounds of war. We demobilized our Armed Forces and drastically reduced our military budget. We proposed—not only proposed but worked hard to obtain agreement—that atomic energy should be put under control of an agency of the United Nations, that it should be devoted solely to peaceful purposes, that nuclear weapons should be abolished and forever forbidden.

What happened? Stalin refused to cooperate. Even before the guns were silent, he set in motion a program of imperialistic expansion, in violation of his pledges to the Western Allies, and in contravention of the principles of the United Nations.

You will recall that the United Nations was designed on the assumption that the great powers in the alliance destined to be victors in the Second World War would remain united to maintain the future peace of the world. The United Nations would be the instrument through which these powers, in cooperation with others of course, would give effect to their mutual determination to keep the peace against any threats that might arise from some future Mussolini or Hitler. World peace was to be enforced by international forces carrying the flag of the United Nations, but called into action and directed by agreement among the major powers. Action without big power agreement was not ruled out by the Charter, but such agreement was assumed to be the prior condition of an effective peace organization. Indeed, it was stated repeatedly by early supporters of the United Nations that the organization could not possibly work unless the wartime Allies joined in collective action within the United Nations to exert their combined power to make it work.

That view of the postwar world rapidly turned out to be an illusory hope. One might well have expected—as many good people did—that when the conceptual basis for the United Nations fell to the ground, the organization would fall down beside it.

But all great institutions are flexible. The United Nations adjusted gradually to the political and power realities of the quite different world that came into being. In the absence of major power agreement in the Security Council, it drew on the Charter's authority to balance that weakness with a greater reliance upon the General Assembly.

By adapting to political reality, the United Nations lived and grew in effectiveness, in prestige, and in relevance. It could not act in some of the ways the founding fathers intended it to act, but it went on to do many things that the founding fathers never envisaged as being necessary. The most dramatic reversal of its intended role is seen in the fact that while the United Nations could not bring the great powers together, it could on occasion keep them apart by getting between them—by becoming the man in the middle—as it did in differing ways in the Middle East and in the Congo.

In short, the political organs of the United Nations survived and did effective work under the shadow of a nuclear arms race of awesome proportions—despite the so-called cold war between the major powers whose unity was once presumed to be its foundation.

This was not bound to happen. It is evident that in the political environment of the second half of the 20th century both technical and political reasons dictate the need for large-scale and diversified international organizations. But it does not necessarily follow that the United Nations was destined to work in practice—or even to survive. Indeed, its very survival may be more of an achievement than it seems at first blush. That it has steadily grown in its capacity to act is even more remarkable.

It has survived and grown in effectiveness because a great majority of the nations of the world have been determined to make it work. They have repulsed those who sought to wreck or paralyze it. They have remained determined not only to keep it alive but to improve and strengthen it. To this we owe in part the peace of the world.

IV

Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the existence of the General Assembly and the Security Council these past 18 years was a plain necessity for the preservation and repair of world peace. The failures would still have been failures, but without the U.N. some of the successes might not have been possible.

In the world of today any breach of the peace could lead to the destruction of civilization. In the thermonuclear age, any instrumentality with a potential for deterring war can hardly be described as less than indispensable to mankind. In 18 brief years, the United Nations has helped to deter or to terminate warfare in Iran and Greece, in Kashmir and Korea, in the Congo and the Caribbean, and twice in the Middle East, and twice in the western Pacific. It is not fanciful to speculate that any or all of us may owe our lives to the fact that these dangers were contained, with the active and persistent help of the processes of the United Nations.

With half a dozen international disputes chronically or repeatedly at the flashpoint, with forces of change bordering on violence loose in the world, our very instinct to survival informs us that we must keep building the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations—and keep it lubricated with funds and logistical support.

And if we are to entertain rational hopes for general disarmament, we know that the U.N. must develop a reliable system for re-

conciling international conflict without resort to force. For peace in the world community—like peace in smaller communities—means not an end of conflict but an accepted system of dealing with conflict and with change through nonviolent means.

V

Traditional bilateral diplomacy—of the quiet kind—has a heavier task today than at any time in history. But with the annual agenda of urgent international business growing apace, with the birth of more than half a hundred new nations in less than two decades, an institution that can serve as an annual diplomatic conference becomes almost a necessity. As a general manager of our own Nation's diplomatic establishment, I cannot imagine how we could conduct or coordinate our foreign affairs if we were limited to dealing directly through bilateral channels with the 114 nations with which we have diplomatic relations tonight.

At the last General Assembly representatives of 111 countries met for more than 3 months to discuss, negotiate, and debate. Two more countries became U.N. members, to make it 113. When the tumult and the shouting had died, the General Assembly had adopted, curiously enough, 113 resolutions. This is what we have come to call parliamentary diplomacy.

But outside the formal agenda the General Assembly also has become the world's greatest switchboard for bilateral diplomacy. For many of the young and small nations, lacking a fully developed diplomatic service, the United Nations is the main, sometimes the only, general mechanism available for the conduct of their diplomacy.

Without formal decision, the opening of each new Assembly has turned into something like an informal conference of the foreign ministers of the world community. In New York last fall, in a period of 11 days, I conferred with the Foreign Ministers or heads of government of 54 nations.

I believe that too many items are placed on the agenda of the General Assembly. Too many issues are debated and not enough are negotiated. I feel strongly that members should take more seriously article 33 of the Charter which pledges them to seek solutions to their disputes "first of all . . . by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice" before bringing disputes to the U.N. at all.

But the point here is that it is hard to imagine the conduct of diplomacy throughout the year without a meeting of the General Assembly to deal in one forum, and in a more or less systematic manner, with subjects which demand widespread diplomatic attention among the members of the world community.

The need for an annual diplomatic conference, the need for a peacekeeping deterrent to wars large and small, and the need for an international monitor of peaceful change, are plain enough. They seem to me to warrant the conclusion that the political organs as well as the technical organs of the United Nations have been very useful to the world at large for the past decade and a half. Commonsense informs us that they can be even more useful in the years ahead.

VI

I suspect that the near future will witness another period of adjustment for the United Nations. Some adjustments are, indeed, required—because the political environment is changing and so is the structure of the U.N. itself.

For one thing the cobweb syndrome, the illusion that one nation or bloc of nations could, by coercion, weave the world into a single pattern directed from a single center of power, is fading into limbo. That other illusion, the bipolar theory, of a world di-

vided permanently between two overwhelming centers of power with most other nations clustered about them, is fading too. The reality of a world of great diversity with many centers of power and influence is coming into better focus.

Meanwhile, a first brake has been placed on the nuclear arms race and the major powers are searching for other agreements in areas of common interest. One is entitled to hope that the major power conflicts which so often have characterized U.N. proceedings in the past will yield more and more to great power cooperation; indeed, there was some evidence to sustain such a hope in the actions of the 18th General Assembly.

As long as a member possessing great power was intent on promoting conflict and upheaval—the better to coerce the world into its own image—that member might well regard the United Nations as a threat to its own ambitions.

But suppose it is agreed that all members, despite their deep differences, share a common interest in survival—and therefore a common interest in preventing resort to force anywhere in the world. Then the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations can be seen realistically for what it is: an indispensable service potentially in the national interest of all members—in the common interest of even rival states.

If this reality is grasped by the responsible leaders of all the large powers, then the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations will find some degree of support from all sides—not as a rival system of order but as contributor to, and sometimes guarantor of, the common interest in survival.

It would be a great service to peace if there could develop common recognition of a common interest in the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations. That recognition is far from common now. My belief that it will dawn is based on the fact that it would serve the national interests of all nations, large and small—and because sooner or later nations can be expected to act in line with their national interests.

Peace will not be achieved by repeating worn out propaganda themes or resetting rusty old traps.

But if our Soviet friends are prepared to act on what Chairman Khrushchev says in part of his New Year's message—that war over territorial questions is unacceptable, that nations should not be the targets of direct or indirect aggression, that we should use the United Nations and every other means of peaceful settlement—then let us together build up the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations to prevent even small wars in our flammable world.

For small wars could too easily, too quickly, lead to nuclear war, and nuclear war can too easily, too quickly, prove fatal to friend and foe alike.

VII

Meanwhile, the internal structure of the United Nations has been changing radically over the past several years. The United Nations began life with 51 members. When its headquarters building was designed, United Nations officials believed they were foresighted in planning for an eventual membership of 75. This year major alterations will be undertaken to make room for the present 113 members and more. It is a fair guess that membership of the U.N. will level off during the next decade at 125 to 130 members.

This more than doubling of the U.N.'s membership is proud testament to the tidal sweep through the old colonial areas of the doctrine of self-determination of peoples. It is a triumph of largely peaceful change. It is a tribute to those advanced countries which have helped bring dependent areas to self-government and independence and made possible their free choice of their own destiny. It is a striking and welcome result of

the greatest wave of national liberation in all time. It also has important implications for all U.N. members—the new members and the older members too—and for the U.N. itself.

The most prosaic—but nonetheless important—implication is for methods of work in the General Assembly. With more than twice as many voices to be heard, views to be reconciled, and votes to be cast and counted, on a swelling agenda of business, there is obvious danger that the General Assembly will be swamped.

I already have suggested that the agenda may be unnecessarily bloated, that in many cases private discourse and real progress are preferable to public debate and symbolic resolution, and that the U.N. might well be used more as a court of last resort and less as a forum of original jurisdiction.

But I think still more needs to be done. If the expanded Assembly is to work with reasonable proficiency, it must find ways of delegating some of its work to units less cumbersome than committees of 113 members. The General Assembly is the only parliamentary body in the world that tries to do most of its business in committees of the whole. The Assembly has, in fact, moved to establish several subcommittees, including one to consider financing peacekeeping operations; and perhaps more thought should now be given to the future role of such committees in the work of the organization.

The radical expansion of the membership raises problems for the newer and smaller nations. They rightly feel that they are underrepresented on some organs—notably the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council—whose membership was based on the U.N.'s original size and composition.

The growth of membership also raises problems for the middle range powers, who were early members and have reason to feel that they are next in line for a larger voice.

And it raises problems—or potential problems—for the larger powers, too.

The rapid and radical expansion of the General Assembly may require some adaptation of procedures if the U.N. is to remain relevant to the real world and therefore effective in that world.

Theoretically, a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly could now be formed by nations with only 10 percent of the world's population, or who contribute, altogether, 5 percent of the assessed budget.

In practice, of course, this does not happen; and I do not share the dread expressed by some that the General Assembly will be taken over by its swirling majorities.

But even the theoretical possibility that a two-thirds majority, made up primarily of smaller States, could recommend a course of action for which other nations would bear the primary responsibility and burden is one that requires thoughtful attention.

There are two extreme views of how national influence should be expressed in the work of the United Nations. At one extreme is the contention that no action at all should be taken by the United Nations without the unanimous approval of the permanent members of the Security Council. This is a prescription for chronic paralysis. The United Nations was never intended to be kept in such a box. The rights and duties of the General Assembly are inherent in the Charter. The United Nations has been able to develop its capacity to act precisely because those rights were not blocked by the requirement of big power unanimity.

At the other extreme are those few who feel that nothing should matter except the number of votes that can be mustered—that what a majority wants done must be done regardless of what states make up the majority. This notion flies in the face of commonsense. The plain fact of the matter is that the United Nations simply cannot take significant action without the support of

the members who supply it with resources and have the capacity to act.

Some have suggested that all General Assembly votes should be weighed to reflect population, or wealth, or level of contributions, or some combination of these or other factors. I do not believe that so far-reaching an answer would be realistic or practical.

The equal vote in the General Assembly for each member—however unequal in size, wealth, experience, technology, or other criterion—is rooted in the idea of "sovereign equality." And that idea is not one which any nation, large or small, is eager to abandon.

I do not pretend to have the final answer—nor is it timely or appropriate for any member to formulate the answer without wide and careful consultations with others in the world community.

However, extended discussions lie ahead on such questions as expanding the councils, scales of payment for peacekeeping, and procedures for authorizing peacekeeping operations.

I shall not discuss U.N. finances in detail tonight. But let me say that the first principle of a healthy organization is that all its members take part in its work and contribute their proper shares to its financial support. Two years ago more than half the U.N. members were behind in their dues—some because of political objections but many simply because they were not paying. I am glad to see that most members are now beginning to act on the principle of collective financial responsibility. But there remains a serious problem of large nations that have not been willing to pay for peacekeeping operations.

I would hope that the discussions which lie ahead will not only strengthen the financial underpinnings of the U.N. but, among other things, develop an acceptable way for the General Assembly to take account of capacity to act, of responsibility for the consequences, and of actual contributions to the work of the U.N. Such a way must be found if the United Nations machinery is to be relevant to the tasks that lie ahead—in peacekeeping, in nation building, and in the expansion of human rights.

All adjustment is difficult. Adaptation of the U.N. to recent changes in the environment may take time. It will require a shift away from some hardened ideas and some rigid patterns of action and reaction—perhaps on all sides. It will require—to come back to Hammarskjöld's words—"perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers."

To ask all this may seem to be asking a great deal. But I am inclined toward confidence the U.N. already has demonstrated a capacity to adapt under the flexible provisions of the Charter to the realities of international politics.

I am further persuaded that all, or most, of the smaller members are realistic enough to know: that their own national interests lie with, not against, an effective United Nations; that the U.N. can be effective only if it has the backing of those who have the means to make it effective; that the U.N. is made less, not more effective, by ritualistic passage of symbolic resolutions with no practical influence on the real world; that only responsible use of voting power is effective use of voting power; that true progress on behalf of the world community lies along the path on which the weak and the strong find ways to walk together.

VIII

These are some of the reasons, derived from analysis of the current state of world affairs, why I expect the United Nations to evolve and to grow in executive capacity to act in support of its goals.

And apart from the issue of human survival, the greatest of these goals is, of course, the steady extension of human rights.

Dedication to the principle of the universality of fundamental human rights collides in practice with dedication to the principle of national sovereignty. For, most violations of human rights are committed within the confines of national societies, often by the very governments that have ratified the Charter's prescription for "fundamental freedoms for all." Yet, securing equal rights for all individual members of the human race is the ultimate goal of world community—and the ultimate challenge to the United Nations as the elementary but principal expression of that community. Somehow, the United Nations must learn how to increase respect for the rights of the human person throughout the world.

It is here that we sense the permanent value and the final force of the basic principles of a charter which dares to speak for "We, the peoples of the United Nations." Sometimes I feel that we talk too much about the universality and brotherhood of man and too little about the valuable and interesting differences that distinguish all brothers. But the lessons of recorded history, and the teachings of the world's great teachers, make clear the basic wants of mankind.

Men and women everywhere want a decent standard of material welfare for themselves and their children. They want to live in conditions of personal security. They want social justice. They want to experience a sense of achievement, for themselves, and for the groups with which they identify themselves.

But men and women everywhere want more. They want personal freedom and human dignity.

Individuals and societies place differing values on these aspirations. But surely these are universal desires, shared by all races in all lands, interpreted by all religions, and given concrete form—or lip service—by leaders and spokesmen for every kind of political, economic, and social system.

Peace and security, achievement, and welfare, freedom, and dignity—these are the goals of the United Nations for all peoples. And any nation which questions for long whether we should seek these aims is destined to become a pariah of the world community.

Because the kind of world projected in the Charter is the kind of world we want, the United Nations—despite its quarrels and its shortcomings—commands our continuing support.

As President Johnson said to the General Assembly on December 17: " * * * more than ever we support the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind."

And because the kind of world projected in the Charter is the kind most people everywhere want, I believe that others will join with us in improving and strengthening the United Nations. That is why I am confident that the executive capacity of the United Nations—its machinery for keeping peace, building nations, and promoting human rights—will be greater on its 25th birthday than on its 18th.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield, so that I may make a brief statement on a nonurgent subject?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Delaware, with the

understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

KID-GLOVE TREATMENT OF ANTHONY DeANGELIS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to call attention to another situation wherein the Government has given the kid-glove treatment to Mr. Anthony DeAngelis, the man who allegedly is responsible for the \$100 million disappearance of soybean oil.

In this instance it appears that Mr. DeAngelis as an individual, the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., Bayonne, N.J., and his other affiliated companies, have all over the years had a miserable record of delinquencies when it came to filing their income tax returns.

In addition to being habitually delinquent, Mr. DeAngelis, on November 19, 1957, settled a \$1,542,494.18 income tax liability for \$250,000, or about 16 cents on the dollar.

It should be noted that while Mr. DeAngelis may today be considered bankrupt, he was considered wealthy at the time this compromise settlement was negotiated.

The Treasury Department is not the only agency which extended to Mr. DeAngelis and his companies exceptionally favorable consideration. Appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 11, pages 15124 to 15126, I called attention to the Senate the manner in which the Department of Agriculture had purchased a lot of soybean oil which they did not need, at prices far in excess of what they should have paid, and then accepted for delivery an inferior product packed in faulty containers.

The result was that this inferior salad oil, which was shipped all over the world, became rancid and was declared unfit for human consumption. All of these transactions took place with a man who even prior to this had been declared by a Government agency as unreliable and thereby not eligible to participate in Government contracts.

This earlier suspension had been based on previous trouble which the Government had had with the same outfit involving shipments of soybean oil to Spain which had been financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1954. That earlier suspension had resulted in claims totaling \$1.5 million being filed by the Department of Justice. Upon settlement the company was suspended from participating in any program which was financed by the U.S. Government, but that suspension proved to be no handicap.

I understand that the McClellan committee is preparing to examine the complex activities of Mr. DeAngelis and his companies to determine how he was able to receive such considerable attention from the numerous Government agencies as well as how he was able to perpetuate the \$100 million inventory fraud in his soybean oil holdings.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part

of my remarks, the letter dated February 4, 1964, signed by Mr. Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In your letter of December 17, 1963, you requested certain information concerning Mr. Anthony DeAngelis and other taxpayers. The replies are numbered to correspond to the questions in your letter.

1. Have this individual and the companies filed timely income tax returns?

(a) If not, a report of all delinquencies. Anthony DeAngelis, Fort Lee, N.J.

We have a record of income tax returns having been filed for the years 1944-62, inclusive. The return for the year 1961 was delinquent when filed.

Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., Bayonne, N.J.

This corporation was incorporated in November 1955. We have a record of income tax returns having been filed for the fiscal years ended in 1956 through October 31, 1961. We do not have a record of a return having been filed for the fiscal year ended in 1962. The returns for the fiscal years ended in 1959 and 1960 were delinquent when filed.

Trans World Refining Corp., Bayonne, N.J.

This corporation was incorporated in July 1953. We have a record of income tax returns having been filed for the fiscal years ended in 1954 through June 27, 1958, and for the fiscal years ended July 2, 1960, through June 30, 1962. We have not been able to locate a record of a return having been filed for the fiscal year ended June 28, 1959. The returns for the fiscal years ended in 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1962 were delinquent when filed.

Metropolitan Fats & Oils, Inc., Bayonne, N.J.

This corporation was incorporated in June 1953. We have a record of income tax returns having been filed for the fiscal years ended in 1954 through June 3, 1961. We do not have a record of a return having been filed for the fiscal year ended in 1962. The returns for the fiscal years ended in 1954, 1955, 1957, 1958, and 1959 were delinquent when filed.

Shortening Corp. of America, Inc., Jersey City, N.J.

This corporation was incorporated in February 1955. We have a record of income tax returns having been filed for the fiscal years ended in 1956 through March 31, 1962. The returns for the fiscal years ended in 1957 and 1958 were delinquent when filed.

3. Have there been any compromise settlements with the individual or any of the corporations referred to during the past 20 years?

(a) If so, a complete report showing the dates of such settlements, the total amount of assessed tax including all penalties and interest, and the net amount for which the case was settled.

We have a record of one accepted offer in compromise.

On November 19, 1957, Mr. DeAngelis filed an offer amounting to \$250,000 to compromise income tax liabilities including ad valorem penalties and interest for the calendar years 1944-46 and 1950-54, inclusive, totaling \$1,542,494.18. The offer consisted of collateral agreements with respect to the adjustment of the basis of certain assets for income tax purposes and the waiver of carryback adjustments. The terms of payment of the

offer were: \$25,000 cash with offer; \$25,000 to be paid within 15 days after notice of acceptance; \$200,000 balance to be paid in installments; \$5,000 on the first day of January, April, July, and October, with interest, following the quarter after acceptance.

On April 20, 1960, the offer was accepted. The records indicate that as of December 1963, the taxpayer met his obligations as set forth in his offer and was current in his payments.

We will write you further regarding the filing and payment record of withholding tax returns by these companies (question No. 2 in your letter) as soon as the information is received from our field offices.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield 1 minute to me so that I may proceed out of order, notwithstanding the rule?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE IOU'S, NO. 4—A REPLY TO PROPAGANDA FILM

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, an employee of a rural electric cooperative in North Dakota is also a keen film critic.

He is Mr. Conrad Blomberg, staff assistant of the Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

The film is "The Power Within," a propaganda production of the investor-owned electric utilities. I inserted the text of this film and other material in the RECORD during the course of my January 8 speech, and subsequently have inserted in the RECORD two "Project: Action" newsletters which tell how the utilities are getting community groups to use this disreputable film.

As in the 1920's, so also in the 1960's, the charges made by the IOU's are cruel, untrue and unnecessary.

I agree with Mr. Blomberg that the investor-owned utilities have "strayed far, far from the traditional spirit of fair-play and integrity in American business."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Blomberg's comments, which were presented to the annual meeting of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association in Denver, on December 10, 1963.

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

WHY IT AFFECTS YOU—AN ANALYSIS OF THE MOVIE "THE POWER WITHIN"—WHY IT HAS AN EFFECT ON ITS AUDIENCE AND WHAT ITS APPEALS ARE

(By Conrad Blomberg)

The basic theme of the power company movie, "The Power Within," is one which does not recommend it well. Simply stated, the theme is distrust and suspicion. Distrust of our duly elected and constituted Federal Government, and suspicion of the motives, patriotism, and loyalty of a large group of American citizens.

The citizens upon whom the unfair scourge of suspicion is cast are the owners, directors and management of Rural Electric Cooperatives in the United States.

In this brief discussion of this propaganda movie, I would like to cover two things: the basic appeals made and why they are effective; and, secondly, an analysis of the so-called facts which this movie presents.

Let us first, however, admit something about this moving picture—it is technically an excellent production. It cost, we are told, about \$38,000 to make. The writing, directing and acting are all excellent. It has impact and great force. We cannot ignore this movie because unlike the snows of winter, its effect will not fade with the passage of time. Only hard and persistent effort on the part of those who are the subjects of its half-truths and innuendo will ever mitigate its deep and lasting effect on those who will see it.

Now, let's take a look at the appeal which this movie makes—what does it say, and how does it say it? What, if it is boiled down to its essence, is its message? Although the movie is colored by some action and a lot of words, its message consists of only three things:

First. The Government in the United States is not trustworthy. The Government is wrong. The Government has taken a mysterious and sinister path which will destroy our fundamental economic system and us with it.

Second. The cause of the wrong-turning by the Government is the so-called Federal takeover of the power industry through rural electric cooperatives.

Third. The unpatriotic, anti-Americans in this country are the people who own, control or work for rural electric cooperatives. They are leading the way to a complete Federal takeover of our lives.

This is a cruel, untrue, and unnecessary message to hurl at any group. It is a message which has strayed far, far from the traditional spirit of fairplay and integrity in American business.

It is unfortunate for rural electric people that many in our land will find this message of distrust and suspicion to their liking and will feed upon this low attack. These hate-racked and extreme people will spread this untrue virus of suspicion among all who will listen.

I would like now to leave from the basic message of this movie and take up some of the so-called facts as they are presented.

I am only at this time, going to cover nine statements made. There are many, many others which are half true, untrue, or badly warped in this film, but to cover them all would take more time than we have here today.

Statement 1: The son complains to Ed Jenkins that his Federal income tax is too high. He says, "Nowadays I'm paying upwards of 20 percent of my income."

Let us look at the income this young man is making and see what kind of a man he is:

First, we know that he is a married man with two children. This gives him four dependency deductions. It is not stated exactly where he lives, but he does not complain about State income taxes so therefore he must live in some State like South Dakota which has no income tax.

Let us now compute his income from the 20 percent of his income which he says he pays in taxes.

With four dependents he has deductions of \$2,400 automatically. He can then go the short way of computing his tax and, deduct a straight 10 percent of his income in lieu of itemizing his expenses. These two types of deduction will give taxable income, upon which the tax is figured.

Our accountant figured it out using U.S. Treasury Department publication 1 from the Internal Revenue Service. Taking schedule II which applies to married taxpayers filing joint returns, he found that Ed Jenkin's son makes about \$22,000 per year which inci-

dentally is more than the REA Administrator is paid.

It is figured this way: \$22,000 income; less \$2,200 deduction in lieu of itemized expense, less \$2,400 deduction at \$600 per dependent for \$4,600 total deductions; taxable income is \$17,400.

Tax on \$17,400 taxable income equals \$4,396 or 19.9 percent of \$22,000. Had this boy been any kind of a businessman and had he taken any deductions such as medical bills, interest paid, car expense, and so on, he could have easily earned more than \$22,000 per year and still paid only the tax of \$4,396. We will, however, give him the benefit of the doubt. Somehow his statement that he can barely get by on his income doesn't ring quite so true when you can take a close look at the facts. Unfortunately the statement on taxes goes by so fast in the movie, most people will accept it as true. I know that until I investigated it, I had no idea what percentage of my income was paid in Federal income tax.

Statement 2: The whole basis for the distrust and suspicion of our Federal Government turns on the old Hoover Commission report. Many of you are familiar with this commission and the difficulty we had in even presenting the rural electric side of the story during its hearings.

I think we all realize that any commission or similar body is necessarily going to have to reflect the personal feelings and biases of the membership. This is certainly true of the Hoover Commission.

It is interesting to note that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power were so extreme that two Eisenhower appointees, Arthur S. Fleming and Herbert Brownell, dissented from the Commission's recommendations in this area. They stated that the extreme recommendations "would impede the Federal Government in exercising its proper role in the development and use of the Nation's water resources."

Who then was the chairman of the task force of the Hoover Commission which made these extreme recommendations? The recommendations, I might point out, on which the whole movie hangs.

The chairman of the task force was Adm. Ben Moreell of Pittsburgh. A retired naval officer and steel executive, Mr. Moreell has long been noted for his extremely conservative views. He has been a speaker at many rightwing meetings and has written many articles and papers espousing a philosophy which would preclude his having an unbiased view of Federal water resource development.

Let me briefly sketch in some of the other members of the task force and see whether they could be called unbiased.

Charles L. Andrews: After the announcement of his appointment to the Hoover Commission Task Force he told a reporter that he was not a supporter of TVA. Member of the Conservative Americans for Constitutional Action.

Wesley W. Horner: Chairman of the subcommittee for power generation and distribution who was on record for both disposal of Federal power at the damsite and for sale of all Federal power facilities to the States or their "nominees." (Horner is no longer carried in Who's Who.)

Edward A. Krackle: A certified public accountant. A member of the Conservative Americans for Constitutional Action.

Charles Edison: An endorser of the rightwing Manion Forum; treasurer and trustee of Americans for Constitutional Action; on the editorial advisory committee of American Opinion, the John Birch Society magazine, a charter subscriber to Human Events, a rightwing publication; participated in many other rightwing activities.

J. Bracken Lee: On the committee of endorers of the John Birch Society; on the

editorial advisory committee of the Birch Society publication American Opinion; an endorser of the Manion Forum; on the national board of the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, a Birch Society "front" group according to the society's Blue Book; a leading proponent for abolition of the Federal income tax; participated in many other rightwing activities.

Albert C. Mattai: One of Herbert Hoover's closest associates who reportedly shares Hoover's views on the Government getting out of the power field. Supporter of Human Events.

Donald R. Richberg: Author "Labor Union Monopoly," 1957, a figure in the National Right-to-Work Committee which works with the rightwing Manion Forum.

Arthur B. Roberts: Recommended to the first Hoover Commission that the Government should build the large multiple-purpose dams and permit private power companies to install the generating facilities in each dam. Washington observers felt this would give a monopoly to the large power companies and result in the complete destruction of the preference clause.

William D. Shannon: Seattle, Wash., construction engineer. Former member of the Engineers Joint Council which recommended the sale of Federal power at the busbar or damsite. Under this policy, Federal power also would be sold almost exclusively to the private utilities.

These are not all the task force members. They are however, a large enough group to indicate the tone of belief among those on the task force. To me they do not sound like an unbiased group.

While the other members of the task force may or may not have been as conservative or rightwing as those listed above, they were certainly influenced greatly by the men whose background and beliefs are outlined.

Therefore, I believe that basing the criticism of REA and rural electric cooperatives and indeed the whole Federal Government on the Hoover Commission—and especially on the water and power task force report—is basing it on shaky grounds. I would prefer a more unbiased committee. I would prefer men who did not have strong rightwing or leftwing associations. I would prefer a study made without prejudgment. I do not believe this is what this little film tries to preach, however. Bias is acceptable, provided it is pro-power company bias.

Unfortunately for rural electric people, however, many will regard the Hoover Report as unbiased and fair. We can only combat this impression by continual and fair explanations of the rural electric story to the public.

Statement 3: The original purpose of REA as explained in the movie is erroneous. Ed Jenkins as a rural electric director lets this one slip by without a wink. Ed must be sleeping through most of his co-op's board meetings. The movie says: "The original purpose was to bring electricity to farmers." This was not and is not the purpose of REA at all. The purpose is to electrify the unserved rural areas. Thus the name Rural Electrification Administration. Both Republicans and Democrats have in the past agreed upon this basic premise. It is not the farm electrification administration.

Again another so-called fact does not ring true.

Statement 4: There is a discussion in the movie of section 5 and RAD loans. This is again misleading and untrue. Let me quote to you from the dialogue: "How could banks compete with REA interest rates on such loans? REA is competing in the loan business as well as the power business."

You directors and managers know that this is not true.

One of the actors in the movie then reads a list of RAD loans made in the recent past. You directors and managers know that to

make such a loan the borrower must be able to prove in writing that he has been turned down by every reasonable source of credit, including banks. A rank misstatement about rural electrification cooperatives again.

In addition, one of the actors indicates that Congressmen are up in arms after holding a hearing on section 5 loans made to rural electric. Let me tell you what actually happened:

At a recent hearing of the House Agricultural subcommittee, Representative Jones of Missouri, Chairman of the subcommittee on governmental oversight told newsmen after the hearing: "I had many reservations on these loans before this hearing but my opinion has changed. They (Mr. Clapp and his staff) have shown justification I was not aware of."

Unfortunately for us, most of the public will be as unaware as Congressman Jones of the justification. The movie is untrue, but many will believe it.

Statement 5: Much is made of who the owners of the power companies really are. The movie tells us that widows, businessmen, students, insurance companies, pension trusts, and so on, are the owners. This is true, they are all stockholders, and thus have a share in ownership, however small.

However, in the case of a publicly owned stock company it is not ownership that counts—it is instead, control that really matters.

Power company stock is profitable stock, made better by Government subsidy through fast tax writeoffs, and sweetened even further by overcharges beyond the allowable rate of return overlooked by friendly regulatory bodies. Because it is profitable stock, ownership is widely held by many citizens and groups. However, the companies are closely controlled by small groups of men—or in some cases by one man—often the president. This little group or single individual owns just a small percentage of the total number of shares outstanding, but this percentage is enough to control. To all intents and purposes, this company is his to bend in any direction he wishes.

Now, therefore does the control lie as the movie puts it with "a handful of Wall Street manipulators?" You be the judge.

Now please do not misunderstand what I am saying. We have no quarrel with this type of ownership. It is a legal, usual, legitimate way to do business. We do quarrel, however, with equating stock ownership with control of the company. These things are not now, and never will be, equal as long as 1 share of stock is 1 vote and 10 shares are 10 votes. No; the misleading point here is not that stock ownership is widespread—for it is—the point is that control of power companies is closely held and widows and students have little voice in its decisions.

Statement 6: Did you notice that in the example of the purchase of the house for \$15,000 the actor said the REA-type payments would be \$50 and then wrote \$50, and then went back and placed a decimal point before the 5 making it 50 cents. This is a transparent attempt at subliminal influence. For those of you who are not familiar with the tricks of the advertising world, subliminal influence is not supposed to be noticed consciously. Subliminal influence comes in below the threshold of consciousness and influences you without your quite knowing why. It is almost entirely visual. This crude attempt which can be seen clearly by anyone who is watching for it, is at the very least insulting to the public who is expected to watch the film.

Statement 7: Since when do we equate a home loan with an electric utility loan? Do you get the same terms on a car loan as you do on a home loan? Certainly not. Do you get similar terms on a loan a railroad or steamship company gets from an investment

bank as you do on a home loan? Of course not. Do you finance your home through the sale of stocks and bonds like power companies do? Ridiculous. It is like comparing lemons and eggs. Both are roundish in shape, but there the resemblance ends.

Statement 8: Most people are aware of the difference between federally owned power and cooperatively owned power. Cooperatively owned power is privately owned power—yet in this movie both are lumped together. At one point an actor says that rural electric cooperatives are Government power about to swallow up the power companies. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Can you tell me how rural electric cooperatives are going to swallow up the power companies when rural electric is not permitted to serve in towns of over 1,500 population? Nor to serve anyone now getting central station service?

The bogeyman of TVA is held up as somehow being the same thing as rural electric cooperatives. Let me point out that the people in the TVA area seem to like TVA and don't complain. Just how all this ties together is purposely made vague and amorphous. Clearly another misdirection and misstatement of fact, deliberately done to influence those who don't know or don't care.

Statement 9: There is a lot of talk about normal taxes in this movie. We are led to believe that rural electric cooperatives don't pay any taxes. This is the oldest, weakest power company war cry. I'm surprised that they dragged it out and propped it up again. You know, and I know that rural electric pay hundreds, thousands, and hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes every year. We do not pay income tax because we have no income. We are rendering a service at cost to member-owners who get any overpayment back in the form of capital credits.

Thus again we see a misdirection, a misstatement calculated to give the wrong impression.

Statement 10: At the end of this picture there is a moving, emotional scene showing President Abraham Lincoln as immortalized in marble in Lincoln's tomb. The announcer reads, in Lincolnian tones what is obviously meant to be construed as a quote from this great President. The announcer says, "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help man permanently by doing for him what he could and should do for himself."

Nowhere have we been able to find such a quote by Lincoln. But we did find a famous quotation of Lincoln's which might apply here. He said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate or individual capacities."

Thus I believe that Lincoln would soundly and deeply support the rural electric cooperatives in their relationship of borrowers from Federal Government.

I have here covered only a very few of the statement made in the movie. Time will not permit me to cover more, but rest assured that statement after statement can be refuted with documented fact.

You have now seen the tissue of half-truths, innuendo and actual misstatement on which this movie hangs—why then does it have so much impact? For surely it does have impact.

Part of the impact comes because to the viewer there is apparently a defense of rural electric built into the movie. Ed Jenkins is a rural electric cooperative director, who apparently raises all the defenses. And he does—in a very weak and offhand manner. He also makes statements like: "You may be right," and "I can see I've been wrong." Put an actual director in Ed Jenkins' shoes

and you'd not see such a tissue paper defense.

Just by way of documenting the tissue paper defense Ed Jenkins puts up in behalf of his rural electric cooperative, let me give you some of the phrases he uses:

"I give up. You're probably right. Things sure seem to be gettin' worse all right, I'll admit. You've made your point. I've been unfair. There's a loss right there. I've been enjoying a free ride. High time something was done. Push this country in the direction its headed. See our American system get tossed away."

These are not the words of a knowledgeable director defending the rural electric cooperative from a low attack.

So part of the impact comes from what appears to be a fair answer to the charges—even though it is scarcely that.

The greater part of the impact on the viewer, however, comes through the use of emotion-laden words. It is said that if you could read a man's mind and know how he thinks, you could just say to him certain emotion-laden words and either make him very happy or very angry. Whether or not this is true, it is a fact that we are all affected by emotion-laden words. This effect varies from being slight and almost unnoticeable to strong and violent depending upon the word and the context in which it is used.

I have gone through this tricky little movie and winnowed out some of the emotion-laden words.

Let us not accept being called names unworthy of the American business community. Let us rather consider that we are the legal, normal competition to stockholder-owned power companies.

Let us, above all, continue to regard our Government as an instrument of our people—freely arrived at, and responsive to the needs and wishes of all Americans, great or small.

Let us look at the words applied to our Federal Government (a federal government that I believe to be among the best in the world) and to rural electrification and rural electric people:

That stinks, push you around, pretty sorry, an enormous bucket of swill, depriving private business, don't pay taxes, subsidized, Frankenstein, swallow up, squeezed out, unfair, frightening, no justification, used against us, back door Federal takeover, negation of our fundamental economic system, nonsense, path of no return, pouring out larger and larger amounts, burns me up, drain income.

When you read that list, it almost makes you angry just reading it—without relating it to anything specific. The effect is to make you distrustful and suspicious of our Federal Government and rural electric people.

Now let us look at the words applied directly and indirectly to the power companies:

Do their part, benefit, broadest and truest, regulated, legal, free, wonderful, American, solid principles, fairness, equality, drive, initiative, hymn, school, church, God, spirit, independence, anthem.

Such a list would make you cheer—regardless of what it was applied to. It is applied in this case to power companies.

Thus did the writer of this movie do his work. Using words from which emotion drips, he makes power companies seem like the savior of mankind, our Federal Government suspicious and rural electrification seem anti- or un-American.

Unfortunately again for us, most people will not be able to pick out these words and segregate their appeal from the facts as they actually exist. You yourself can judge the effect.

You know, over the past 10 years, I have known literally hundreds of rural electric people. I have never met any I would consider un-American or anti-American. Yet

the total effect of this movie is to make rural electric people appear to be un-American and therefore suspect. This is surely as low a blow as can be struck.

I know that rural electric people do not call power company people by the emotion laden words, which you have just heard. No rural electric director says that power companies are out to destroy America, and the American way of life. We would not dream of sinking to this depth.

Why then do the power companies do this? Why do men who control the most successful, most profitable businesses in America stoop to calling names unfit for the seamiest barroom? The only reason I can find is that they are motivated by an unreasoning fear. But fear of what? Fear of competition. Good old American competition. Perhaps this movie points it out as no previous advertisement or article ever has.

Let us look at the average power company executive who makes the decision to swing the low blow. What is he like?

He is, I would wager, a man in his late fifties or early sixties who went to work for his power company back in the 1920's. He spent almost 20 years in the power business before REA was a real factor. Before REA came along he worked in a business virtually without any competition. Had he been a grocer or a retail merchant he would have had all his life to face competition. He would have known that competition is recognized as the central core of our American business system.

What is it that keeps prices in line? That gets us more for the money? Competition. Competition which forces everyone to look inward on himself and to do his best to improve.

But power company people have never known the discipline of competition until rural electric cooperatives came along and then they only faced competition by example. Suddenly this power-company man woke up to the fact that there was an example of competition and he doesn't yet realize what it is.

I say he doesn't realize what it is because he doesn't act like the grocer and try to best his competition by more and better service, by lower prices or more courteous personnel. No. Instead he resorts to name calling, invective and near slander.

Instead of lower rates he shrieks about Government takeover.

Instead of more service to his consumers he cries that rural electric cooperatives are un-American.

Instead of more courtesy to his customers he uses movies like "The Power Within."

Instead of emulating the American business community in meeting competition directly and forthrightly, he turns to the doubtful practice of casting suspicion on our Government.

If I had over three-fourths of the grocery business in my town and the other 25 percent was divided up among a hodgepodge of small competitors I would not stand on the street corner yelling "foul" every time they tried to improve themselves. That is not the essential spirit of the American business community. It is instead the spirit of demagoguery and incitation.

What can we learn from this tricky, emotional little movie, "The Power Within"?

We can learn one hard lesson. Power companies that use it are not our friends or even good neighbors. Those who use this movie are hitting below the belt in an emotional jungle of suspicion and distrust. They are willing to imply that their own and your own free government is suspect.

We can learn to consider the Government of the United States, our Government if you please, duly elected by its citizens in free elections, as an instrument of society. An instrument of which we should be proud, rather than suspicious.

This small-scope moving picture would encourage our citizens to be distrustful and suspicious of the most free and open government the world has ever seen. This, I think, is an unhealthy abnormal thing. Disagree, yes. Oppose openly, yes. But let us not use the emotional catchphrase. Let us not sow among our citizens the seeds of hate and discord. Today among men we need more—not less harmony of action in our free society.

We can learn from this movie to support our organizations, great and small, that tell people the truth about our efforts to make rural America a better place to live and to keep it that way.

Rural electric directors and management—and the cooperatives themselves are all operating within the boundaries of free, private enterprise. Rural electric cooperatives are not Government owned nor are they a threat to the American way of life. They do, however, form the strong, privately owned competition in the power business.

TWELFTH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Connecticut yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. DODD. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, on Wednesday morning, February 5, 1,000 persons, including the President of the United States, members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, delegates to the conference and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership groups attended the Presidential Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C.

This gathering of the leaders in Government, the clergy, and lay leaders at a prayer breakfast, where we rededicated ourselves to the spiritual values which have been and are basic in our Nation's history, was most inspirational. It should create confidence among peoples everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the program and the statements made by the President of the United States, Dr. Billy Graham, and others who participated.

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

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM, 8 A.M.

Navy Sea Chanters: "Prayer for These Days."

Presiding: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senate, Kansas.

Invocation: The Honorable George Hayes.

Greetings: Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), president, International Christian Leadership.

Old Testament lesson: Exodus 20: 1-17.

Greetings from the U.S. House of Representatives: The Honorable JEFFREY COHELAN, president of Breakfast Group, U.S. House of Representatives.

New Testament lesson: Matthew 5: 13-20.

Greetings from the U.S. Senate: The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senate, Utah.

Remarks: The Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon.

Vocal solo: George Beverly Shea (Tedd Smith at the piano).

Intercession for national leaders: Dr. Abraham Vereide, founder, International Christian Leadership.

Message: Dr. Billy Graham.

The President of the United States. Benediction: Dr. Richard C. Halverson, associate executive director, International Christian Leadership.

Closing song: "America the Beautiful."

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees, beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam,
Undimmed by human tears!

America! America!

God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!

INVOCATION BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE
E. C. HAYES

May we pray, God our Heavenly Father, maker of heaven and earth, it is fitting that we should begin this day with acknowledgment of our dependence upon Thee and invoke Thy divine blessing. Enlarge our hearts that we may be more and more devoted in prayer and that we may in truth and in fact be witnesses for thee. Help us in all our perplexities to know Thy will and give to us the strength and courage to do as Thou desirest, make us conscious of Thy presence as we are granted this privilege of breaking bread together, and Almighty God in these days of constant stress and strain, in these days of wars and rumors of wars, in these days of national calamity evidencing man's inhumanity to man, we ask a special blessing upon the President of the United States, his Cabinet, and those in positions to speak and act for this great Nation of ours. Be Thou their consultant, let their words and their deeds be always acceptable in Thy sight.

Give to our statesmen the grace, wisdom, and courage to promote righteousness at home and in our relations with other countries.

Bless, too, the other nations of the world with their rulers and statesmen, may we all of us somehow be instrumental in opening the doors of other homes for Thy divine incoming.

And now, accept our thanksgiving for Thy generous blessing in material refreshment and spiritual strength. Keep us under Thy care so that whether we eat or drink or whatever we do, we may do all in the name of the Lord Jesus and to the glory of God. Amen.

MESSAGE OF WELCOME BY SENATOR FRANK
CARLSON

Once again we meet in this manner, and we are again honored in having the President of the United States meet with us. We are also honored to have with us the Speaker, members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, members of the executive branch of the Government, Members of Congress, and others interested in the welfare of this great Nation. We have found this event to be most meaningful, not only to those of us who gather here but to millions of citizens across this Nation. The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 12 years has been remarkable, more than 45 of our States had Governors' prayer breakfasts, and scores of cities across the land have had their own mayors' prayer breakfasts. A breakfast much like this one here this morning was held recently in Costa Rica and was attended by the Presidents of three of the Latin American countries. Prayer groups now meet regularly in Tokyo, Paris, Madrid, and in a number of other world capitals, and there is a growing appreciation for the values gained when the leaders meet in a spirit of prayer recognizing that our ultimate hope and our trust is in God. This annual event grew out of the inspiration received in the prayer breakfast groups which met weekly in the U.S. Senate

and the House of Representatives. New prayer groups which meet weekly are being organized amongst businessmen, civic officials, secretaries, clerks, housewives, college and university students. This should be most encouraging to all of us, for it can do much to strengthen the spiritual character of our great Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS BY SENATOR CARLSON

In addition to those on the program, we are honored to have with us at the head table the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; the Honorable Edmond Michelet, president of ICCL; the Honorable Douglas C. Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General; the Honorable John Stennis, U.S. Senator from Mississippi; the Honorable Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska; the Honorable Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida; the Honorable Carl Sanders, Governor of Georgia; and Mr. Bill Jones, Los Angeles, Calif., host for the breakfast.

GREETINGS BY GENERAL SILVERTHORN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen, this occasion is really very significant. Here we have assembled the leaders of our three branches of Government together with certain business, educational, and professional leaders from nongovernmental activities. We have come here, Mr. President, to manifest to you and to our country and to the world our Christian heritage. We recall that some of the earliest settlers of our country declared that their purpose in colonizing this land was for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith.

Today, as a great Christian nation we can assemble here above political and creedal differences and declare our faith and belief in Jesus Christ and rededicate ourselves to Him. The passage of Scripture which comes to mind at this time is that one in which Almighty God said that "If His people, which are called by His name, would humble themselves and pray and seek His face and turn from their evil ways, He would hear from Heaven, forgive their sins and heal the land." And so, Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that through our presence here this morning we pledge to do our part in maintaining God as our standard in public and private life and by that action we can produce an awakened United States through dedicated Christian citizens.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE MARK O. HATFIELD, GOVERNOR OF OREGON

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished leaders of many nations, in the magnificent Capitol Building of the State of Oregon there are words engraved in the marble: "In the souls of its citizens will be found the likeness of the State, which if they be unjust and tyrannical, then will it reflect their vices, but if they be lovers of righteousness, confident in their liberties, so will it be clean in justice, bold in freedom."

The words "lovers of righteousness" denote both an individual and a national ethic, one in which man has the capacity to rise and to achieve. Not because of our own abilities or ego, but because there is possibility and need to displace the human ego with a commitment to a higher authority. We have been given this capacity

through the great teachings of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament. We have been further given this capacity by the great invasion of history by the thrust of God in a new revelation in His Son, Jesus Christ, who was sent to redeem man from sin and from self. And because of this invasion of our history, and this revelation, and through our commitment to Him, we can, indeed, have the capacity to be seekers of righteousness.

The words "confident in liberty" also denote the fact that our liberties and our freedoms that this Nation has come to enjoy were obviously not bestowed by men, but have been endowed by our Creator. And in the defense of these liberties and these freedoms, we need then to mobilize all our resources, and the call for spiritual mobilization is a clarion call in this day. Spiritual mobilization, not in terms of labels, not in terms of commitment to institutions or organizations, but truly a spiritual mobilization in terms of what Christ can do in the lives of men, in the lives of cities, in the lives of States and in the lives of nations.

So that in this commitment, and in this spiritual mobilization, we can, indeed, resolve the conflicts, we can, indeed, resolve the injustices. And, by banding ourselves together, so that we may think this way, that we may pray this way, and that we may live this way, we can, indeed, create and bring the spiritual revolution.

INTERCESSION FOR NATIONAL LEADERS BY DR. ABRAHAM VEREIDE

We as a nation are meeting today, let us rise and talk to God. O wonderful God, our heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being. As a people we meet through our representatives here this morning to thank Thee for Thy grace and mercy to us, for the forgiveness of our sins, for grace and strength for every situation, for Thy presence here and now and with us moment by moment where we are to sustain us with wisdom and power for every hour and what we need for every situation. Lord God, we do thank Thee that Thou art available, that this is so. Throughout the ages past Thou hast revealed Thyself, we have found that as we humbled ourselves and forsook our sins and sought Thy face and prayed, and prayed, and prayed, that Thou didst forgive our sins and healed the land and brought new blessings to us as individuals, as cities, as States, and as a nation and throughout the world. This morning, O God, we present our people, our leadership, and especially our beloved President, and ask for their anointing power with Thy Holy Spirit invasion that we indeed may go forth and to acquit ourselves like real men, without fear, without weakening for any problems, knowing that Thou hast not given us the spirit of fear but of power, of love, and of a sound mind and so we dedicate ourselves and pray Thy grace to abide with us, through Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

MESSAGE BY DR. BILLY GRAHAM

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished guests, there's a passage in the 21st chapter of Luke by our Lord Jesus Christ that I think is relevant for us here this morning in view of the headlines of the last few weeks. All the way through the Scriptures, the Bible talks about the last days; the Bible talks about the climax of history; the Bible talks about the day of the Lord. The other day, Pope Paul stood at Maghetho and met the President of Israel, at that place where the Bible predicts will be the last great battle of history and pled for peace.

In this passage, Our Lord is talking about that period in history, and He says this: "And there will be signs in the sun, and the moon, and the stars. And upon the earth

there will be distress of nations in perplexity at the roaring of the sea and of the waves. Men fainting with fear and with forboding at what is coming on the world, for the powers of the heavens and the earth will be shaken."

It seems to me, that if there has ever been a period in history when the powers of the earth and the heavens are shaking, it is at the present moment. And here are two very interesting words in Greek that Jesus Christ used: The first one is "sinicha" (sinika). He used it for distress, as translated in English, and it means this: to be pressed from all sides. In other words, Jesus said, "There's coming a future generation upon the earth that will be pressed from all sides." And, then, the second word is also very interesting, which is translated "perplexity." That word in Greek actually means "no way out." Jesus said there is coming a period in history when the nations of the world will be pressed from all sides and there will be no way out.

Today, we are pressed. We are pressed internationally, from South Vietnam to Cyprus, to Panama, around the world we are being pressed as never before. And we are reminded of the words of the late President Kennedy when he said, "No man entering upon this office could fail to be staggered upon learning the harsh enormities of the trials through which we must pass in the next few years. Each day the crisis multiplies. Each day their solution grows more difficult. Each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger," and then he said, "Time has not been our friend." We are pressed demographically. The population of the world is increasing rapidly. Three billion people now. In 37 years there will be 6 billion people, and one-half of the entire population of the world at this hour is under 21 years of age. These are young people, who think of World War II as ancient history. They're the atomic young people. They are the young people of the science, the space age, and they are impatient, and they are not going to wait. And, in the Congo at this very hour, we read in our papers this morning that those marauding bands of terrorists are all from 15 to 18 years of age. Young people on the march under various flags throughout the world.

We are pressed morally. Most of us read in one of our news magazines 2 weeks ago about the moral conditions of the Nation. The publisher of that magazine has written a letter in the present issue of the magazine, Time magazine, and he says the reason Time printed that article was to shock the American people and to show us how far down the road morally we've gone. If ever we needed a moral revival, it is today.

We are also pressed in other ways. We are pressed in social problems. Poverty, race. We all applaud the President's war on poverty. We were all shocked to read in one of our cities, at Christmastime, 12 people burned to death, they were living in 1 room. This should never be in a nation such as America, the wealthiest in the world. And the race problem is not going to be solved entirely in the streets or in the halls of the legislature. It's going to be solved in the hearts of men and women, and it's going to be solved in a spiritual dimension. We are pressed.

We are also pressed by a pessimistic philosophy. Henry James, James Joyce, Eugene O'Neill, Hemingway, Faulkner, Wolfe, Conrad, Kaiser, Hardy, Aldous Huxley, H. G. Wells, D. H. Lawrence, Sinclair Lewis, and others, portray today a society in a mood of indecision, confusion, and bewilderment, shifting in its human positions, frightened and unsure and pessimistic. And one of our European philosophers from France, Jean Paul Sartre, has said there is no exit from the human dilemma.

We are also pressed psychologically. One-half of all the hospital beds in the United

States at this hour are occupied by mental patients. Our people are being pressed psychologically. Home problems, business problems, health problems, family problems, personal problems. We want to scream at life. We want to bury our heads in the sand and say, "Maybe it'll go away." But it doesn't go away, it's still there.

And Jesus said there would come a time in history when men would be pressed like this from all sides and He said there will be no way out. Except one. He said there'll be one way out and only one. He said, "I am the way, the truth, and the light. No man can enter the Kingdom of God except by Me." There is one way out of our dilemma. One way out of our pressures. Many people are turning to dope, to alcohol, to sex experiences, to every other thing. There's one way out. But this is the way that we seemingly refuse to take. It's so simple. The Bible teaches that when Jesus Christ died on that cross, He took our sins and mistakes and pressures. And Jesus said, "In the world ye shall have pressure, but be of good cheer. I have overcome the world." The victory is found in a spiritual dimension, and I believe that the greatest need of America at this hour is a moral and spiritual awakening that will sweep the Nation from coast to coast and put back into our society a moral fiber that we need, and a will to resist the forces of tyranny and a will to maintain our freedoms at an hour when they are being attacked.

How can we do it on a personal level? Our society is only made up of individuals and our Nation is only as strong as the individuals that make it up. First, there must be a realization of human needs. We read our newspapers every day, and it testifies of our sins and our failures. It may be an Eichmann in Germany, it may be an Oswald in the United States. Wherever we turn, we see sin, prejudice, hatred, wickedness, murder, lying, cheating. Where does it come from? The Bible says it comes from the human heart. And all of us are guilty. We're all involved. Because the Bible says all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. You and I are guilty. We have sinned before God, we are a planet in rebellion against God. We turn every direction for the solution of our problem but to God. There has to come a time, ladies and gentlemen, when we're willing to say "I'm wrong." "I, Billy Graham, have sinned, I've failed, I need help." We need to be like Lillian Roth in "I'll Cry Tomorrow." She never solved her problem of alcoholism until she was willing to say "I need help." And when you come to that in your own individual life, and say "I need God," that's the first step to the Kingdom of God. He can rid you of your pressures and the things that are feeding upon you from every direction.

Secondly, by faith, we must turn to the cross. That's where Christ came into history, that's where God spoke. And in the crucifixion of Christ, it wasn't just the death of a good man, this was God dying in our place, taking our sins. And He says if you come by faith, as a little child, you may be a leader of government, you may be a professor in the university, but Jesus said no man will enter the Kingdom of God except as he comes as a little child. We have to humble ourselves, it takes a great deal of humility and we have to be willing to humble ourselves as individuals and say, Oh, Christ, I take you as my own, and I make this commitment that we've already heard about.

And, then, lastly, we must be willing to obey Him. Yes, there's a way out. It's the way that our fathers took, the early colonists that came to this country. It's the way that George Washington took at Valley Forge. It's the way that Benjamin Franklin and others took at the Constitutional Convention. It's the way that Abraham Lincoln took during the Civil War. We are pressed

today. And President Johnson's first words as President were: "I will do my best, and that's all I can do. I ask for your help and God's."

I believe, sir, that these people are committing to you their prayer, their cooperation, and their help as you lead this Nation through a perilous course during these dangerous days of history.

God bless you, sir, and thank you very much.

MESSAGE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Senator Carlson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, members of the Cabinet, Dr. Graham, my fellow Americans, no man could live in the house where I live now, or work at the desk where I work now without needing and without seeking the strength and the support of earnest and frequent prayer.

Since last we met, it has fallen to me to learn personally the truth Thomas Jefferson spoke so long ago, when he said, "The second office of the Government is honorable and easy, the first is but a splendid misery."

In these last 70 days, prayer has helped me to bear the burdens of the first office which are too great to be borne by anyone alone. We who hold public office are enjoined by our Constitution against enacting laws to tell the people when or where or how to pray. All our experience, and all of our knowledge proves that injunction is good. For if government could ordain the people's prayers, government could also ordain its own worship and that must never be.

The separation of church and state has served our freedom well because men of state have not separated themselves from church and faith and prayer. Senator Carlson, I believe that these annual prayer breakfasts serve a most useful purpose in both reminding and reassuring the people that those who hold their trust are themselves godly and prayerful men and women.

In saying this, there is a personal thought that I would like to express to you. This Federal city of Washington, in which we live and work, is much more than a place of residence. For the 190 million people that we serve, and for many millions in other lands, Washington is the symbol and the showcase of a great nation and a greater cause of human liberty on earth.

In this Capital City today, we have monuments to Lincoln, and to Jefferson, and to Washington, and to many statesmen and many soldiers. But, at this seat of government, there must be a fitting memorial to the God who made us all. Our Government cannot and should not sponsor the erection of such a memorial with public funds, but such a living memorial should be here. It should be a center of prayer, open to all men of all faiths at all times.

If I may speak this morning as a citizen and a colleague and a friend, I would like to suggest to this group which has done so much through all the years to undertake the mission of bringing together the faiths and religions of America to support jointly such a memorial here in this Federal city, the Capital of the free world.

The world is given many statistics about the per capita vices of Washington, but the world knows all too little about the per capita virtues of those who live and labor here. I believe, and I would hope that you would agree, that the true image of Washington is not that of power or pomp or plenty. It is rather that of a prayerful Capital of good and God-fearing people.

BENEDICTION BY DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON, ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ICL

Let us rise together. We thank Thee, our Father, for what our ears have heard and for what our eyes have seen and our hearts have felt this morning. Grant that we shall not soon forget this moment, that we shall hum-

ble ourselves before the Lord our God and acknowledge our helpless dependence upon Him and live in His strength and His righteousness. Grant that we as individuals and we as a people shall serve the Lord our God in righteousness and peace. We ask this in the name of Him who taught us to pray: "Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, one of the problems confronting the livestock industry at this time is the ever-increasing imports of beef and meat products—particularly beef.

Up to last year imports of beef and meat products into the United States did not exceed 5 percent of total consumption, however, during the past year this has increased to 11 percent and is having a serious effect on livestock prices. In fact, it is disastrous to many livestock producers.

It is imperative that action be taken that would limit these imports to 5 or 6 percent if we are to protect and preserve the livestock industry.

At a recent meeting of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association, a resolution was unanimously adopted urging that positive action be taken to bring about an agreement reducing and limiting beef imports into this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed.

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

RESOLUTION ON BEEF IMPORTS

Whereas, throughout most of the year of 1963, U.S. livestock producers have faced almost steady declining prices, and the outlook, according to the Department of Agriculture, in 1964 is for prices to continue to weaken; and

Whereas imports of beef and veal into this country more than tripled in the 5-year period 1957-62, and, said imports increased 25 percent in 1963 over 1962, and, nearly 11 percent of all beef consumed in the United States was imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas the available market for U.S. cattle production is so decreased by these imports, then, increased imports of beef is very prominent among the reasons for the disruption of our livestock market; and

Whereas it is possible to control imports, it is possible to reduce our imports and thereby increase the available market for our own beef produced in the United States; and

Whereas in Kansas cash receipts from the sales of livestock account for more than one-half of total farm income, and that this income is now very seriously endangered by increasing beef imports; Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association request the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, the Chairman and Commissioners of the U.S. Tariff Commission and the members of the Kansas congressional delegation; that immediate and positive action

be taken to bring about an agreement reducing and limiting beef imports into this country.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS FLYING FARMER ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, the Kansas Flying Farmer Agricultural Committee and the board of directors of the Kansas Flying Farmers at a recent meeting unanimously adopted resolutions regarding some of our domestic and international problems.

The Kansas Flying Farmer Association was organized several years ago and its membership is composed of several hundred farmers and other outstanding citizens of our State. They have for years taken an active interest in the problems affecting our State's welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

Be it resolved, That the Kansas Flying Farmer Association officially encourage the Kansas delegation (Senators and Representatives at Washington level) to discourage legislation which tends to conform to USDA policy of division and moving of acreages from established areas to other locations; be it

Resolved, That the KFF Agricultural Committee work with its local level Representatives and Senators to hold rein on the state office of USDA on farm problems; be it

Resolved, That the KFF request their Kansas delegation at Washington to discourage any further farm program, and encourage complete repeal of all present legislation; be it

Resolved, That the Kansas delegation (Washington level) show more interest in legal actions taken by USDA and the Justice Department against citizens of their States, in that those actions are in many cases misrepresentations of true facts and have only harassing value; be it

Resolved, That U.S. Representatives and Senators be requested to reduce appropriations to USDA—and specially limit the administrative budget of USDA; be it

Resolved, That legislation be encouraged to isolate present stocks of CCC wheat, feed grains and other farm products, from current domestic and world markets; be it

Resolved, That U.S. Senators and Representatives be encouraged and requested to remove the Anfusio amendment, which now can remove acreage even though the May 21 referendum failed.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I have been disturbed, as I am sure many of my colleagues have been, by the virtual epidemic of attacks on the Central Intelligence Agency in recent months.

Some of these attacks have clearly been the product of irresponsible and speculative news reporting by men who are more concerned with the headline value of something that smacks of sensation or scandal than they are with the security of the country.

But there have also been attacks, or sharp criticisms, by commentators of national reputation who are generally careful about their facts but who have apparently been impressed by some of the rumors and stories and inaccuracies

which seem to have become credible because they have been repeated so often.

There have also been attacks on the CIA by distinguished Members of Congress which seem to me exaggerated and without foundation. These men are friends of mine, whom I respect and who are greatly respected by the country. Their views are very influential and because of this I feel an obligation to make reply to some criticisms which I feel are unwarranted.

Baiting the CIA almost seems to have achieved the stature of a popular national pastime.

It is a highly dangerous pastime because the CIA is one of the essential elements of our security.

There is also something unbecoming about the pastime, because the CIA cannot defend itself. Attacking the CIA, indeed, is something like beating a man who has his arms tied behind his back. For reasons of national security, the Agency cannot confirm or deny published reports, true or false, favorable or unfavorable. It cannot alibi. It cannot explain. It cannot answer even the most outrageously inaccurate charges.

It was to this situation that President Kennedy addressed himself when he spoke to the CIA personnel at their headquarters in Langley, Va., on November 28, 1961.

Your successes are unheralded—

Said President Kennedy—

Your failures are trumpeted. . . . But I am sure you realize how important is your work, how essential it is—and, in the long sweep of history, how significant your efforts will be judged. So I do want to express my appreciation to you now, and I am confident that in the future you will continue to merit the appreciation of our country, as you have in the past.

The charges that have been made against the CIA in recent months are almost as numerous as they are sensational.

We have been told that the CIA has been running wild, that it has been functioning without control or supervision either by Congress or the administration, that it has been making foreign policy. The CIA has been criticized for the U-2 overflight.

It has been blamed for the Bay of Pigs disaster.

And it has even been criticized for the anti-Mossadegh coup in Iran and for the overthrow of the pro-Communist Arbenz government in Guatemala.

Whether the critics realize it or not, these charges also constitute an attack on the wisdom and integrity of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. It is tantamount to accusing them of passively allowing an executive agency to function without control or supervision, and to make foreign policy—in other words, to usurp the President's own authority. This is patently ridiculous. Neither President would ever have permitted such a thing.

I propose to say a few words about some of these charges.

I feel that I am in a position to do so, because in the course of my travels around Europe, Asia, and Africa, I have come to know many of the CIA's field

representatives, and, from long conversations with them, I have some appreciation, I believe, of the work they do. In addition, I know something of the headquarters operation because senior officers of the Agency have on a number of occasions appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and have given testimony of vital significance.

If the overall quality of an agency may be judged from the quality of the men who compose it, then the CIA would have to be given a triple A rating. I have never encountered in any Government agency a body of men whose ability and dedication impressed me more.

Perhaps the most popular charge directed against the CIA is that it operates completely without congressional oversight or supervision. It is this charge that has given rise to the clamor for a congressional watchdog committee.

This charge is totally and demonstrably untrue. Indeed, the CIA is probably one of the most supervised agencies in the Government.

In both the House and Senate there are special subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee and of the Appropriations Committee that oversee the activities of CIA.

In the House these subcommittees are headed by Representatives CARL VINSON and CLARENCE CANNON; in the Senate they are headed by Senator RUSSELL and Senator HAYDEN. These men are among the most knowledgeable and conscientious legislators our Nation has produced; and I, for one, am willing to abide by their judgment on matters which, for reasons of security, cannot be revealed to all Members of Congress.

The Director of the CIA and the chairman of the House and Senate subcommittees have frequent meetings during the course of the year. The subcommittees are advised and fully informed of special or unusual activities. They are also informed upon the receipt of significant intelligence.

In 1963, the Director of Central Intelligence or his deputy, Gen. Marshall S. Carter, appeared before congressional committees on some 30 occasions. In addition to briefings of the CIA subcommittees in the House and Senate, these appearances included briefings on subjects of special interest to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, and other committees.

I recall the clamor that immediately arose when our U-2 plane was shot down over Soviet territory in May of 1960. Many people jumped to the conclusion that the CIA had been operating on its own, without the authorization of President or Congress. The U-2 flights were charged with endangering the security of the Nation, when, in fact, they had defended us against the possibility of a surprise missile attack.

President Eisenhower put an end to the speculation about the lack of Executive authorization by informing the press that he had personally approved the U-2 program. Unfortunately, it did not receive quite as much attention when

Representative CANNON on May 10 rose to inform the House that the House subcommittee was fully apprised of the project, had approved it, and had recommended the funds for it.

Let me quote his words on that occasion, because I think they constitute an adequate response to all those who, in ignorance of the facts, still charge that the CIA operates without congressional supervision.

This is what Representative CANNON said:

The plane was on an espionage mission authorized and supported by money provided under an appropriation recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations and passed by the Congress.

Although the Members of the House have not generally been informed on the subject, the mission was one of a series and part of an established program with which the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation was familiar, and of which it had been fully apprised during this and previous sessions.

The appropriation and the activity had been approved and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and, like all military expenditures and operations, was under the aegis of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, for whom all members of the subcommittee have the highest regard and in whose military capacity they have the utmost confidence.

It seems to me that what some Members of Congress have been complaining about in advocating a joint congressional watchdog committee is that they have been unaware of certain activities conducted by the CIA. But the information gathered by CIA and the activities conducted by it must, of necessity, be confined to a careful selected and restricted committee. If this information were made available to all Members of Congress, the security essential for national defense would cease to exist.

The Members of Congress are all trustworthy; but a secret ceases to be a secret when it is shared by more than 500 people.

Even if a joint congressional watchdog committee were established, it would have to observe the same rules of secrecy that today govern the activities of the House and Senate subcommittee; and those Members of Congress who today complain that they do not know what the CIA is doing, would still find that they know precious little about it. Which, I may say, is the way things ought to be.

Whether or not a joint committee of Congress could more effectively supervise the activities of the CIA than the House and Senate subcommittee now in existence is a purely mechanical question which I frankly consider to be of a third-rate importance. This proposal appears to be based on the false assumption that the CIA has engaged in unauthorized activities. It also casts doubt upon the competence and dedication of the distinguished Members of the House and Senate who now serve on the two subcommittees.

As for the oft-repeated charge that even the President does not know what the CIA is doing, let me quote a few paragraphs from the National Security Act

of 1947, under which the Central Intelligence Agency was established:

There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof.

The National Security Act further provides in section 102(d):

For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security * * *;

(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

The text of any piece of legislation makes dry reading, but I have gone to the trouble of reading these paragraphs of the National Security Act for the record because they repeatedly make it clear that the CIA functions under the direction of the National Security Council, and as an arm of the National Security Council.

They also make it abundantly clear that the CIA was to have duties broader than the simple gathering of intelligence data, operating under the direction of the National Security Council.

The wording of the National Security Act was a reflection of the growing recognition that we cannot compete with communism if we confine ourselves to orthodox diplomacy and orthodox intelligence collection.

Over and over and over again, it has been demonstrated that a handful of trained Communists can seize control of a trade union or a student federation, or for that matter, of a country. The fact that the overwhelming majority of the people are non-Communists or anti-Communists has, in most such situations, not seriously impeded them because the opposition generally lacks organization, lacks know-how, lacks discipline, lacks funds.

In every country that has been taken over by the Communists or that has been menaced by Communist takeover, there have always been men of understanding and of courage who are prepared to risk their lives for freedom. There have been situations, and there will, I am certain, be situations in the future, in which some sound advice plus some limited assistance in the form of funds, or even arms, may make the difference between victory or defeat for the forces of freedom.

If we are not prepared to give this assistance to those who share our beliefs, then we might as well run up the flag

of surrender today; because it can be predicted as a certainty that the Communists will move without serious opposition from one triumph to another.

I do not propose to draw up a scorecard of CIA victories and CIA defeats. I do not know for certain whether they played any role in the uprising that overthrew the pro-Communist government of President Arbenz in Guatemala. Nor do I know whether the Agency was in any way connected with the overthrow of the lunatic Mossadegh regime in Iran in 1953. But I would like to discuss these two events because I consider them to be outstanding examples of the kind of perilous situation I have just described.

In the case of Guatemala, the Arbenz government, which had been elected on a nationalist and reform program, was moving, in a manner later to be emulated by Castro, toward the complete communization of the country. As the government introduced more radical measures, it lost its hold over the people and over the armed forces. But the regime would not have toppled had it not been for the courageous action of a handful of patriots under Col. Castillo Armas, who invaded Guatemala from Honduras in 1954.

When this small band of determined patriots established themselves on Guatemalan soil, the Arbenz regime collapsed like a house of cards. Hardly a shot was fired in its defense, so completely without support was it among the people and among the Guatemalan armed forces.

A similar situation existed in Iran under Mossadegh in 1953. Mossadegh had come to power as a Nationalist. But his nationalism was of the lunatic variety that was prepared to give carte blanche to the Communists in return for their support. Had he remained in power another year, it is probable that today Iran would be on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

In August 1953, mass demonstrations against the Mossadegh regime erupted in Teheran. Within 48 hours, the regime had been swept out of power, the Communist Tudeh Party had been crushed, and wildly cheering throngs hailed the return of the young Shah to his throne.

If the CIA did have a role to play in Guatemala and Iran, then it played its role successfully. It inflicted two great defeats on the Communists and thereby saved two vital countries from slipping into the Communist orbit. Is this something we should apologize for? No, on the contrary, it is something of which every American should be proud.

There are some people who would have us place an absolute prohibition on any form of assistance to the forces of freedom in other countries in the name of "nonintervention."

Some of these are of the absolute pacifist variety, who would rather let the Communists take over the world than fight against them.

Others are muddleheaded moralists, who might be willing to fight if their own country were threatened by a Communist takeover, who are prepared to

admit that the Communists engage in massive subversive activities of every kind, but who, for some strange reason, consider it wrong for the United States to do anything about it.

At least a few of the critics of the CIA's operations are unquestionably fellow travelers and Communists.

What is most damaging and most perplexing, however, is the criticism that comes from Members of Congress who are staunch anti-Communists, who do not believe that the United States should stand by, indifferent and supine, while the Communists proceed to take over in other countries, but who, nevertheless, argue that the CIA should not have an operational function. They say that if the United States is to conduct operations designed to meet the Soviet subversive threat, this should be done by a separate agency.

Once the need for clandestine operations is conceded, I frankly do not see the importance of the argument that they should be conducted by a separate agency. In either case, the United States would still be involved in the business of covert operations which so disturbs the ultramoralist critics of the CIA. From a strictly practical standpoint, moreover, I believe that grave harm would be done by separating the conduct of clandestine operations from the careful processing of intelligence which must govern such operations.

It may disturb some people, but I think it can be stated as a certainty that many countries that remain free today would not be free if it had not been for the CIA.

The U-2 flights which the CIA conducted with such outstanding success for some 4 years before the shooting down of Gary Powers also disturbed some of our ultramoralists. But I think that the vast majority of the American people take great pride in the knowledge that we had been able to penetrate Soviet secrecy.

The CIA has been attacked from many different directions for the role it played in the Bay of Pigs invasion. I am not saying that the CIA is blameless or that it has made no errors. But I do oppose what appears to be a mounting tendency to shift all the blame for the Bay of Pigs disaster onto the much abused head of the CIA, because the record made it clear that many people shared the blame.

Essentially, it failed because we had not made the decision that it must not be permitted to fail.

This is the position I took in speaking on the floor of the Senate on April 24, 1961, hard on the heels of the disaster; and since that time and up to this minute, no information has been adduced which would lead me to revise this position.

The propaganda campaign against the CIA reached a crescendo during the recent Vietnamese crisis. Last October 4, an article written by a correspondent for an American newspaper chain charged that the CIA had been subverting State Department policy in Vietnam, and that John Richardson, the CIA

man in Saigon, had openly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Lodge.

The correspondent who wrote this article was guilty of openly identifying a CIA representative abroad, thus reducing, if not destroying, his potential usefulness forever. Visiting Congressmen and members of the press may sometimes know the identity of the CIA representative, but it has been taken for granted that they do not reveal his identity to the public.

To the best of my knowledge, this was the first instance in which an American correspondent has been guilty of this flagrant breach of the ethics of security.

Moreover, these sweeping charges against an important agency of the Government, and against a man's integrity, were obviously based on a one-sided presentation from some official source. Mr. Richardson and the CIA could not defend themselves. I have always taken it for granted that American newspapermen in any controversial situation endeavor to obtain the facts from both sides, and all the more so when such sweeping accusations are involved. Not only have I taken it for granted, but it is also true what the vast majority of our newspapermen do. But the correspondent in question apparently considered this unnecessary.

In the third place, the charges against Mr. Richardson were a tissue of falsehoods. President Kennedy, when he was asked about the charges against the CIA and Mr. Richardson at his press conference of October 12 said:

I must say I think the reports are wholly untrue. The fact of the matter is that Mr. [CIA Director John] McCone sits in the National Security Council. I imagine I see him at least three or four times a week, ordinarily. We have worked very closely together in the National Security Council in the last 2 months attempting to meet the problems we face in South Vietnam. I can find nothing, and I have looked through the record very carefully over the last 9 months, and I could go back further, to indicate that the CIA had done anything but support policy. It does not create policy; it attempts to execute it in those areas where it has competence and responsibility. I know that the transfer of Mr. John Richardson [CIA official in Saigon] who is a very dedicated public servant has led to surmises, but I can just assure you flatly that the CIA has not carried out independent activities but has operated under close control of the Director of Central Intelligence, operating with the cooperation of the National Security Council and under my instructions.

So I think while the CIA may have made mistakes, as we all do on different occasions, and has had many successes which may go unheralded, in my opinion in this case it is unfair to charge them as they have been charged. I think they have done a good job.

President Kennedy's characterization of Mr. Richardson, I can wholeheartedly endorse from my personal knowledge of Mr. Richardson. In most countries I have visited, the briefings by CIA representatives have been limited to an hour or two. But in May 1961, when I was in the Far East, Richardson briefed me for some 7 or 8 hours, all told. Certainly, it was the most detailed, most balanced, most knowledgeable briefing I have ever

been given. But I was even more impressed by Mr. Richardson as a man than by his exceptional competence as an intelligence officer. Indeed, of all the hundreds of people in the American service whom I have met in the course of my travels through Europe, Africa, and Asia, I can recall no one for whom I formed a higher esteem than John Richardson.

There is a final word I wish to say in this connection. It is clear that the article in question originated in some official source. It had to. The official who was guilty of giving out this story to the press was himself guilty of violating the rules of security as well as the ethics that should govern relations between government departments. This officer, in my opinion, should be identified and dismissed.

The time has come when Members of Congress and members of the press must take stock of the growing campaign against CIA and of the part they themselves may have played in forwarding this campaign.

I am not suggesting that the CIA should be immune to criticism because of the sensitive nature of its operations. No government agency should be immune from criticism.

I do believe, however, that there has been far too much sensationalism, far too many inaccuracies, and far too little concern for the national security in some of the criticism that has heretofore been made of the CIA.

I believe that, before we indulge in criticism of the CIA, we should take into account the fact that it cannot defend itself. We should also take into account the fact that every critical statement, whether accurate or inaccurate, will be picked up by the special bureau of the Soviet secret police whose task it is to discredit the CIA, and will be put to work through all the information and propaganda channels open to the Kremlin and through all its agents in the world's news media.

Because these things are so, we all share a special responsibility, if we feel constrained to criticize the CIA, to check our facts painstakingly, to weigh our words carefully, and to speak with restraint. If we have questions or complaints, I believe that, before taking them to the mass circulation press, we should discuss them with the Director of the CIA, or his deputy, or with the chairmen of the four House and Senate committees charged with the supervision of the CIA's activities. And if, after checking in this manner, there is any one of us who still considers it necessary to speak out against certain policies of the CIA, the proper place to do it would be on the floor of Congress rather than on television, or through the mass circulation periodicals. This would provide an opportunity for rebuttal and debate, and the press accounts, hopefully, would reflect all sides of the discussion.

For whatever its errors and shortcomings may be, I believe, with President Kennedy, that the CIA will in the future continue to merit the appreciation of our country, as it has in the past.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Connecticut on an excellent speech. I particularly commend him on the fact that what he has done is not easy to do. It is always much easier to denounce an agency, than to defend it, particularly an agency, which, as the Senator from Connecticut has so well said, cannot defend itself, because by its very nature it cannot reveal secret information which it would be necessary for it to reveal in order to defend its position.

The Senator has very well stated what must be the objective of every Member of Congress and of the overwhelming majority of the American people; namely, to stand up against communism and to fight back in ways that are effective.

I am concerned about a few aspects of this situation, and I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, who is informed on many aspects of the question, whether it might not be helpful to have some evaluation or report rendered on the Central Intelligence Agency. Such a report, of course, would have to be after the fact. I have in mind a regular report, either an annual or semi-annual report, being made to Members of Congress on the conduct of the CIA, which would be in addition to the careful and expert scrutiny that Representative CANNON and Senator RUSSELL, in their committees, make of the funds that the CIA wishes to spend.

Mr. DODD. Let me respond by saying that it would depend on the nature of the report. Was the Senator thinking of a fiscal report?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was thinking of a regular report. I recognize that the Senator has said it is not possible to have a revelation of classified information. Some information would have to remain classified throughout our lifetime.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Obviously it would have to be something like a report on the Bay of Pigs situation, or the situation in Guatemala, or the developments in Iran, or in South Vietnam. In all of these areas the CIA has been reported to have been active. It would seem that much information could be made available to Members of Congress after the fact.

I believe that any governmental agency will improve and do a better job if it is subject to evaluation and criticism and consideration in the Congress. I believe that is one of the most essential and important functions of Congress.

Mr. DODD. I agree.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This Agency receives a great deal of money, and it must operate secretly. As the Senator from Connecticut has well said, the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress cannot know very much about it.

I have in mind situations in connection with which information would not have to remain classified indefinitely.

In such a case, we would be in a position to make a useful contribution toward making the Agency more efficient.

Mr. DODD. I agree that it would be a very good thing for us to do, if we could do it in that way. I could not agree more that in our free society we ought to have full information on the operation of every governmental agency.

However, we come to a very special category. Let us assume, for example, without naming any country, that, in the interest of our security, the CIA is operating in country X. This operation may go on for many years, as the Senator has indicated. If we were to divulge the fact that we have an interest in that country, that we were trying to protect ourselves from some possible disaster, I believe it would destroy the effectiveness of this Agency. It is extremely difficult to spell out, in any sensible detail, what an agency of this kind is doing. It would be something like asking the Office of Naval Intelligence or the Office of Military Intelligence to make a public report on what it has done each year. How could that be done and at the same time have the Agency be effective?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator that it could not be a comprehensive report, but would have to be a report based on limited activities, and on activities which were no longer sensitive.

For example, we could perhaps have a comprehensive report now on the Bay of Pigs incident, and also on the U-2 incident. Perhaps we could also have, to some extent, a report on the Guatemalan and Iranian situations.

Mr. DODD. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that any kind of independent, objective appraisal by Members of Congress would help bring about a greater public understanding of the problem, and would help CIA greatly in improving its operations.

Mr. DODD. Let me take the three cases cited by the Senator from Wisconsin. Are we sure that it would be safe now fully to divulge what happened in connection with the Bay of Pigs disaster? Castro is still a problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not believe that all that information would have to be divulged.

Mr. DODD. Or even any of it. It might be harmful to do that. There is the situation of the U-2 overflights of the Soviet Union. We are still being plagued by the Soviet Union, as the Senator knows. Every day there is something new. Where can we turn in the world with respect to the operation of this Agency and say, "That job is done; it is all over"? It is an extremely difficult thing to do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree that the report could not be comprehensive; therefore, it would not be absolutely satisfactory.

I believe the Senator agrees with me that the great advantage we have over the Soviet Union is that we do not conceal our mistakes, but talk about them, learn from them, improve on them

through the bright, cleansing searchlight of public scrutiny.

Mr. DODD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While the Agency has some information which must remain secret permanently, I also believe that some appraisal of it would make it more useful. The Senator has made a great contribution in this field, and he has greatly enlightened me.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to the Senator for saying that. I wish I knew more about it. I am no expert in this field. I know only what I have observed, what I have heard, and what I have read.

The Senator has raised a key question, namely, how can a free society at this time in history preserve itself without having recourse to the same clandestine instrumentalities which our foes utilize?

We say we abhor this sort of thing. We do. We do not like it. It is all dirty business—spying, espionage, sabotage—and I wish we had never had anything to do with it. However, we live in a world in which this sort of thing is widespread. I believe the nature of the times in which we are living forces us, in the interest of our own survival, to do some of these things. We cannot survive if we do not do them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; indeed. The Senator from Connecticut is a cosponsor with the Senator from Wisconsin of the Freedom Academy.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Which would endeavor to give a greater public understanding of this kind of operation and more information on paramilitary action against the Communists.

There is no reason why the most powerful Nation in the world, with an economy that is more than twice as powerful as that of the Soviet Union, with our acknowledged military advantage, should be less effective in some areas than the Soviet Union, except that we are not doing our homework, in the way in which the Communists are succeeding in doing theirs, in taking over governments by subversion of radio stations, newspapers, and universities in crucial areas. We ought to do more than we have done in that field. We ought to do it better. We ought to win.

Perhaps the discussion between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin will focus to a greater degree on public enlightenment through something like the Freedom Academy.

Mr. DODD. The Senator could not be more correct. As he well reminds us, the proposal for a Freedom Academy would, if enacted, be of great help to all of us in understanding better the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged and what we must do to win it. Through such an institution, we could teach the American people in what manner they can successfully resist the forces of communism.

As the Senator knows, we have not been able to get much action on the proposal. However, it is one of the absolutely essential necessities. I hope we may obtain some action this year. The

Senator from Wisconsin has been of great help. I know he will continue, with the rest of us, to try to have the bill passed before the end of the session.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

COMMERCE FAILS TO KEEP PLEDGE OF SHIPMENT OF WHEAT TO SOVIET BLOC IN U.S.-FLAG VESSELS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, regardless of the rule of germaneness, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The U.S. Department of Commerce has broken faith with U.S. shipping firms. The Department made a solemn pledge to U.S.-flag lines and to the Nation that at least 50 percent of wheat sales to the Soviets would be shipped in U.S. vessels. This pledge has been breached. This breach of faith casts increasing doubt on the validity of the wheat transactions.

The most recent figures of the Maritime Administration show that only slightly more than one-fourth of all shipping arrangements completed for wheat to the Soviet bloc have been for U.S.-flag vessels. Representatives of a number of prominent American shipping lines have written to me, indicating that their ships are ready, willing, and able to carry this American wheat.

Yet, the figures supplied to me by the Maritime Administration indicate that only slightly more than 59,000 tons of wheat have been shipped in U.S.-flag vessels, and over 160,000 tons in foreign-flag ships. Only 27 percent—not 50 percent—of the total wheat shipments have gone to U.S.-flag operators.

One of the principal arguments for the wheat transactions was that our economy would benefit from the 50-percent shipping requirement. However, as I recall the debate on the floor of the Senate upon that subject, at one point, 100 percent of the shipments were to have been made in American-flag vessels, and this was to have had a beneficial effect upon our balance of payments. Later the Department of Commerce cut this down to 50 percent. But in practice it is only 27 percent.

It is difficult to understand why we should make this concession to the Soviet Union, in view of our very strong bargaining position as the only Nation in the world having surpluses available for the Soviet Union at this time.

It is true that, Canada has sold \$500 million of wheat, but every indication is that not another bushel of wheat can be shipped from Canada this year, or at least in this season, to the Soviet Union. Australia sold all the wheat it had available. On the basis of testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency earlier this year, it was clearly established that the only wheat available for the Soviet Union was from the United States. Yet on one issue after another, we have caved in. We sell to

the Soviet Union at the world price, which is a subsidized price. We guarantee, through the Export-Import Bank, credit to the Soviet Union for up to 18 months. Now we are to permit the transportation of three-fourths of this wheat in foreign vessels, in spite of the firm public promise and commitment that 50 percent of the shipments of the wheat would be in American vessels.

Madam President, it is understandable, now, why some of the great trade unions of the United States now strongly oppose this whole wheat deal. The Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, composed of representatives of some 31 AFL-CIO unions, meeting in Florida, this morning denounced the sale of wheat by the United States to the Soviet Union.

Second, they criticized the U.S. Government for reneging on its 50-percent guarantee of shipments in U.S. vessels. In the third place, they pledged full support to the International Longshoremen's Association for not loading foreign ships with U.S. wheat.

I am sure it is a source of concern to all Members of Congress when prominent labor organizations of the Nation decide that, on the basis of their own convictions, and their own feeling of obligation to this country, they cannot conform to the law laid down by Congress, and the President, but it is clearly understandable why the trade unions have made this decision. It is beyond my understanding why the Department of Commerce, having made this firm commitment, has not been able to adhere to it.

APPOINTMENT OF JOE T. DICKERSON, OIL LOBBYIST, AS DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the Secretary of the Interior has appointed Mr. Joe T. Dickerson to be Director of the Office of Oil and Gas, Department of the Interior. Mr. Dickerson, by virtue of his office in the Department of the Interior, will have substantial authority over the oil industry.

It may be recalled that President Johnson, shortly after he took office, delegated to the Department of the Interior full, complete, and final authority over oil policy. He did so for understandable and proper reasons.

We all recognize that the President of the United States was a most effective Senator from Texas and, as a Senator, was a champion of the oil industry, a perfectly proper and necessary role if our democratic, parliamentary processes are to operate. As President, Lyndon Johnson did what President Roosevelt had done, which was to delegate authority from the Office of the Presidency to the Department of the Interior.

However, when we recognize that the Department of the Interior has this authority, it seems to me we ought to pay close attention to the oil policy appointments made to that Department from the oil industry. Who is Mr. Joe Dickerson? Joe Dickerson has been active in the oil business since 1923, when he

joined the Skelly Oil Co., in Tulsa. He has been an executive of the Shell Oil Co. for 33 years. He was elected a vice president in 1951.

Since 1960, Mr. Dickerson has been executive vice president of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association and a registered lobbyist for the association.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Joe Dickerson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BIOGRAPHY OF JOE T. DICKERSON

Joe T. Dickerson, of Tulsa, Okla., has been appointed Director of the Department of Interior's Office of Oil and Gas, Secretary Stuart Udall announced. The appointment is effective March 1. Mr. Dickerson has been active in the oil and gas industry since joining the Skelly Oil Co. in Tulsa in 1923 and is currently executive vice president of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, supervising both its Tulsa and Washington offices. He succeeds Jerome J. O'Brien, who resigned January 1 to return to private industry. As senior staff officer of the Mid-Continent Association, Mr. Dickerson conducts trade association activities for oil and gas producers and companies operating in Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Illinois. He joined the association in 1960 following a 33-year career as an executive of the Shell Oil Co. As Director of the Office of Oil and Gas, Mr. Dickerson will serve under Assistant Secretary John M. Kelly in providing staff assistance to Secretary Udall in the development and management of oil and gas programs assigned to the Department of Interior, including emergency governmental operations.

Born in Marion, Kans., on October 8, 1898, he moved to Oklahoma at an early age. He attended Central State College and the University of Oklahoma, which awarded him an LL.B. in 1921. After practicing law in Osage County, Okla., for 2 years, he joined the legal department of the Skelly Oil Co., Tulsa. In 1927, he joined the Shell Oil Co. in Tulsa and he served in both legal and executive positions with that company until he retired in 1959.

With Shell he was manager of its legal department in Tulsa, Okla.; St. Louis, Mo.; New York City; and Houston, Tex. In 1947, Mr. Dickerson was appointed manager of Shell's oil and gas explorations development and production activity in east Texas and the Texas gulf coast. In 1951, he was elected as vice president of Shell in charge of all explorations, development and production activities in Permian Basin area, responsible for the work of major departments such as geological and geophysical production and engineering, gasoline and gasoline plants, scouting and land, as well as legal, purchasing, accounting, and personnel.

Mr. Dickerson became president of the Shell Pipe Line Corp., a wholly owned Shell subsidiary, in 1954, where he was chief executive responsible for all corporate and occupational activities for Shell's entire pipeline transportation system east of the Rocky Mountains.

During World War II he served with the Air Force in north Africa, and Italy, attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel. Mr. Dickerson is a member of the Oklahoma Bar Association, Missouri Bar Association, Texas Bar Association and is admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. He is a member of the American Petroleum Institute and has been active in civic and industry affairs. He lives at 4201 Cathedral Avenue NW.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wish to give a list of the major mem-

bers of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association which were represented by Joe Dickerson, the new Director of the Office of Oil and Gas, in Mr. Dickerson's capacity as lobbyist for Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association:

- First. The California Co.
- Second. Cities Service Oil Co.
- Third. Gulf Oil Corp.
- Fourth. Humble Oil & Refining Co.
- Fifth. Phillips Petroleum Co.
- Sixth. Shell Oil Co.
- Seventh. Sinclair Oil & Gas Co.
- Madam President, Mr. Dickerson, who has just been appointed head of the Office of Oil and Gas, is one of the two men most responsible for establishing oil policy in our Government.
- Eighth. Socony Mobil Oil Co.
- Ninth. Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.
- Tenth. Texaco, Inc.
- Eleventh. Atlantic Refining Co.
- Twelfth. Continental Oil Co.
- Thirteenth. Marathon Oil Co.
- Fourteenth. Pure Oil Co.
- Fifteenth. Sun Oil Co.
- Sixteenth. Sunray DX Oil Co.
- Seventeenth. Tidewater Oil Co. of California.
- Eighteenth. Union Oil Co. of California.
- Nineteenth. Amerada Petroleum Corp.
- Twentieth. Champlin Oil & Refining Co.
- Twenty-first. Hunt Oil Co.
- Twenty-second. Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc.
- Twenty-third. Skelly Oil Co.
- Twenty-fourth. Standard Oil Co. of Ohio.
- Twenty-fifth. Superior Oil Co.
- Twenty-sixth. Ashland Oil & Refining Co.
- Twenty-seventh. British - American Oil Producing Co.
- Twenty-eighth. Kewanee Oil Co.
- Twenty-ninth. General American Oil Co. of Texas.
- Thirtieth. General Crude Oil Co.
- Thirty-first. Murphy Corp.
- Thirty-second. Quintana Oil Corp.
- Thirty-third. Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp.

Madam President, all these oil companies were represented by Joe Dickerson until a few days ago, when he was appointed Director of the Office of Oil and Gas. There is no question that Mr. Dickerson has represented the giants of the American petroleum industry as their lobbyist.

Of course, there is nothing wrong with a man's being a lobbyist; and I am sure Mr. Dickerson is an honest and decent man. Nevertheless, he has a lifetime of service to the oil industry; he was paid to represent it and its viewpoint. So I think it proper to point out that as a representative of the oil industry and as a lobbyist, Mr. Dickerson failed to comply with the clear requirements of the Federal Lobby Act. Let me detail this specifically; here is the way Mr. Dickerson violated the Federal Lobby Act:

CONSISTENTLY VIOLATED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL LOBBY LAW

On his original registration form, dated February 3, 1960, Mr. Dickerson, the new appointee as Director of the

Office of Oil and Gas, did not answer the question about how long his legislative interests would continue; he did not state what his specific legislative interests were in reference to House bills and Senate bills, and whether he was for or against such bills; and he did not state whether any publications were distributed in connection with legislative interests.

In the 4-year period of his reporting, he never—and, Madam President, I stress the word “never”—stated the nature of his business, the nature of the business of his employer, or his legislative interests and publications connected with those legislative interests.

Furthermore, on three occasions he filed late.

In 1960, his receipts were never completely filled in, and he did not answer any questions about his expenditures for three quarters in 1960. In 1961, for the first quarter, he did not answer any questions about his expenditures, and he did not completely fill in his receipts.

Yet, Madam President, this is the man who has been appointed Director of the Office of Oil and Gas.

DICKERSON RESPONSIBILITY AS DIRECTOR OF OIL AND GAS

He, along with Mr. John Kelly, is the one who will be most responsible for the oil policies of the Federal Government, while serving in a department which has had delegated to it by the President of the United States the unique power of having control over the oil policies of our country.

The fact is that as head of the Office of Oil and Gas, Mr. Dickerson will provide staff advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Kelly, in the development, coordination, and management of oil and gas programs and functions which are assigned to the Department by the President or by Congress. He will provide leadership in obtaining coordination and unification of oil and gas policies and related administrative activities of all Federal agencies.

He also will serve as the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, State regulatory bodies, and the petroleum and gas industries.

OIL COMPACT COMMISSION MONOPOLY THREAT

Mr. President (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair), in his capacity as the principal channel of communication with the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Joe Dickerson will be in a very powerful and important position, in which he should act as an impartial, objective referee between the oil industry and the consumer and between the oil industry and true conservationists whose interests often contradict and conflict with those of the oil industry.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission was established a number of years ago. Practically every Congress since 1935 has reviewed the effects of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission on the oil industry.

In 1949 a Special Committee on Small Business, headed by the late Senator Wherry, found that activities coordinated by the compact were aimed not

only at conservation, but also at maintaining high prices. Their criticism was not so much directed at the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, as at the entire decentralized regulatory system over which the compact has advisory power.

The congressional concern was finally satisfied in part in 1955 by an amendment to the resolution which extended for 4 years the life of the Oil Compact Commission. That amendment required the Attorney General—acting as a representative of the public and as a legal expert—to submit to Congress an annual report as to whether or not the States' activities were consistent with conservation purposes and not with controlling prices.

Mr. President, about a year ago I pointed out that for 4 years the Attorney General had neglected to make this report, in spite of the fact that the previous reports had indicated a developing degree of monopoly and indicated that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission had played a part in diminishing the influence of the independent oil firms.

Furthermore, on March 14, 1963, I discussed on the floor of the Senate a memorandum written by Allen Calvert, Jr., a member of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, reporting on a conversation with Assistant Secretary Kelly—now the boss of Joe Dickerson, and now the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on Minerals, the top man on oil policy—and I pointed out that “it is clear that this oil duo is intent on confining the representation of the Interior Department in the oil survey—requested by President Kennedy of the Oil Compact Commission—largely to themselves.”

At that time I also informed the Senate that Secretary Kelly would lead the Compact Commission's representation with men from oil States whose interests were strictly on the side of the producers, and did not recognize the public interest in keeping prices competitive and in keeping the consumer adequately represented.

KELLY, DICKERSON'S BOSS, ALSO ALL-OUT OILMAN

Mr. President, when an oil lobbyist who consistently has failed to meet the reporting requirements of the lobbying law is appointed the head of the Office of Oil and Gas, that fact in and of itself is shocking. However, when we also recognize that the one to whom he reports is Mr. John Kelly, we can recognize how damaging this appointment is to the public interest.

Who is Mr. John Kelly? He was nominated, and his appointment came to the Senate on March 28, 1961. At that time, I opposed confirmation of the nomination; I did so because I was able to show on the floor of the Senate that Mr. Kelly was not only a big lifetime oil producer but still had enormous oil holdings. It is true that he divested himself of about 50 percent of them; but in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he admitted that he still held on to about 50 percent of “great holdings.” I shall quote from his testimony before the committee, because in an otherwise very good and very accurate

article published this morning in the Washington Post, it is indicated that Mr. Kelly, when appointed to his present job, divested himself of all of his oil holdings, in order to become Assistant Secretary of the Interior in Charge of Minerals. However, that simply is not true. He did not.

I quote now from the hearings which were held at the time when the nomination of Mr. Kelly was voted on favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Senator, * * * I do not intend to continue to operate my properties. I will hold ownership of them. But the actual operations would be carried on by other people.

I repeat:

I will hold ownership of them.

That was after Mr. Kelly made clear that he was divesting himself of those lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, because the law expressly stated that he had to divest himself of their ownership if he was going to occupy that office. Furthermore, he said he had signed over his ownership of stock in oil companies as an irrevocable gift to his minor children, and that he had resigned as president of the Elk Oil Co. That reference is to his oil holdings on Federal lands which would be subject to his jurisdiction in his position as Assistant Secretary of the Interior in Charge of Minerals. Nevertheless, he held on to other oil properties on State lands and the other holdings he had, and he made clear that about 50 percent of the property which he had held—and his holdings were termed very great—he would continue to hold.

Mr. President, both Mr. Dickerson and Mr. Kelly have devoted their lifetimes to the oil industry and to promoting enormous oil interests. There is nothing wrong with doing that, for the oil industry is a great one. It has contributed massively to the American economic system; it has made remarkable progress. It deserves admiration. But certainly if we are to have a regulatory policy which means anything, we should not appoint to the top regulatory positions in the Department of the Interior, to oversee the oil industries, persons directly connected with that industry—as Mr. Kelly is now, and as Mr. Dickerson has been throughout his lifetime.

Mr. President, I have the greatest admiration and respect for President Johnson. He has rendered a magnificent service in his first 2½ months as President. He has won the overwhelming support of the American people. I make that statement as one who has just returned from 8 days in Wisconsin. During that time I talked to literally thousands of people. I have never encountered an experience of the kind I have had out there. I know that President Eisenhower was extremely popular; and President Kennedy was also very popular. But, on the basis of the many people with whom I talked in Wisconsin, I would say that President Johnson is

far more popular than either President ever was. Republicans, as well as Democrats, concede that he is rendering a fine service, and that he has taken charge under extremely difficult circumstances. He has won admiration, and he has won it the hard way.

I earnestly hope that President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Udall will reconsider the tragic implications of the appointment. The head of the Office of Oil and Gas should be a man who has equal regard for the interests of the consumer and the general taxpayer as well as the oil-producing industry.

OIL INDUSTRY RECOMMENDED DICKERSON

Mr. President, one other aspect of the appointment of Mr. Dickerson as head of the Office of Oil and Gas is most disturbing. After Mr. O'Brien, who is also an oilman, resigned from the Department of the Interior, or indicated that he would resign, Secretary of the Interior Udall wrote Mr. R. G. Follis, chairman of the National Petroleum Council, asking this chairman of the Petroleum Council of the oil industry to assist the Secretary in choosing a successor by consulting with the members of the National Petroleum Council and providing a list of nominees for the head of the Office of Oil and Gas.

The National Petroleum Council is made up entirely of petroleum industry representatives. At that time I urged that the Secretary not confine his consideration to the list submitted by the oil industry. Mr. Dickerson was a choice of the oil industry. His name was on their list. They wanted him. It is obvious why. He has devoted his life to representing their interests, which are legitimate and deserve consideration. They deserve representation. They should be protected, and jealously protected.

But in the name of justice, Mr. President, it is certainly not representation in the interests of all the American people when two persons in the Interior Department who are the experts and the real authority in advising the Secretary of the Interior on the oil industry are of, by, and for the industry which they are supposed to regulate, have devoted their entire lifetime to representing the producers, and, in the case of Mr. Dickerson, one who has served as a paid lobbyist of the petroleum industry.

I earnestly hope that the President and the Secretary of the Interior will reconsider that unfortunate appointment, in view of the very great power which the President has delegated to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Department of the Interior to determine oil policy.

Laurence Stern, a staff writer for the Washington Post, who won a George Polk memorial award in 1962 for distinguished reporting, has commented in the latest issue of the Progressive magazine on the new oil policy. I should like to read in part what Mr. Stern has said.

Laurence Stern has reported in part as follows:

The influential organ, the Oil and Gas Journal, caught this note of exuberance in

a December 16 report: "Industry spokesmen were quick to voice approval of President Johnson's action, pointing out that it places oil problems in the hands of Government officials who know most about oil."

L. Dan Jones, general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) bubbled: "It [Interior] is the best informed agency of Government on the oil and gas industry and the only agency staffed with specialists and technicians capable of providing complete and authoritative information on the industry." And Frank Ikard, president of the industry's highest lobbying council, the American Petroleum Institute (API), echoed the view that the President's action was "entirely logical."

Nell Regeimbal, Washington editor of Gas Magazine, has predicted that not only will President Johnson moderate further the Government's attitude toward the oil industry, but that he will reach all the way into the Federal Power Commission and replace its present Chairman, Joseph C. Swidler, probably with Commissioner Lawrence J. O'Connor, a fellow Texan much more friendly to oil and gas than is Swidler.

Mr. O'Connor is much more friendly. Before Mr. O'Connor was appointed to the Federal Power Commission, he was a lobbyist for the oil industry. He was a lobbyist for the American Petroleum Institute, which, as Mr. Stern properly reports, is the principal lobbying agent of the oil industry.

But Mr. President this is truly putting the foxes in charge of the henhouse.

True conservationists, and the American oil consumer has about as much chance of a fair break out of this lineup in the Interior Department with its new sovereignty over the oil industry as the Beatles have of being in President Johnson's Cabinet.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I may be permitted to address the Senate on several subjects.

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

THE PLACE OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the early part of February, the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was invited to Latin America, South America, and particularly to Santiago, Chile. On the occasion of his visit to that country, he delivered a very illuminating speech on the place of the savings and loan association in Latin and South America. One part of his speech, which I shall ask to have printed in the Record, pertains to the need for housing in Latin and South America. That need is probably the greatest in the world. The theme of the speech was that Mr. McMurray, on behalf of our Government, would be as helpful as possible in setting up a similar form of financing for the people of South America, so that they might achieve some of the things which we have in the United States in the way of housing.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Record in full.

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

THE PLACE OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Joseph P. McMurray¹)

To my good friends old and new, both from the southern and from the northern portions of our great American Hemisphere, I desire first of all to wish a happy and prosperous New Year.

I know that those of you who are not from the United States share with us our sorrow for the tragic loss of our beloved and courageous President, John F. Kennedy. I ask your prayers and your kind wishes for the endeavors of his very able successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, a man whom I had the pleasure of working closely with while he served in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. Your own well-being has at all times been close to the heart of each of these leaders of my country.

As Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal agency of the United States charged with protecting the safety and soundness of savings and loan associations, I am gratified to meet with representatives of sister organizations of some nine Latin American countries, together with the other persons whose interest in the savings and loan concept is attested by their presence here.

A year ago the first Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference was held in Lima, Peru. While it was not my good fortune to be there I received most favorable accounts from many persons who took part, including my friend Joseph J. Williams, Jr., who was then my colleague on the Board.

Now at the second such conference, here at Santiago in this beautiful Republic of Chile, it will be my pleasure and my gain to learn of the progress which is being made in the movement for savings and loan associations in Latin America.

I shall be equally interested in hearing of the problems which have been and are being faced and the solutions which are being found. It is a firm belief of mine, shared with me by most of my fellow countrymen, that my country has as much to learn from other countries as they have to learn from mine.

The members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board have a strong and continuing interest in savings and loan systems in other countries, and particularly in Latin America. We in the United States did not originate the savings and loan association. It came to us from England, so that we are as much borrowers of the idea as you can be. But the savings and loan industry has had with us a proud and a great history of more than a century and a quarter. It consists today of some 6,300 associations with assets of more than \$100 billion.

Its beginnings were small and its early progress was slow, as perhaps must be the case in your countries, although we hope that ways may be found to speed your progress. But it was built on a firm foundation, and was destined from the start to ultimate success.

The interest which we at the Board have in your own efforts is tangibly expressed in an interagency agreement recently made by the Board with the Agency for International Development, under which the Board will

provide continuing technical assistance in this field.

Without waiting for a formal agreement of this nature, the Board has been glad to make members of its staff available to assist in the establishment of savings and loan systems in your part of the hemisphere. These have included Lyndon R. Day, our Director of Federal Home Loan Bank Operations, and Joseph Misora of our supervisory staff, who went on an assignment to the Dominican Republic; Simon Trevas of our legal staff, who is now my executive assistant, and John Broullire of our supervisory staff, both of whom assisted in El Salvador; and Michael Patron of our examining staff, who has served in Argentina.

We are glad, too, that members of the staffs of the Federal Home Loan Banks, which are under our supervision, have rendered service of this nature. In this connection I should like to mention J. Alston Adams, who was the president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco until his untimely death and who took part in surveys in Argentina; Louis Woodford, senior vice president of that bank, who served in the Dominican Republic; Paul Heywood, vice president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, who gave help in Peru; and Dean Prichett, the legal counsel of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, who assisted in Ecuador.

However, as I have said quite frankly on previous occasions, the most outstanding contributions of time and effort which have been made from the United States to this great work have been made by the men of the savings and loan industry itself and of their trade organizations.

Many of those people are here at this Conference. They are too numerous for me to try to call their roll, but you know who they are. They have been ably assisted by sponsorship and cooperation from the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, each of which has also supplied a substantial amount of actual financial assistance toward the establishment of savings and loan systems in Latin American countries. More recently the Peace Corps, in cooperation with other organizations, has initiated its program of providing the services of Peace Corps volunteers who, after periods of training in the United States, are assigned to assist in the establishment and development of savings and loan institutions in the country of their assignment. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has also provided valuable technical assistance.

The backbone of the whole endeavor has, however, been the personal efforts of dedicated members of the savings and loan industry and their trade organizations. These are the men who have the most intimate knowledge of the operating side of savings and loan associations and who have been and are ready to share that knowledge with you.

Let me add the thought that in this common effort there is a substantial place also for advice and assistance by those who, in their daily work on the staff of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, have acquired the point of view and the skills involved in the regulatory and supervisory side, as distinguished from the operating side, of the savings and loan picture.

I believe that savings and loan associations can succeed in your countries only if there is adequate authority for their proper regulation and supervision and only if the regulatory and supervisory staffs are competent and able. At the same time, too rigid, tight, and detailed regulation can stifle initiative and deny to associations the tools which are needed for successful operation.

The services of persons who have a firsthand knowledge of the regulatory and supervisory process can assist you in avoiding the mistake of too little regulation and supervision and the mistake of having too much.

While a few people in the United States have advanced the view that savings and loan associations cannot feasibly be transplanted to a Latin American environment, I do not share that view.

Your civilization, your culture, in both of its great Spanish and Portuguese branches, is of course different from ours. It is much older than ours and has its roots in a different source.

But in our own State of Louisiana, whose population and whose laws and customs come quite largely from the French and to some extent from the Spanish element of the Latin peoples, savings and loan associations have for many years been thoroughly accepted and highly successful.

Throughout our Southwest, from Texas to California, those who operate and those who use savings and loan associations, both as savers and as borrowers, include many persons of Spanish-American origin and roots. The same is true in those parts of Florida which received early settlers from Spain or later ones from Spanish America.

Let me say at this point, in the most careful way I can, that I most sincerely believe that none of your countries should be or should feel under any kind of pressure, financial or otherwise, to adopt the savings and loan association as one of your institutions. Under the true principle of self-determination, in which I firmly believe, this must be a matter of free choice by each of your countries.

I am gratified that already a number of your countries, exercising this undeniable right of free choice, have voted in favor of establishing savings and loan associations, though I naturally respect in all sincerity the decision of those who may not choose to do so.

I am thus gratified because I am strongly convinced of the social utility of the savings and loan association and because I cannot help seeing the spirit of dedication to the service of others, the genuine spirit of altruism, which manifests itself in the outlook and the conduct of those who operate savings and loan associations.

For the savings and loan association is not only an institution, it is an institution with a social mission. Privately owned and operated, and truly representative of the most enlightened form of private enterprise, it is nevertheless devoted to a form of service which is public in the highest sense.

Some years ago it became briefly the fashion in a few circles of savings and loan operators to deprecate and to ridicule this idea of the public role of the savings and loan association.

In the minds of these persons, the savings and loan industry should regard itself as just another form of profitmaking enterprise and should look upon its operators as merely a group of aggressive businessmen seeking personal advancement.

This view, held by only a few at most, has long since disappeared. It was not and is not true either of the associations themselves or of the vast majority of savings and loan operators.

In what other line of business would you find executive after executive not only willing but eager to make personal sacrifices of time and effort in going to other countries to assist in the establishment of similar businesses there, without the hope or even the possibility of monetary reward? I can think of none. I can account for it only as a manifestation of that spirit of helping

¹ Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., at the Second Inter-American Savings and Loan Meeting, Hotel Carrera, Santiago, Chile, Tuesday, January 21, 1964.

the other person which pervades and accompanies the savings and loan industry.

If the same spirit pervades the executives and personnel of the savings and loan associations which you have established and will establish, the ultimate success of your associations will be virtually assured. You will, of course, have to exercise through your regulatory and supervisory staffs the same diligence that we do to bar and to eliminate the small fringe of unscrupulous and unsound operators who from time to time find their way to the savings and loan industry. I am confident that your ability to do so can be equal to ours.

Now, granted that adequate conditions for their functioning will be established, what is the opportunity for savings and loan associations in Latin America?

In looking into that question, we must note first of all that the primary characteristic which separates the savings and loan association from other types of savings institution is the fact that a savings and loan association invests the greatest part of the savings which it receives from the public in loans on housing.

From my personal experience when I was the Housing Commissioner of the State of New York, I know at first hand the importance of good housing.

I have seen what poor housing can do in the way of producing discouragement, disease, and crime.

I have also seen what decent housing can do in increasing man's happiness, lifting his spirit, and improving his ability to work and to produce.

Those who have studied the matter from the psychological side have pointed out that a person's physical environment, and specifically the kind of housing and the kind of neighborhood he lives in, is a powerful determinant of his character. It has also been pointed out that a person's most formative years, those of his infancy and childhood, are mainly spent within or near his family dwelling, and that family life, which is said to be still the most potent of socializing forces, has its location and its very being in the family dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Further, it has been observed that a man's dwelling is psychologically not merely a physical structure but an extension of the man himself, and that it is one of the things that determine what he thinks of himself and what others think of him.

My own philosophy is that man is made in the image of God and that man, made in God's image, has an inherent dignity and a right to live in decency. Living in decency, men will respect each other and will respect themselves. But living in slums, bringing up children in slums, is the antithesis of living in decency.

The need for decent housing, in fact the need for housing per se, is in Latin America perhaps the greatest in the world.

Your populations are literally exploding. You have tremendous rates of population increase, resulting from rapid falls in your death rates from the advances of modern medicine, while your birth rates remain at high levels which have not decreased.

These increasing streams of people are being steadily drawn into the vortices of your cities and your urban complexes, by forces which are perhaps more psychological than economic or at least as much the one as the other.

What is happening in this respect is clearly evident from data presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the U.S. Senate in the housing study recently made by that committee. The urban population of Latin America had an increase of some 30 million, or about 45 percent, in the period from 1950 to 1960. During that time the rural population had a growth of only some 13 million, or less than 15 percent. The esti-

mated urban population in 1970 will be about 138 million, more than double the 1950 figure of approximately 66 million and representing an increase of some 72 million, as contrasted with an estimated increase in the rural population during that period of only about 29 million.

From this you can see that there will be a constantly expanding need in Latin America for the construction of housing, and therefore for the financing of housing construction.

Savings and loan associations cannot be the entire answer to this need for housing finance.

They cannot reach down to the lowest strata of the population, the unemployed or the unemployable, or those whose incomes are wholly insufficient to pay for the kind of housing they need. For these, the answers must necessarily be found in some form or forms of public subvention.

But, these lowest groups aside, savings and loan associations can serve the need for housing finance in the broadest and most flexible manner. Their ability to do so will be limited only by the amount of funds that they can obtain, in the form of savings of the people or otherwise.

On the savings side, I do not believe that savings and loan associations can be as successful as they should be, in Latin America or elsewhere, if attempts are made to tie the savings operation into the lending operation.

Specifically, I am skeptical of methods under which an attempt is made to give the saver a contractual right to obtain a loan from the association, or a preference in obtaining a loan.

I believe that the inevitable effect, though of course not an intended effect, of such arrangements would be to create the impression that saving in such associations is only for those who are saving for this specific purpose. Also, such arrangements would carry potentialities for discredit to the whole operation by reason of inability of the association to meet its contractual obligations to make such loans to savers or by reason of the long delays which might occur before the preferential rights resulted in actual loans.

It is my belief, therefore, that the only inducements which should be held out to people to place their savings in associations should be those which relate to the merits of the savings facilities themselves, such as safety, convenience, and a fair rate of return.

Once again, I emphasize that each country must make its own decision in matters such as this choice between what I may call a "tied savings" plan and the "free savings" approach which I recommend.

Even under the most favorable conditions, the initial growth of your new associations will be slow, with the supply of savings as the chief limiting factor on their expansion. The habit of saving is one that does not arise automatically, but must be fostered and encouraged through processes of education which require time to become effective.

There will, therefore, be a continuing need for seed capital to facilitate the establishment and development of your associations.

Substantial amounts of such seed-capital funds have been supplied by the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, but there is need for more. In recognition of that need, legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank for this purpose, as I am sure you are all aware.

The capital of the Bank would be supplied principally by savings and loan associations in the United States and by the Federal home loan banks, whose stock is owned by savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. In a broad sense, therefore,

the proposed Bank would constitute a channel by which the savings and home financing industry in the United States would render assistance for the establishment and development of savings and home financing institutions in other countries.

The proposed legislation was introduced both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and hearings were held in August and September of last year before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. In the present status of the matter I am not in a position to give you official views as to the proposal, but I can express to you the personal hope that, whether in the form of an International Home Loan Bank or in some other form, a means will be provided by which the members of the savings and loan industry in the United States will be enabled to render this assistance which they are desirous of providing.

In the meantime, and regardless of the final outcome of this issue, I hope that you will continue your efforts toward the establishment in your countries of sound, strong, and efficient systems of savings and loan associations. My best wishes and my assurances of the highest cooperation go with you.

CONFIRMATION OF REAR ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO FOR THIRD TERM AS DIRECTOR OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the confirmation by the Senate of Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo for a third term as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey augurs well for the Nation's scientific agency, created in 1807 by Thomas Jefferson.

During Admiral Karo's tenure as Director, the survey has made tremendous progress and, in fact, attained worldwide recognition in many scientific fields including oceanography, seismology, geomagnetism, and hydrography.

Although born in Nebraska, Admiral Karo is esteemed as an adopted son of the State of Washington. It was in Seattle that, in 1923, he joined the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for many years, both prior to World War II and subsequently, he operated Survey ships out of this major Pacific Northwest port. His lovely wife, the former Elsie Cooper, is a native of Everett, Wash.

During World War II, incidentally, Admiral Karo served with the U.S. Army Air Force with the rank of colonel.

Since 1955, when he first became its Director, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has greatly expanded production of aeronautical and nautical charts, has established a worldwide network of seismographs to record earth tremors whether natural or artificially induced, and has developed a satellite geodesy program based on optical tracking of both active and passive satellites.

Enactment of S. 2482 in the 86th Congress, legislation cosponsored by myself and Senator ENGLE, of California, and which authorized the Coast and Geodetic Survey to conduct oceanographic research in the deep ocean beyond the Continental Shelf, to which it had previously been restricted, has enabled the Survey to become one of the most active and effective agencies in this vital field.

Recent developments under Admiral Karo's direction included the electronic computer adjustment of stereoscopic in-

strument aerotriangulation; the application of infrared photography to shoreline mapping; the application and extensive use of color photography for coastal and alongshore surveying and mapping, and the modification of a pilot model deep-sea stereoscopic camera and the first stereoscopic contouring from these photographs using a standard multiplex plotter.

The Survey also is pioneering in the use of color photography to identify and to locate aids to navigation; to map shoals and channels, and the topography of uneven bottom in shoal waters to assist the hydrographer in developing these areas, and to map alongshore rocks awash and submerged rocks in places difficult to determine by sounding.

These services, Mr. President, are particularly important when one considers that ships navigating American waters annually carry cargo valued in excess of \$100 billion. Nautical charts are vital in safeguarding this huge volume of water traffic against the thousands of dangers from which ships might meet disaster. This service also is an important factor in establishing the rates of marine insurance.

The Pacific Northwest and Alaska, with their many seaports and heavy commerce, will welcome the reappointment of Admiral Karo to his distinguished post and the unanimous confirmation of this appointment by the Senate. The Nation can be assured of further scientific progress in the maritime and aeronautical mapping fields under his able leadership.

ENCROACHMENT OF SOVIET RUSSIAN FISHING ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce, and particularly the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries published a study last week on the encroachment of Soviet Russian fishing on the high seas and territorial waters of free nations.

The editorial staff of the Tacoma News Tribune read the report and, as a result, wrote a very fine editorial on Monday, January 27, entitled: "Bully of the Seas." I call this matter to the attention of all Americans. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BULLY OF THE SEAS

Plenty of attention has been given Soviet Russia's territorial aggression. Not enough has been focused on the Reds' aggression on the high seas and in the territorial waters of free nations. Actually, Russia has emerged as the bully of the seas. Soon this Nation and others must confront Russia on this, for the Russian aggression will kill the fishing industry of every nation, while the Russian industry, already doubled in the past 10 years, will triple and quadruple.

The U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, of which Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington State, is chairman, has just published a full documentation of the Soviet threat to the world fishing industry, prepared by the Library of Congress with the aid of the University of Washington Fisheries

Research Institute, which translated Russian fisheries articles and news from Soviet publications.

Russia, the report shows, has gone all out to provide great fleets of the most modern fishing vessels, and has sent them, 100 or more at a time, into waters off Alaska, the Pacific Northwest, Japan, Scotland, Norway, Cuba, and even close to the shore of Massachusetts. Roughhouse tactics are used by the Russians to drive off competitors, equipment that flouts international and treaty law is used to clean up the ocean floor and waters without regard to conservation. And the Russians use their fleets to track satellites, spy on our oceanic activity, test water for Soviet submarine operations. Whenever this country has an important experiment going on, Russian fishing vessels are observed in the area.

According to the report, the Soviet vessels use hit-and-run collisions to drive away the ships of other nations. They use fine-mesh nets to scoop up the fish, an outright violation that gives them advantages over our fishermen. They break up our nets, lobster pots and crab lines.

Quoting the report's summary:

"As a result of the intrusion of the prowling and ravenous fishing fleet of the U.S.S.R. into the traditional fishing grounds of a number of nations around the globe, the orderly pattern of activity of many fishing communities has been painfully disrupted, contributing a new and dangerous source of conflict among the nations of the world."

Our immediate area certainly has a definite interest in Pacific fisheries. We should pen some notes in commendation of Senator MAGNUSON for getting up the documented report, and to President Johnson and the Senate Commerce Committee to inquire what effective use will be made of it before our fishing resources disappear.

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:

PROPOSED REVISION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LEGISLATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, recommending the revision of proposed legislation forwarded to the Senate on December 12, 1963, amending the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Three letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1964 had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON GUARANTEES BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that that Bank had issued certain guarantees relating to the importation of cotton by Hungary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FUNDS FOR USE OF ALLIED ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

for funds, authorized for use of allied armed forces on a reimbursable basis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for fiscal year 1963, together with a report of the annual inspection of the Home, 1963, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM—EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the Federal contributions program—equipment and facilities, for the quarter ended December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, for the quarter ended December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

A letter from the chairman and chief executive officer, Communications Satellite Corp., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that corporation, for the period February 1, 1963, to December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to allow credit to certain members of the U.S. Secret Service Division for periods of prior police service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF CERTAIN ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of certain advisory committees of that Department, for the calendar year 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS SUPERVISED BY FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Home Loan Banks supervised by Federal Home Loan Bank Board, year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN RADIO COMPONENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary cost incurred in the procurement of AN/ARN 21C Tacan radio components through failure to accept option offer, Department of the Air Force, dated January 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the legislative and policy requirements governing Federal participation in acquisition of rights-of-way and in other activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of California, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated January 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON WEAKNESSES IN HEADQUARTERS PAYROLL ACTIVITIES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in headquarters payroll activities, Post Office Department, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL SCHEDULING OF CERTAIN CITY DELIVERY CARRIERS, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical scheduling of certain city delivery carriers, Post Office Department, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON IMPROPER WAIVER OF POLICY REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the improper waiver of policy requirements applicable to the Federal-aid highway program, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated January 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN ENLISTMENT AND DISCHARGE OF UNQUALIFIED APPLICANTS FOR REGULAR AND RESERVE FORCES OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the enlistment and discharge of unqualified applicants for Regular and Reserve Forces, Department of the Navy, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXCESSIVE FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IN FEDERALLY AIDED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN STATES OF LOUISIANA AND OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive financial participation in federally aided public assistance programs in the States of Louisiana and Oklahoma, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERPRICING OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR SUBMARINE COMPONENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpricing of nuclear submarine components purchased by Plant Apparatus Division, Westinghouse Electric Corp., under two subcontracts awarded to Edwin L. Wiegand Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., Department of the Navy, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXCESSIVE CHARGES FOR LEASED TELEPHONE SERVICES INCURRED BY U.S. FORCES IN JAPAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive charges for leased telephone services incurred by U.S. Forces in Japan, Department of Defense, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT RELATING TO EXCESSIVE CHARGES FOR LEASED TELEPHONE SERVICES INCURRED BY U.S. FORCES IN JAPAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential supplementary report relating to excessive charges for leased telephone services incurred by U.S. Forces in Japan (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Coal Research, dated February 15, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS MADE FOR DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS

A letter from the Acting Associate Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on negotiated contracts made for the disposal of materials, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONCESSION CONTRACT IN GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract for the operation of the Triangle X

Ranch in Grand Teton National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1963 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Office, during the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES AMENDMENTS OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GRADUATE PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in the grades of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the fiscal year ended March 1, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

"Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia has submitted a proposal in December 1963 to the Area Survey Committee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (abbreviated NASA) for the location of the NASA Electronics Research Center in or around that area which is the Delaware Valley area of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware; and

"Whereas this Delaware Valley area is centrally located within the Washington, D.C.-New York, N.Y., industrial strip containing the greatest concentration of electronics research and supporting electronic resources—electronics organizations, electronics employees, industrial laboratories, engineers and scientists, electrical engineers, electronics technicians—in the United States; and

"Whereas the Delaware Valley is most accessible to and from NASA centers and other centers of electronics activity in the United States in terms of travel time and cost savings; and

"Whereas there is a great concentration of large established electronics firms and supporting small business firms, many specializing in some aspects of electronics, with a large capital investment in the Delaware Valley; and

"Whereas there is a great concentration of industrial electronics research laboratories, with extensive supporting services, in the Delaware Valley, with a large capital investment in special space-oriented electronics research facilities; and

"Whereas there is a great concentration of electronics engineers and scientists with supporting technicians and craftsmen, highly qualified and experienced in electronics and associated fields, in and around the Delaware Valley; and

"Whereas there are good technical educational institutions of compelling magnitude with advanced scientific and engineering graduate training facilities in or accessible to the Delaware Valley—including the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Delaware, Drexel Institute of Technology, Temple University, Lehigh University, University of Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania State University, to mention only a few; and

"Whereas there are excellent and economical urban and suburban living conditions, with available homes in choice residential areas convenient to the Delaware Valley area; and

"Whereas this area offers an excellent and diversified cultural environment; and

"Whereas the Delaware Valley abounds in huge land tracts from which to choose available and suitable 1,000-acre sites; and

"Whereas, excellent transportation, communications, and utility services—power, water, etc., are readily available; and

"Whereas, there is convenient access from this area to the Philadelphia International Airport and to other transportation terminals; and

"Whereas, this area provides for most efficient and most economical operation of a research center of this type; and

"Whereas, no one is more competent and versatile to corroborate the superb suitability of the Delaware Valley for the location of the NASA Electronics Research Center than His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, who until recently was

Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council; and

"Whereas it is axiomatic that by being located in the Delaware Valley, the NASA Electronics Research Center will be most conducive to the leadership of the United States of America in applying electronics technology to the conquest of space: Now be it therefore

"Resolved, That those responsible persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in the U.S. Senate, in the U.S. House of Representatives, and in the executive branch of the U.S. Government give sole and sustained consideration to the location of the NASA Electronics Research Center in the Delaware Valley area of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware without being distracted by regional rivalries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Pennsylvania delegation in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives give full support without deviation whatsoever to the location of the NASA Electronics Research Center in the Delaware Valley; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward a copy of this resolution upon its passage to His Excellency the President of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward a copy of this resolution upon its passage to each member of the Pennsylvania delegation to the U.S. Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded upon its passage to the following persons: Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, NASA; Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, NASA; Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Associate Administrator, NASA; Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; Hon. George P. Miller, chairman, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics; Mr. Edward C. Welsh, Chairman, National Aeronautics and Space Council; Hon. Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate; and Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Whereas Roama is now located at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and

"Whereas this is an integral part of our air defense; and

"Whereas the worldwide situation is in such a state of turmoil that our defenses must be at full strength at all times; and

"Whereas the withdrawal of Roama from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y., would necessarily weaken our position; and

"Whereas the moving of Roama from Griffiss Air Force Base would have a depressing economic effect on the entire area near Rome, N.Y.; and

"Whereas sufficient reason or cause has not been made public of the feasibility of such plan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to determine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move Roama from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to

the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 2

"Whereas since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the passage of the Dodd bill, as amended; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill, as amended, requires the registration of all firearms held by citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas the second amendment, Constitution of the United States, guarantees to each citizen the right to keep and bear arms; and

"Whereas enactment of the Dodd bill, as amended, creates an undue burden on the people of this country and is in direct violation of civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas, responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association and others have no objection to preventing the misuse of firearms, but firmly oppose general registration and licensing; and

"Whereas it is an unfair imposition to restrict the rights of law abiding citizens; and

"Whereas any restrictive legislation should be directed to persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitive from justice, mental incompetents, or other undesirable;

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd bill, as amended.

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine any legislation relating to firearms which restricts the rights of law abiding citizens and take appropriate measures to amend such a law so that any restrictions are imposed only on persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, or other undesirable.

"3. The secretary of state is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

A letter signed by Kurt Otto Rader, of Chomedey, Canada, relating to the establishment of a space transport system; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The memorial of John Wittick, of Newark, N.J., remonstrating against the enactment of any medical care bill which does not pay all of the patient's expenses while ill; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Donald David Evans, of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the designation of the Peace Corps as the Kennedy Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Franklin County Democratic Club of Pasco, Wash., signed by that club's president, favoring the enactment of a strong civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Merilee Bauer, and sundry other citizens of Muskegon, Mich., relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fourth degree Knights of Columbus of the Padre Gomez general assembly, at Cubao, Quezon City, Philippines, relating to the death of the late President John F. Kennedy; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present certified copies of the following resolutions passed by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on February 6, 1964:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation controlling the sale, transportation, distribution, and licensing of firearms in interstate commerce.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in New England.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from \$1,200 to \$2,000.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation commonly referred to as medicare.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the amounts of payments under the social security program.

Resolutions memorializing Congress to consider extending medical aid to persons at age 62.

I ask that these resolutions be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Commerce:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION CONTROLLING THE SALE, TRANSPORTATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND LICENSING OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation controlling the sale, transportation, distribution, and licensing of firearms in interstate commerce; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN NEW ENGLAND

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in New England; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the "Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO INCREASE ALLOWABLE EARNINGS OF PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FROM \$1,200 TO \$2,000.

"Whereas under present regulations, those persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than \$1,200 in

any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

"Whereas many of the persons receiving such payments are well-nigh totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

"Whereas the cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

"Whereas an increase of allowable annual earnings from \$1,200 to \$2,000 will enable such persons to retain their self-respect: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact the above named legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS MEDICARE

"Whereas an enlightened civic consciousness requires that adequate medical care and hospitalization be made available to our aged workers; and

"Whereas a very large proportion of such workers are included in the social security system; and

"Whereas such workers are prone to injuries and illness of long duration, the medical treatment of which is very costly; and

"Whereas the cost of such treatment is so large as to cause the impoverishment of the worker, causing him to become despondent and frequently to lose his self-respect; and

"Whereas legislation commonly referred to as Medicare will be a complete and satisfactory solution to the problem confronting such workers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact the above-named legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

"Whereas the cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an alltime high; and

"Whereas a substantial portion of the people of this Nation depend to a large extent if not entirely upon the monthly payments received by them under the social security program; and

"Whereas the current monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

"Whereas an increase of such maximum payments to \$150 per month would tend to relieve such conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation in-

creasing the maximum monthly payments of such individuals to \$150; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO CONSIDER EXTENDING MEDICAL AID TO PERSONS AT AGE 62

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently reduced the eligible age allowing persons to collect benefits under the Federal Social Security Act from age 65 to age 62; and

"Whereas there exists a national tendency to reduce the age of retirement from age 65 to age 62; and

"Whereas the present program for aid to the aged now takes effect at age 65: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to reduce the age of eligibility from age 65 to age 62; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four concurrent resolutions adopted by the South Dakota Legislature at a session concluded Monday, February 10.

The first of these resolutions, Mr. President, is Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, expressing the appreciation of the South Dakota Legislature for the 25 years' service in the Congress of the United States of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

I would like to join the South Dakota Legislature in extending congratulations to the Senator, now embarked on his 26th year in Congress.

The second resolution calls on the Corps of Army Engineers to establish visible takelines with visible markers around the reservoirs of the great Missouri River dams in the State. In the absence of such lines, private owners are forced to employ surveyors, contrary to the Corps of Engineers commitment that the work would cause the adjacent landowners no economic loss.

The third concurrent resolution urges the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconsider its decision to carry its own insurance on CCC grain stocks because South Dakota law requires elevators in our State to carry such insurance and the CCC action will mean overlapping insurance.

The final resolution calls for Federal action in regard to beef imports and beef prices and has just a slight political flavor added. In one paragraph, it intimates that the junior Senator from South Dakota only recently became aware that beef imports have risen and are affecting our already seriously depressed domestic cattle prices.

As a matter of record, Mr. President, I started directing the attention of the Department of Agriculture to the cattle price situation a year ago and formally called for a study of the problem on March 4, 1963. The South Dakota Legislature was in session in this same period. While it did not act on the cattle problem then, I shall forgo comment on that fact.

Excessively high imports of cattle and domestic marketing of fed beef, running several percent in excess of the previous year, have pulled cattle prices to seriously low levels. Stockmen in South Dakota are losing around \$50 per head on their fed animals in the markets today.

As records of this body reflect, the Tariff Commission is under orders to study and report promptly on the economic effect of beef imports by resolution of the Finance Committee, a resolution authorized by Senator QUENTIN BURDICK and backed by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and myself among others.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is negotiating voluntary import limitations with Australia and New Zealand. And I have taken up with the Department of Agriculture a beef purchase program to attempt to relieve the pressure on prices.

This body, Mr. President, should implement the President's call for an investigation of the effects of vertical integration and chain marketing on farm-to-consumer price structures and the need for my bill, S. 1270, introduced in April of last year, to prohibit large packers and chainstores from engaging in the livestock feeding business.

I am happy to have the South Dakota Legislature's resolution in the RECORD, Mr. President, for it reflects the serious concern—which I have long felt—over the cattle price situation in South Dakota and is as gracious an agreement with my views on the situation as I could possibly expect from my good friends of the Republican faith in the South Dakota Legislature, particularly at a moment when they may have been undergoing some embarrassment over the fact that they said nothing on this subject a year ago.

I would like to add, Mr. President, that I shall always honor this legislature for having made South Dakota the 38th key State to ratify the poll tax amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolutions are as follows:

Ordered to lie on the table:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Concurrent resolution, expressing the appreciation of the people of South Dakota for the long, distinguished service of KARL E. MUNDT, senior Senator from South Dakota, in the Congress of the United States

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT, our senior Senator from South Dakota, has devoted 25 years of his life to the service of the people of

South Dakota in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has served this State and Nation in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States and has achieved national recognition for his contribution to the growth, development, and freedom of our State and Nation; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has earned the affection and esteem of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States and of the people of South Dakota as has been evidenced by the recent congratulatory expressions extended to him on the occasion of his 25th anniversary dinner at Madison, S. Dak.; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has never wavered from his devotion to principle and his selfless determination to promote the welfare of the people of South Dakota and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The people of South Dakota through their elected representatives in the Legislature of South Dakota, both Houses concurring, do hereby express their appreciation for the long, distinguished, devoted, and fearless service of KARL E. MUNDT and wish for him many more years of good health and humanitarian devotion to this State and Nation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to Senator MUNDT, and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate, January 27, 1964.
Concurred in the house of representatives, February 4, 1964.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary, State Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk,
House of Representatives.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River Reservoirs

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring therein):

"Whereas it was the pledge of the Corps of Engineers that the Missouri Basin Development program would cause the adjacent landowners no economic loss;

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers has failed to delineate the take lines of the Missouri River dams with visible markers; and

"Whereas the owners of land adjacent to the Missouri River dams have been forced to hire private surveyors to plat and to survey the take lines, and then mark such take lines;

"Whereas it is unfair to the adjacent landowners to have to pay for such surveying and the establishing of such markers; and

"Whereas the lack of adequate markers for the take lines results in a problem of great magnitude affecting a large number of the citizens of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the sen-

ate concurring therein), respectfully requests the Corps of Engineers to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River reservoirs; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Secretary of the Army of the United States; to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable Karl Mundt and the Honorable George McGovern, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; and to the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Ben Relfel, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota.

"PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker of the House.

"W. J. MATSON
Chief Clerk of the House.

"NILS A. BOE,

Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the senate."

Adopted by the house: February 5, 1964.

Adopted by the senate: February 7, 1964.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7 A Concurrent Resolution

"Concurrent resolution, urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation recognize the statutory requirements provided by South Dakota law, establishing the insurance protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen shall maintain in force upon grain held in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by said Commodity Credit Corporation to abrogate these laws by substituting the Federal Government as insurer

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the licensed public grain warehousemen of South Dakota are required by law to insure all grain that they hold in storage, either for private individuals or for the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

"Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has publicly announced its intention to become its own insurer on commodities owned by the Government or pledged as collateral on price-support loans in commercial storage, and to arbitrarily assess costs of this Federal assumption of risk against the warehouseman; and

"Whereas public grain warehousemen insure the contents of their warehouses under reporting forms of insurance contracts which are designed to provide flexible protection for the fluctuating values created by constantly changing quantities and market values, the operation of which policies require the full reporting of all grain stocks regardless of ownership; and

"Whereas the extent to which grain in public storage may or may not be pledged as collateral on price-support loans from day to day could never be accurately established for insurance purposes; and

"Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation proposes to levy a charge against the warehouseman's storage payments, for assuming a risk which he cannot segregate as a practical matter of accounting, and which he is compelled to insure by law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action proposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be in conflict with the regulatory controls already wisely established by the legislature of this State and administered by the public utilities commission; and be it further

Resolved, That this proposal would arbitrarily subject every warehouseman to two

systems of insuring the same risk, at a duplication of cost which would be an unfair and unnecessary burden upon them; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota hereby memorialize the Commodity Credit Corporation to abandon their plan as being incompatible with State laws and necessary insurance practices; and be it finally

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of South Dakota.

"Adopted by the senate January 23, 1964.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives January 30, 1964.

*"Nils A. Boe,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

*"Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary, State Senate.
"Paul E. Brown,
Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

*"W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk,
House of Representatives."*

To the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States; pertaining to beef imports

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas agriculture as a whole during 1963 suffered numerous setbacks and this condition or any solution or program relative thereto were not set forth in any manner in President Johnson's state of the Union message; and

"Whereas according to a news release from the Agriculture Department of the United States published in newspapers during the last few days of 1963, it was revealed that farm prices in comparison to items upon which parity is figured had reached their lowest point since 1939; and

"Whereas farmers received 5½ percent less for their livestock marketed in 1963 and that such loss had an adverse effect upon all farming and ranching operations and that such loss was reflected not only in livestock produce but also in the raising of feed grains; and

"Whereas all the farming people are more than desirous of doing their share in the field of foreign relations, people associated with agriculture are entitled to some of the considerations given to all other agencies throughout the United States, and while it is apparent that there is a great divergence of opinion over Government subsidy programs as shown by the defeat of the wheat referendum, certainly all people in agriculture believe in equal protection of the agriculture industry as furnished by the laws of the U.S. Government for other industries; and

"Whereas imports of boneless beef, veal and mutton and all fresh or frozen products as a whole of these items has more than tripled since 1959 when Congress reduced import duties on these products by 50 percent, and following which the United States swung from a position of being a net exporter of these products to a net importer thereof; and

"Whereas from 1960 to 1962 the total meat consumption in the United States increased by 4.3 percent and during the same period the consumption of imported beef increased

by 81.8 percent, and while in 1930 the tariff on beef imported into the United States amounted to 58 percent of the value of the domestic product, by 1962 the tariff had been reduced to 9.5 percent of the domestic product; and

"Whereas most of the foreign nations sending meats to the United States have stringent regulations against the importation of the U.S. livestock products; and

"Whereas Senators CURTIS, of Nebraska, and SIMPSON, of Wyoming, introduced legislation as amendments to the 1963 feed grain bill to effectuate reduction of such imports, and by the inclusion of such amendments in the feed grain program attempted to gain the support of feed grain producers for the livestock industry; and

"Whereas all the foregoing facts and many more similar thereto were presented on the floor of the U.S. Senate in open discussion without dispute and are reported in the Congressional Journal of Wednesday, May 15, 1963, between pages 8202 and 8218 thereof; and

Whereas on page 8215, Senator MUNDT, senior Senator from South Dakota, spoke in support of such legislation, and subsequently voted therefor; and

Whereas Senator McGOVERN, the junior Senator from South Dakota, according to late press releases now also recognizes the serious adverse effect that imports of foreign livestock products have upon prices paid South Dakota farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President and Congress be memorialized by this body and especially that all congressional delegates of South Dakota to the U.S. Congress be memorialized to pass legislation such as that introduced by Senators CURTIS and SIMPSON as before stated, to afford the agricultural industry support similar to that given to other industries of this Nation, and which action would substantially assist the agricultural industry without the use of Government funds.

"Adopted by the senate January 30, 1964.

"Concurred in the house of representatives February 6, 1964.

"Attest:

*"Nils A. Boe,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.*

*"Paul E. Brown,
Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

*"Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary, State Senate.
"W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk,
House of Representatives."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. Pastore):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1043

"Resolution memorializing Congress, requesting favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed

"Whereas many hundreds of thousands of our Nation's finest citizens served the cause of democracy during the period of World War I; and

"Whereas a large number of these veterans have now reached the age and circumstances in which they are no longer self-supporting, as well as suffering illnesses and infirmities aggravated by this honorable service to their country; and

"Whereas through no fault of their own, they have largely become a class of forgotten men, many of whom are close to the grave: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island recognize the predicament of these veterans of World War I and petition the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to H.R. 2332 (World War I Pension Act) providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which will provide relief so vitally needed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the recording clerk of this house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

*"Salvatore R. Cesaro,
Recording Clerk."*

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to institute such action as is necessary to prevent the centralization of cotton storage facilities.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 639

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to institute such action as is necessary to prevent the centralization of cotton storage facilities

Whereas there are 173 cotton warehouses with 651 buildings and compartments operated under the South Carolina State warehouse system; and

Whereas during the fiscal year 1962-63 these warehouses handled 920,000 bales of cotton valued at \$153 million; and

Whereas it is mandatory in South Carolina that the State warehouse system foster and encourage the erection of warehouses so as to localize the storage of cotton; and

Whereas any policy initiated to disturb this program of localization would defeat the intent of the South Carolina law; and

Whereas our system has served the cotton loan programs since 1933 which have been continually improved; and

Whereas the farmers, warehousemen and textile mills are dependent upon the present system, and any change would materially affect their economy and the economy of labor forces; and

Whereas the intent of Congress in providing the cotton loan program was a rural-boosting program; and

Whereas a "bargain counter" centralized type of storage ignores the producers, warehousemen and local mills, and displaces local labor forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring, That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture are respectfully requested to in-

stitute such action as may be necessary to prevent the centralization of cotton storage facilities and to return to the localized system; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the South Carolina delegation in the Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States to not enact legislation which would further limit the right of private citizens to purchase and possess firearms.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO NOT ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD FURTHER LIMIT THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE CITIZENS TO PURCHASE AND POSSESS FIREARMS

Whereas various misinformed and misguided groups are seeking to have enacted Federal legislation to further limit the time-honored right of American citizens to purchase and possess firearms; and

Whereas such legislation is contrary to the principles upon which this country was founded and a gross insult to the American tradition of responsibility and self-reliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring): That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact no legislation which would further limit the right of private citizens to purchase and possess firearms; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the U.S. congressional delegation from South Carolina.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island at its January session of 1964. This resolution expresses the congratulations of the Rhode Island General Assembly to Mr. Francis Darigan, Jr., on his designation as Catholic Young Adult of the Year.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, EXPRESSING THE CONGRATULATIONS OF THIS BODY TO MR. FRANCIS J. DARIGAN, JR., ON HIS DESIGNATION AS CATHOLIC YOUNG ADULT OF THE YEAR

Whereas Francis J. Darigan, Jr., 26 Emmet Street, Providence, has engaged in a

number of activities which have earned for him the designation as Catholic Young Adult of the Year; and

Whereas Mr. Darigan has been president of the Cathedral Parish CYO Youth Council, president of the Providence South Regional CYO Youth Council, president of the Diocesan CYO Youth Council and president of the National CYO, is a graduate of Tyler School and LaSalle Academy, president of his class in the junior and senior years at Providence College, is active in the Army ROTC program at Providence College, a member of the Pershing Rifles Drill Team, a member of the Friars Club, a recipient of the Eagle of the Cross Medal, coach of Cathedral Parish basketball teams, Chairman of the Annual Conference of the Rhode Island Youth Council, and a page in the State senate; and

Whereas in these days of recurring anxiety and concern caused by reports of youthful misdeeds, Mr. Darigan has been an outstanding example of how a young Rhode Islander can use the opportunities open to him to develop his full potential, thus being a real inspiration to his contemporaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly does congratulate him on the honors he has brought on himself, his family, and the people of Rhode Island through his designation as Catholic Young Adult of the Year; directing the secretary of state to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to Mr. Francis J. Darigan, Jr.

JOHN H. CLAFEE,
Governor.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2502. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimierz Koscielny;

S. 2503. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Kotaba; and

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Maria Papakonstantinou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. MECHEM):

S. 2505. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2506. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2507. A bill for the relief of Maj. Preston E. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2508. A bill to authorize certain improvements on the Big Sioux River, Iowa and South Dakota, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 2509. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2510. A bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. MECHEM):

S. 2511. A bill to provide price supports for the 1964 and subsequent crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2512. A bill to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a permanent memorial to past Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED SIOUX RIVER FLOOD CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize improvements on the Big Sioux River in South Dakota and Iowa in the interests of flood control and allied purposes.

The Big Sioux River, Mr. President, forms the common boundary between South Dakota and Iowa and enters the Missouri River near Sioux City, Iowa. For many years flooding on this river has resulted in hundreds of thousands of dollars crop loss to some of the richest agricultural lands in the Nation on both sides of the river.

Recently, the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army has recommended the submission of this project for the consideration of the Congress. His report is in response to a resolution adopted July 29, 1955, by the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives. The report recommends channel improvements and straightening, with a proposal for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, acceptable to the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Commission and the field offices of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of the bill and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie on the table for 5 days so that other Members from the area effected who wish to cosponsor the bill may have the opportunity to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 2508) to authorize certain improvements on the Big Sioux River, Iowa and South Dakota, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the

Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the project for flood control and allied purposes on the Big Sioux River, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 7, 1964, at an estimated cost of \$6,400,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the principle of independent judicial review of personal claims is well established in our legal system. To give finality to the decision of an administrative agency precludes an independent evaluation. It has been brought to my attention that judicial review is not afforded in the case of veterans claims. The final arbiter of these claims is a board of appeals made up of members of long experience in the Veterans' Administration. I do not question the integrity or public devotion of these individuals. However, men schooled in the regional offices of the agency, no matter how they may try, are bound to bring with them the bias of their experiences. The cases, therefore, are merely being decided by Veterans' Administration boards sitting in another town.

The creation of a Court of Veterans Appeals will afford the veteran appeal rights to an independent body. It will assure him equity and justice and an impartial review of the legal aspects of his claim. It will create a right deemed indispensable to a fair, just system of adjudicating claims.

Today, Mr. President, to assure veterans the right of judicial review, I introduce for the consideration of Congress a bill for a Court of Veterans Appeals to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business on Friday, February 28, to enable the other Senators to join in its sponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 2509) to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 71 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 72—COURT OF VETERANS' APPEALS

"Subchapter I—Establishment and Jurisdiction

"Sec.
"4051. Establishment of Court of Veterans' Appeals.

"4052. Provisions relating to judges.

"4053. Jurisdiction of the court.

"4054. Review by the court.

"4055. Attorneys and agents.

"4056. New and material evidence.

"Subchapter II—Procedure and Administration

"Sec.

"4061. Clerk.

"4062. Commissioners.

"4063. Stenographers; clerical employees; bailiff.

"4064. Fees; charge for court's opinions.

"Subchapter I—Establishment and Jurisdiction

"§ 4051. Establishment of Court of Veterans' Appeals

"(a) There is hereby established the Court of Veterans' Appeals (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'court'), which shall consist of five judges through December 31, 1969, and thereafter shall consist of three judges, who shall be appointed from civil life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate from time to time one of the judges to act as chief judge.

"(b) The court shall hold at the seat of government an annual term at a time to be fixed by rule of court.

"(c) The court may prescribe its own rules of procedure and determine the number of judges required to constitute a quorum. A vacancy in the court shall not impair the right of the remaining judges to exercise the powers of the court.

"(d) If a judge of the court is temporarily unable to perform his duties because of illness or other disability, the President may designate a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to fill the office for the period of disability.

"(e) The Administrator shall provide such necessary administrative support and services as the court may request. The Administrator shall cooperate with the court, and make available to the court such of the records and files of the Veterans' Administration as the court requests in any case.

"§ 4052. Provisions relating to judges

"(a) Each judge of the court shall be entitled to salary at the rate prescribed for the judges of the Court of Claims, and shall be eligible for reappointment.

"(b) No person may be appointed as a judge of the court unless he is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, and has engaged in the active practice of law for seven or more years. No person may be appointed as a judge of the court who within the two-year period preceding his appointment has been a civilian officer or employee of the United States serving in the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, or the General Accounting Office.

"(c) The terms of office of the five judges first taking office after the date of enactment of this section shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, three on December 31, 1969, one on December 31, 1971, and one on December 31, 1974. The terms of office of all successors shall expire ten years after the expiration of the terms for which their predecessors were appointed, but any judge appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed may be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor.

"(d) Judges of the court may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office or for mental or physical disability, but for no other cause.

"(e) While traveling on official business and away from the District of Columbia each judge of the court shall receive all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in sections 835-842 of title 5, upon his certificate to the Administrator.

"§ 4053. Jurisdiction of the court

"(a) The court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review by appeal all questions involved in decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Board') involving claims under chapter 11 or 13 of this title which bear directly on the question of whether or not (1) a disability or death is service-connected, or (2) a widow, child, or parent is entitled to benefits under such chapter 11 or 13.

"(b) Except as provided in section 4056 of this title, all decisions of the court shall be final and no decision of the court shall be subject to review by any official or court of the United States.

"(c) (1) The court, or any judge or commissioner thereof when authorized by the court, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and require, by subpoena, the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents, from any place in the United States at any designated place. Witnesses shall receive the same fees and mileage as witnesses in the case of proceedings before the Court of Claims or commissioners thereof.

"(2) In case of disobedience to any such subpoena, the aid of any district court of the United States may be invoked in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and such district court within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any officer, agent, or employee of any corporation or to any other person, issue an order requiring such corporation or other person to appear or to give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the district court may be punished by such district court as a contempt thereof.

"§ 4054. Review by the court

"(a) Any claimant aggrieved by a decision of the Board involving a claim for benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of this title may, within one year from the date of mailing of notice of such decision, or the date of enactment of this section, whichever is later, apply to the court for a review of any issue of fact or law involved in such decision which bears directly on the question of whether or not (1) a disability or death is service-connected, or (2) a widow, child, or parent is entitled to benefits under such chapter 11 or 13. Such application shall be made by filing in the office of the clerk of the court a concise statement of the errors of law and fact complained of. A copy of such statement shall be transmitted by the clerk to the Administrator.

"(b) The court may decline to review any decision of the Board if it appears that no material error of fact or law is involved in such decision which bears directly on the question of whether or not (1) a disability or death is service-connected, or (2) a widow, child, or parent is entitled to benefits under such chapter 11 or 13.

"(c) (1) Within thirty days after a copy of the statement of errors of law and errors of fact has been furnished the Administrator, he shall file with the court an answer, directed to the allegations of errors of law or fact contained in the statement. A copy of the answer filed by the Administrator shall be promptly furnished to the claimant or to his representative.

"(2) If the Administrator determines that his position with respect to the issues involved in the appeal is adverse to that of the claimant, he shall designate counsel for such appeal to present the Administrator's position to the court, or before a commissioner, as the case may be.

"(d) (1) After the answer of the Administrator has been received by the claimant or his representative, if the only matter in issue, as agreed by the Administrator and the claimant, is a question of law, the case shall be heard by the court, on briefs and such argument as the court may deem advisable. In all other cases, the case shall be referred by the court to a commissioner for a hearing on the matters in issue, as presented by the statement of errors of law and fact filed by the claimant and the answer filed by the Administrator. A hearing before a commissioner shall, if the claimant or his representative so requests, be held at the regional office of the Veterans' Administration having original jurisdiction of the claimant's claim, and for good cause shown, the testimony of any witness may be taken at any other place.

"(2) A claimant may specifically request a hearing before a commissioner on any question involving an issue of fact in connection with an appeal to the court, specifying the witnesses whom he proposes to call to testify with respect to such issue and setting forth the facts which he proposes to establish through such witnesses. Except where subsection (b) of this section applies, the court shall grant such a request.

"(e) In hearings before a commissioner, evidence may be introduced, and witnesses examined, only on matters which are material to the matters in issue in the case. The admissibility of evidence, and its weight and probative value shall be determined in accordance with rules prescribed by the court. Such rules shall permit the introduction of the best nonprivileged evidence available that tends to prove or disprove any material issue, without regard to formal requirements. After the completion of testimony and argument before the commissioner in any case, the commissioner shall file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to the case. A copy of such proposed findings and conclusions shall be furnished to the claimant and to the Administrator.

"(f) Unless an exception is taken by the claimant or the Administrator to any proposed finding of fact or conclusion of law by a commissioner within fifteen days after a copy of the proposed findings and conclusions has been furnished the claimant or Administrator, as the case may be, such finding or conclusion shall become the final decision of the court.

"(g) An exception may be taken by a claimant or the Administrator to any proposed finding of fact or conclusion of law filed by a commissioner by filing with the court a petition for review of such finding or conclusion, specifying the alleged errors in respect thereto. The court shall review such proposed finding of fact or conclusion of law, permitting briefs and oral arguments to the extent deemed by the court to be necessary. After completion of such review, the court shall render a decision on the case, or may return the case to the commissioner to take new or additional evidence and to render proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law after taking such new or additional evidence. Further proceedings in such case shall be in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) and this subsection, in the same manner as in the case of the original proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

"(h) Decisions of the court may include such orders as the court finds to be required in the case. Findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in any decision of the

court shall, except as provided in section 4056 of this title, be binding thereafter upon the claimant and the Administrator in the consideration of the case.

"(i) After the decision of the court has been rendered in any case, the Administrator shall reconsider the case, in the light of the decision of the court, and make such revisions in the decision of the Administrator appealed from as are required.

"§ 4055. Attorneys and agents

"(a) The court, as a part of each decision entered, shall determine and allow reasonable fees for the attorney or attorneys of the claimant or claimants, and apportion same, if proper. The court may also approve reasonable attorney's fees in cases where, after decision has been rendered by the Board adverse to a claimant, an attorney has rendered services to a claimant in connection with an appeal to the court which lead to reversal or modification of the decision of the Board, whether or not an appeal is actually filed with the court in such case.

"(b) The court may prescribe qualifications of persons who may represent claimants in proceedings before the court and the commissioners.

"§ 4056. New and material evidence

"No fact found in a decision of the court may be reconsidered except where new and material evidence is produced after the decision of the court is rendered which was not available or discovered until after such decision was rendered.

"Subchapter II—Procedure and administration

"§ 4061. Clerk

"(a) The court may appoint a clerk and an assistant clerk, each of whom shall be subject to removal by the court. The court shall report any such removal and the cause thereof to Congress as soon as possible.

"(b) The clerk shall pay into the Treasury all fees, costs, and other moneys collected by him.

"(c) On the first day of every regular session of Congress, the clerk shall have published a full and complete statement of all the judgments rendered by the court during the previous year, showing the dates and amounts thereof and the parties in whose favor they were rendered, together with a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims upon which they were rendered, and a statement of the costs taxed in each case.

"§ 4062. Commissioners

"(a) The court may appoint not more than ten commissioners on a full-time basis, who shall be subject to removal by the court. The court may also procure, on a temporary or intermittent basis, the service of individuals as commissioners, in accordance with section 55a of title 5. The commissioners shall perform such duties as the court may prescribe, including, but not limited to, conducting hearings, receiving evidence, taking depositions, qualifying witnesses, and making such reports as the court may prescribe.

"(b) The compensation of each full-time commissioner shall be fixed by the court, but shall not exceed the maximum rate prescribed in the compensation schedule for the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. Each commissioner shall receive all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in sections 835-842 of title 5 while traveling on official business and away from his home.

"(c) No person may be appointed as a commissioner unless he is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, and has engaged in the active practice of law for five or more years. No person may be appointed as a commissioner who within the two-year period preceding his appointment has been a civilian officer or employee of the United States serving in the Veteran's Administration, the De-

partment of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, or the General Accounting Office.

"§ 4063. Stenographers; clerical employees; bailiff

"(a) The court shall appoint stenographers and other clerical employees in such numbers as may be necessary, each of whom shall be subject to removal by the court.

"(b) The court may appoint a bailiff and a messenger who shall be subject to removal by the court. The bailiff shall attend the court, preserve order, and perform such other necessary duties as the court directs.

"§ 4064. Fees; charge for court's opinions

"(a) The court may by rule impose a fee not exceeding \$10 for the filing of any appeal.

"(b) The clerk of the court may collect for each certified copy of the court's opinion a fee in such amount as the court may determine."

Sec. 2. (a) The title and table of chapters of part V of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"PART V—BOARDS, COURT OF VETERANS' APPEALS AND DEPARTMENTS

Chapter	Sec.
"71. Board of Veterans' Appeals.....	4001
"72. Court of Veterans' Appeals.....	4051
"73. Department of Medicine and Surgery.....	4101
"75. Veterans' Canteen Service.....	4201"

(b) The table of parts and chapters at the beginning of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out	
"V. BOARDS AND DEPARTMENTS.....	4001"
and inserting in lieu thereof	

"V. BOARDS, COURT OF VETERANS' APPEALS, AND DEPARTMENTS.....	4001";
--	--------

(2) By striking out	
"PART V—BOARDS AND DEPARTMENTS"	
and inserting in lieu thereof	

"PART V—BOARDS, COURT OF VETERANS' APPEALS, AND DEPARTMENTS";	
and	

(3) By inserting immediately below	
"71. Board of Veterans' Appeals.....	4001"
the following:	

"72. Court of Veterans' Appeals.....	4051".
--------------------------------------	--------

Sec. 3 (a) Section 3405 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "4055," immediately after "3404".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Final" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in chapter 72 of this title, final".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section 4004 is amended (1) by striking out "Administrator, and" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator," and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and the precedent opinions of the Court of Veterans' Appeals".

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 245 OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 to permit the adjustment of status of refugees resident in the United States, who are natives of countries contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent islands, including Cuba.

The bill eliminates the technical requirement of our immigration laws which requires such aliens to leave this country and reenter, in order to become eligible for permanent residence. I do not question this requirement for aliens

who have come here through normal procedure and in casual circumstances, and then elect to apply for permanent residence. The requirement, however, would seem to have little justification in the case of refugees from the Communist regime in Cuba. Certainly, their entry into this country was anything but normal and casual—they were under duress and fleeing oppression.

Moreover, the requirement inhibits the rather substantial Federal program of assistance administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with several voluntary agencies, religious bodies, and civic organizations. As Senators know, the purpose and content of this program is to render effective asylum by providing our Cuban guests with opportunities for self-support, chiefly through resettlement.

Mr. President, the talents of many Cuban refugees are going to waste because State professional licensing laws keep those without permanent status from practicing their skills or professions. This situation, and the expensive and laborious procedure to obtain this status under present law, is keeping many Cubans on relief rolls and in various difficult circumstances. I am thinking, for example, of the Cuban lady in Kinde, Mich., a doctor of philosophy; or another in Holland, Mich., a former teacher of English in Cuba—both of whom have been unable to teach Spanish in the local public schools because of their immigration status. But these refugees are qualified. They could fill an urgent need.

These two examples are multiplied throughout the country in every State and especially on the welfare rolls of the Cuban Refugee Center in Miami.

The bulk of the Cubans are highly skilled and educated persons—professional, technical, and managerial workers, office personnel, and skilled workers. I firmly believe this reservoir of talent should be tapped to the fullest extent—in the interest of the individual Cuban, for the development of our society. We can then anticipate a decreasing Federal expenditure in the program of assistance, and a progressive solution to the problem of refugees from Cuba. The bill I offer today would help accomplish this objective.

I am hopeful, also, that this bill would encourage the resettlement of Cubans to other countries of this hemisphere. The refugee talent should also be tapped for the economic, social and political development of the Western Hemisphere. And certainly, we could find no more effective spokesmen to describe the destruction of freedom under Castro's brand of communism than the Cubans who have fled their homeland.

Today, however, refugees are hesitant to leave the United States. Under their present immigration status they are not assured of reentry, if for valid reasons they choose to return. The proposed bill would help remedy the situation.

The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has conducted extensive hearings on the Cuban refugee problem. On the basis of these hearings

and additional study, I believe the passage of this bill would have immediately beneficial effects for all concerned.

Mr. President, I should emphasize that the bill in no way places a stamp of finality on communism in Cuba. It is merely intended to render more effective asylum to Cuban refugees while they remain the guests of America.

The proposed bill is permissive rather than mandatory. It does not automatically blanket all Cuban refugees in this country with an adjustment of status. We do not want to force anybody to accept permanent residence. The bill is a limited measure to encourage self-support through resettlement, by affording an opportunity for adjustment of status to those refugees who need or desire it to ply their skills and talents. The usual screening process, of course, would apply to such refugees.

Public Law 85-559, enacted in 1958 for Hungarian refugees, is somewhat of a precedent for the bill I offer today. I hope sincerely the Senate will act promptly on this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2510) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Washington is a beautiful city. This is something no one can deny.

But we also cannot deny that the city is overloaded with memorials and is becoming more so. There seems to be no end to the memorials proposed.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would set up a Commission of 12 members to develop a permanent memorial to all past Presidents in Washington. Four each would be named by the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the President of the United States.

This Commission would, I believe, serve to develop plans for a memorial appropriate to all those who have served with distinction as Chief Executive and would obviate the need for Congress to consider seemingly endless requests for memorials, each to an individual past President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 154) to establish a Commission to formulate plans for a permanent memorial to past Presidents of the United States, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CONSTRUCTION OF ALASKAN HIGHWAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR—S. 2417

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next time the bill (S. 2417) to authorize the appro-

priation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway is printed it carry the name of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Howard E. Haugerud, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AND MEANS FOR FILLING A VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming public hearings on Presidential disability and means for filling the vacancy of the office of the Vice President. The hearings shall be held in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m., February 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, if necessary, 1964.

Persons interested in this matter should communicate with the subcommittee prior to February 21.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, appointed during last recess of the Senate;

John Morgan Davis, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, appointed during last recess of the Senate; and

Thomas J. Kenney, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney, district of Maryland, for a term of 4 years, vice Joseph D. Tydings, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, February 24, 1964, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON H.R. 8190

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee

on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled a public hearing on H.R. 8190, a bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office. The hearing will commence on Thursday, February 27, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the Office of the Subcommittee, Room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121 or Government code 180, extension 2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 17, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

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

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PELL:

Address delivered by Hon. FERNAND ST GERMAIN, Member of Congress from the First District of Rhode Island, at the annual awards dinner, Thundermist District, Boy Scouts of America, February 8, 1964, Woonsocket, R.I.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, February 16 of each year people of Lithuanian extraction throughout the world pray that all people behind the Iron Curtain be given the right of self-determination and to live as freemen. Their hopes and prayers go to the free world to aid them in this dedicated cause.

Mr. President, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 54 on July 25, 1963, in which the Senate and the House of Representatives were asked to resolve:

That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States Republics into the Soviet Union, and a resolution declaring that—(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States; (b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and (c) the United Nations should conduct free elections in the Baltic States under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

Mr. President, no action has been taken by the Committee on Foreign Re-

lations on this matter and similar resolutions that have been introduced by our colleagues. Every effort should be made by the Congress of the United States to give hope, faith, and encouragement to the people behind the Iron Curtain who once were proud and free people and are now forced to serve under the yoke of a communistic form of government against their will.

Mr. President, I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee should go even further, under my Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, and enlarge the resolution to include bringing before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of all nations that are now within the orbit of the Soviet Union against their free will. Many of my colleagues in both Houses have spoken on the great issue of liberating these people, but I believe we should generate these words into an effective resolution passed by the Congress of the United States. Only then will the Lithuanians, on February 16, and all other peoples of former free nations who are now behind the Iron Curtain, truly commemorate their respective independence days.

Mr. President, it would be well at this point to reemphasize the various peoples who are in Europe behind the Soviet Iron Curtain: Ukrainians, Turkestanians, Byelorussians, Azerbaijanians, Armenians, Albanians, Georgians, Macedonians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavians, Czechoslovakians, Rumanians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, North Epirotians, Hungarians, and Polish.

Mr. President, I think it is an anniversary well to be remembered when we stop to consider the fortitude of the Baltic people, and the tenacity with which they have clung to the ideal of freedom. I think the day should be remembered. While the statement I make comes a little belatedly, I still wish to salute the fortitude, the stamina, and the fidelity to freedom of the Baltic people, who are still numbered among the captive groups.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, February 16, was the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

We in America proudly remember our own Independence Day as affirming the natural right of individual liberty and formally establishing our sovereign Nation.

February 16 is of similar importance to the people of Lithuania, but for somewhat different reasons.

We are a great country, in size, wealth, and power, and we enjoy the many fruits of a generous land. Living among us are 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, many of whom have narrowly escaped the tragic events in a freedom-loving country to which fate has not been kind.

It is difficult for most of us to understand what it would be like to have lived for years in the shadow of two great, powerful, hostile nations.

It is difficult for us to comprehend the agony of being alternately squeezed, crushed, overrun, annexed, and absorbed by one or both of these great powers.

The people of Lithuania understand this, for, in brief, it is the history of their small nation.

Yet in these heroic men and women, the desire for liberty and the will to freedom and independence have survived despite every effort to crush and smother them.

For this reason, the day in 1918 when Lithuania was declared an independent state is remembered, both as the beginning of a brief and joyful respite from foreign domination, and as a symbol of the hope for regaining this freedom.

Located between Russia and Germany, the nations of the Baltic area have suffered throughout history and have been the victims of every conceivable atrocity.

From 1795 until World War I, Lithuania was held under the power of czarist Russia. All through this period, Lithuanians resisted the intensive programs of forced "Russification," and retained their proud and distinctive national identity.

During the First World War, the country was overrun from two sides and was almost completely ravished by both the Russian and the German Armies.

With the defeat of the Germans and the chaos of the Bolshevik revolution, however, a light began to dawn for the long-oppressed Lithuanian people.

As the old order was collapsing in 1917, the German Government, under extreme pressure, authorized a meeting of a Lithuanian National Congress. This congress soon proposed the establishment of an independent Lithuanian state based on ethnographic frontiers.

On February 16, 1918, this independent nation was declared, and a democratic government was set up.

When the German troops were withdrawn, however, the Russians moved into their place without hesitation, and forcibly installed a Communist regime. The Lithuanians fought courageously against the foreign aggressors, and with the support of Polish troops were finally able to drive the Red army out in 1920.

Negotiations between the Lithuanians and the new Russian Bolshevik Government appeared to reach an understanding, but it was only the beginning of a newer and even more deadly type of treachery.

In 1920, a peace settlement was reached with the Russians, which again recognized an independent Lithuanian state, set the borders between the new nation and Poland and Germany, and renounced all Russian claim to this area.

The next year, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, taking her rightful place among the community of independent states and fully enjoying the democratic freedoms of her new Constitution.

Vigorous activity followed, and this prosperous period of independence was marked by land reforms, great strides in agriculture, and a flourishing of the arts and of free expression.

This freedom from foreign rule, from oppression and subjugation was all too short lived. World War II again brought Lithuania's two powerful and hostile

neighbors pressing down upon her. Despite earlier pledges by the Soviets to respect her sovereign status and the signing of a formal nonaggression pact, the unholy alliance between Hitler and Stalin struck Lithuania to her knees.

Facing insurmountable odds, Lithuania was forced to set up a government friendly to the Soviets, to grant them airbases on her soil, and finally to admit the Red army within her borders.

After the type of sham election which has since become a familiar technique of the Soviets, Lithuania in August of 1940 was declared a constitutional republic of the U.S.S.R.

Mass executions, deportations, and brutal killings followed, as the Soviets moved to wipe out all opposing voices. The Iron Curtain was rung down between Lithuania and the free world, and thus came the tragic death of Lithuanian independence.

This pattern of events is a familiar phenomenon to us now. It is quite typical, in method and brutality, of the Soviet takeover of eastern and central European countries in the 1940's.

Yet the experience of Lithuania is a particularly meaningful example for us, and serves to point up so vividly the conflict between two irreconcilable ideologies and our moral commitment to continually labor for the freedom of all the captive nations.

The people of Lithuania are courageous believers in individual liberty, and have historically resisted foreign oppression and all attempts to smother Lithuania's rich heritage and deeply rooted national consciousness.

Its people have strongly opposed the atheistic programs designed to obliterate all religious beliefs and practices and replace these with the religion of communism.

Today we know little about the true conditions in this country, because a great propaganda facade has been erected to prevent us from seeing Soviet failures in these very areas.

The United States has maintained relations with the independent Lithuanian Government representatives and has refused to recognize the Communist puppet regime. This in itself is an indication of our refusal to accept the status quo.

We must never accept the situation as it exists today. We must constantly reaffirm our dedication to an independent Lithuania and to freedom for all the captive nations, as we have done on this 46th anniversary of that memorable and joyous day in 1918.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, 1964, is a Sabbath that seems just a little holier to millions of Americans who look to Lithuania as their motherland. It marked the 46th anniversary of its national freedom.

So it is the hour again for us to pay our February tribute to that brave land—and we speak no less in tribute to the millions of Lithuania's sons and daughters who are our valued American neighbors and fellow citizens.

It is our hour of appreciation to them for the contribution that their character and courage make to our American scene. And it is an hour of inspiration as the student of history dwells on the

perseverance of Lithuania, a country that refuses to stay conquered.

Yet it is an hour of frustration to all freedom-loving people that brave little Lithuania should be deprived of her earned right of self-determination—the written promise of greater nations that she should be a nation sovereign and free.

Through a thousand years of recorded history Lithuania has played her heroic part. Of old, it was a powerful independent state of Europe. They checked the Germans in their age-old drive to the east. They kept the Mongols and the Tartars out of Europe.

They helped through those centuries to fashion the character of European civilization with a spirit of liberty, education and toleration not surpassed in our time.

Then the shadow of Moscow fell across Lithuania—and its freedom. Revolt followed revolt—and each time the heavy Russian hand sought the harder to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture. But through it all the Lithuanians stayed faithful to their religion, their language, their traditions. Amid all their trials, their fidelity to language and religion were the great factors in maintaining the national identity of the Lithuanians.

As a Lithuanian writer put into words: "Let the warriors use their swords. We, brothers, will go forth into the wide world—on narrow paths—on broad boulevards—we will go from border to border wherever Lithuanians live—and we will proclaim one sun in the sky—one fatherland on earth—one ruler for all the land in which the holy language of our fathers is heard."

When the changing fortunes of the First World War saw first the Russians retreat—and then the Germans to fall back—Lithuania rose above all her tribulations on February 16, 1918, to proclaim herself an independent state, based on democratic principles.

Between the two World Wars, the ancient character of Lithuania showed again in a new triumph of learning, culture, the arts, agriculture and religion.

But again Lithuania became a pawn in the wars of Germany and Russia. She was victimized by both—and with the final peace, Lithuania returned—not to independence—but to Soviet domination.

All the studied cruelties of communism have been practiced upon her. The sovereignty that the United States recognized in 1922 has been torn from Lithuania. But America has never recognized that rape of Russia—and we never will.

We echo the words of our Lithuanian friends as they solemnly vow that they will continue fiercely resisting the alien rule of the Soviet Union—that they have not accepted Soviet slavery—and never will.

So we say we feel frustration because the path to true freedom is still dark. There is warning in the Lithuanian experience for any people who will not fight but will flirt with the blandishments of godless communism.

But we cannot fail to draw inspiration from the unquenchable courage of the

Lithuanians—to believe with them and to work with them so that the hour of slavery may not last forever—and the time will come when little Lithuania will join us in the assembly of the free nations of the world.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today the Lithuanian people and those of Lithuanian descent in the United States are observing their independence day. Yesterday, Sunday, February 16, 1964, was the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania.

Since June 1940, Lithuania has been suffering in Soviet captivity. However, our country still recognizes the Lithuanian Republic. Furthermore, we maintain the Lithuanian legation here in Washington, D.C.

Approximately one-third of all Lithuanians now live outside their captive country. The largest Lithuanian community, of over 1 million population, is in the United States. They are fine people, very appreciative for their haven here.

It seems to me that if we can demand freedom from Portugal for Angola, and full freedom for the people throughout Africa, we should do the same thing for Lithuania, now under the heel of the Communists.

Lithuanian people have remained true in spirit to the West. They look forward to their liberation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several times a year the Congress pauses in its hectic pace to commemorate the anniversaries of the nations held captive by the Soviet Union. This is always a sad event. The strong affinity which developed between the struggling little nations of East Europe and the United States in former, happier days still exists. Millions of Americans trace their ancestral homes to Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, all victims of Soviet imperialism. For these reasons the unfortunate condition of these nations today draws the utmost American attention and sympathy.

On February 16, we honor Lithuania, a nation which is especially close to Americans by reason of its history, and the large number of productive, democratic, American citizens of Lithuanian ancestry.

The Lithuanians have always been energetic, proud people. They were among the first in Eastern Europe to unite behind a national government. In 1450 Lithuanian kings ruled an area as large as modern Germany and France combined. Lithuania was a Christian nation, very cultured, and tied to the Western European tradition just as are we ourselves. It was about this time, 1450, that the principality of Moscow began to expand and to threaten Lithuania. Before long Moscow became the prime oppressor and enemy of the Lithuanian people. For 120 miserable years Lithuania was ruled by the despotic czars. Five times during those years Lithuanians revolted, showing admirable courage, and proving their desire for freedom.

They never lost their sense of national unity despite the Russians' attempts to remake Lithuania in their own image.

The end of the czarist regime during World War I freed Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, 46 years ago today, a National Council declared Lithuania an independent nation.

The Russian Bolsheviks proved their intention to continue czarist imperialism by attacking Lithuania as soon as possible after the Russian revolution. Their attempt to conquer Lithuania presented the world with one of the first examples of the Communist political tactics which have since become infamous. First, impossible demands were made upon the victim country, Lithuania; then, a puppet, Communist government in exile was recognized; then, the Soviet government pledged every possible aid to the puppet government; and finally, Soviet troops openly invaded the country, trailing chaos, murders, and mass executions behind them.

The Lithuanians gathered every resource behind their national army and thoroughly defeated the Russians. In July 1920, the Communist government in Moscow signed a treaty renouncing forever any claims to sovereignty over Lithuania. On September 28, 1926, this treaty was supplemented by a nonaggression pact between Lithuania and Soviet Russia. This also has become a stale Communist tactic intended to allay the suspicions of an intended victim.

Needless to say, both of these treaties were broken by the Soviets in 1939 when they once again followed the same routine they had 20 years before. The Lithuanians still were not interested in submitting to Russian control, but the Red army overpowered them in a mass invasion.

The subsequent story of terror, suppression, and rampant imperialism is well-known to the whole world. The Soviet Union has made every effort to obliterate Lithuanian identity, and to lower Lithuania to the status of a vassal nation. It has not been completely successful, thanks to the extremely brave Lithuanian people, who have carried on their struggle alone in the dark, nearly ignored by the world.

On the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuania itself is not able to rejoice. But there is hope in the continued resistance to Communist exploitation. There is still a proud, and accomplished Lithuanian people beneath the Communist superstructure. The hopes of every American, whether from Lithuania or elsewhere, whether in the city or the country, in the East or the West, are with Lithuania today. We hope that in the future Lithuania will be free again, and that on February 16, there will be happy independence celebrations throughout Lithuania.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, aside from the hope expressed in this body today, the 46th observance of Lithuania's short-lived independence has passed almost unnoticed. Certainly, the enslaved people of that hapless land had little cause or opportunity to observe the event with a celebration of the type which usually marks such occasions in nations where freedom prevails.

A Baltic province of Russia throughout most of its history, Lithuania gained its independence and established a re-

publican form of government in 1918. Just 22 years later, with war raging throughout the world, the tiny Baltic nation was occupied by Nazi and Polish troops, then was again incorporated into the Soviet Union as a slave state.

As a result of the war which brought Communist slavery to Lithuania and so many other formerly free nations, the great powers of the world met in San Francisco in 1945 to found an organization dedicated to the principle of self-determination for all people. Ironically, the Soviet Union, which has taken self-determination from more people than any nation in history, was given greater power within the new world organization than any other member-nation, obtaining three general assembly votes to one each for the free nations. In subsequent years, the United Nations has waged a vigorous campaign against one kind of colonialism, but has religiously refrained from interfering with or criticizing the type which now holds the Lithuanian people in bondage. Indeed, Mr. President, the Secretary General of this organization has vigorously campaigned for these ends. He now is publicly urging the admission of Communist China to the world body, despite Charter prohibitions against membership of nations which are not "peace loving" and the absence of any directive or even implied instruction from the United Nations for him to do so.

Only our own historic dedication to the principle of universal freedom prompted this Nation to take a leading role in the founding of the United Nations and to provide it with the bulk of its financial support since.

It was because of this same dedication that the Congress of the United States, just 6 years ago, overwhelmingly adopted the so-called captive nations resolution, directing the President of the United States, during the second week of July each year to issue a proclamation calling for the liberation of all enslaved peoples. During his last 2 years in office, President Dwight Eisenhower religiously observed this will of Congress, listing by name Lithuania and all the other formerly free states now enslaved by international communism and calling for their independence. Beginning in 1961, however, admittedly for fear of offending Soviet Russia, the present administration has refused to specify that Lithuania and the other Soviet colonies are among those nations whose people we wish to see free.

If these annual observances of Lithuanian Independence Day are to become anything more than occasions of mourning a freedom which can never be reborn, Mr. President, we must, as the representative voice of a nation whose freedom was born in a struggle against foreign oppression, exercise what power we have within the United Nations to guarantee that the charter provisions for self-determination are, indeed, applied to all peoples, particularly the Lithuanians and others who today are held in Communist bondage.

It also is to be hoped that the President of the United States will, in issuing the Captive Nations Week proclamation

this year, revert to the practice followed by President Eisenhower and specify this Nation's desire for Lithuanian independence instead of bowing again to the petulant indignation of the Soviet hierarchy.

Lithuania and the rest of the world can again be free, Mr. President, but not if this and the other free nations of the world abandon, with a simple expression of condolence, such captive peoples to perpetual enslavement.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the spark of freedom no longer glows in Lithuania. It was stamped out many years ago by the heavy boot of Russian communism.

Yet in the hearts of 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, national pride still burns brightly. This was evident Sunday as Lithuanian Independence Day was observed across our Nation.

The tiny Baltic state declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after more than a century of Russian domination. But its freedom was short lived. The Russians restored their tyrannic rule in 1940 and the Lithuanian people, who had reached out so eagerly for liberty, saw it torn violently from their hands.

The United States recognized an independent Lithuania in 1922 but we have not recognized—nor will we in the future—the absorption of that valiant nation by the U.S.S.R. We prefer to work toward the day when, once again, Lithuania will be free of foreign domination, free to determine its own course in world affairs.

The prayer with which the Senate began its deliberations today was offered by the Reverend Joseph Matutis, a Lithuanian and a Connecticut neighbor of mine from New Haven. I am extremely pleased he is with us as we note the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This solemn occasion sobers our thoughts and reinforces our resolve to extend the blessings and bounty of democracy throughout the world, especially to those peoples—like the Lithuanians—who yearn for liberty but are denied it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, particularly at this time of the year, I am saddened to think about the plight of Lithuania, the 46th anniversary of whose too short-lived independence occurred on Sunday, February 16.

As always, I am moved and inspired by the feelings of Americans of Lithuanian origin and by their dedication to the independence of Lithuania, where a large number of them still have relatives. Uppermost in the hearts of Americans of Lithuanian extraction is the liberation of their ancestral homeland from Soviet rule. As I have written to many friends of Lithuania in my State, I would support any feasible policy to help restore the independence of the Baltic countries, and others under foreign domination, short of plunging the world into war over the issue.

The brave little country of Lithuania was free for 22 years following World War I, prior to its being taken over by the Nazis and subsequently by Soviet Russia. During its period of independence, it flourished as a peaceful and freedom-loving nation. The restoration of

its independence is important, not only to Lithuanians under Soviet rule, and to people of Lithuanian origin wherever they are located, but also to all who cherish liberty throughout the world.

Surely, this desire for Lithuanian independence which burns so strongly in so many hearts will not forever be denied. Surely, we may yet look forward to a world more just and equitable, in which this fervent hope will be fulfilled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* the text of a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Ladies' Club of Newark, N.J., on February 5, 1964, commemorating the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1918 until June 1940, when the Soviet Union by subversion and force invaded and occupied the country, and still rules and oppresses the Lithuanian nation to this day; and

Whereas the Government of the United States strongly denounced the unlawful Soviet seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, and rightly does not recognize the illegal annexation and Moscow-imposed rule of these countries; and

Whereas the Soviet Union keeps seeking ways and means, direct and indirect, to gain recognition of its illegal colonialism in the Baltic States, for this purpose recently offering a nonaggression treaty between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact bloc, and an agreement to settle all boundary disputes without the use of armed force: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government to be wary of entering into any agreement with the Soviet Union which would imply the recognition of Soviet rule in the presently captive states, freeze the present boundaries and territory designations, and/or preclude the possibility for the Lithuanians and other captive peoples to use whatever means would be necessary and available at an opportune moment in order to rid themselves of the onerous Soviet yoke and regain their freedom and independence; be it

Resolved, To urge our Senators and the Members of Congress from our districts to support the introduction by the United States of the case of the Baltic States and other Soviet-enclaved nations before the appropriate body of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; and copies thereof to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Senators from our State; the Congressmen from our district; local press.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we as Americans have an abiding interest in the progress of the world toward freedom. We have a great heritage in peace and liberty and we know that its rewards are neither readily won nor easily preserved. Our democracy has been an example to the world for 190 years, and we are proud to share our heritage with peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

But not all people who cherish peace and liberty are fortunate enough to enjoy its fruits within their own national borders. And so the marking of Lithuanian Independence Day, on February 16, is of particular significance.

This day in 1918 brought a new and cherished freedom to the sorely oppressed people of Lithuania. They had fought for 150 years with conviction and determination to rise up from beneath the cruel and absolute rule of the czars. Despite great suffering and repeated setbacks, they had never lost sight of their noble heritage in peace and liberty, they had kept alive their love of freedom. And 46 years ago, as a result of World War I and the collapse of czarist Russia which it occasioned, the tenacious quest of the Lithuanian people for liberty was fulfilled, the banner of freedom unfurled and Lithuania adopted its declaration of independence.

For 20 years Lithuania once again enjoyed the bountiful rewards of freedom in their land. Education made great strides, the economy flourished and the Lithuanian Government played a prominent role in international affairs. But the Soviet Union did not welcome this peaceful and prosperous free nation which offered such a startling and convincing contrast to conditions under communism.

In 1940, ignoring treaties and civilized methods, the Communists conquered Lithuania.

Since that time it has been difficult for Americans to get information about Lithuania. But our American citizens of Lithuanian origin have helped us. They have helped us to learn that the people of Lithuania are not happy under communism, that they enjoy little personal freedom, that they cannot worship freely and that they are liable for severe punishment for political beliefs.

Under these circumstances, it is of special importance that Lithuanians and Americans join together in reemphasizing their common heritage and common future in peace and liberty. The marking of Lithuanian Independence Day serves the cause of freedom well, as we honor our American citizens of Lithuanian origin who have made such invaluable contributions to our country. We are proud to join with them in this commemoration, knowing that the light of freedom still lives in the hearts of their friends, relatives, and compatriots who are now suffering under a cruel oppression.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in noting the 46th anniversary of short-lived Lithuanian independence.

It was on February 16, 1918, that a 20-member national council under the leadership of Antanas Smetona proclaimed Lithuanian independence and set about forming an independent government. This proclamation conceded "special relations" with Germany in return for recognition. A provisional constitution was adopted in October of 1918, vesting governing power in a three-man presidium, with Smetona as provisional president.

Thus began an era of relative stability in the turbulent history of Lithuania, an era which was to be abruptly halted with the advent of World War II. The Lithuanians have been an oppressed people throughout the ages, and their recent history includes bloody

tyranny at the hands of both the Nazis and the Soviets. Mass deportations were suffered during these years, both to Germany and Soviet Russia.

The Lithuanians spring from ancient beginnings. Archaeologists have found evidence that as early as 1500 B.C., people resembling present-day Lithuanians were living near the Baltic Sea and had developed a relatively high state of culture. Other scholars, however, believe Lithuanians migrated to the Baltic area at about the time of Christ. There is a close linguistic tie between Lithuanian and Sanskrit, and certain folklore characteristics, which lend substance to this latter contention.

Whatever their genesis, Mr. President, the Lithuanians have served as political and military pawns for a centuries-long succession of rulers, culminated in the rapacious takeover by Soviet Russia in 1940.

Throughout the centuries, the Lithuanians have kept alive their burning desire for freedom and independence. That desire has not been lessened by oppression but, rather, heightened. Today, Lithuanians the world over still work toward freedom from Soviet shackles for their country and its people, and we must continue to support them in the struggle for this objective.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, marked the 46th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence, which was established at the conclusion of the First World War after Lithuania had undergone more than a century of hardship and domination by foreign rule.

Lithuania's independence lasted only 22 years, until 1940 when the country was seized by the Russians and then invaded and occupied by the forces of Hitler's Germany. Since World War II, Lithuania, under Communist oppression, has suffered once again.

Nevertheless, the desire for freedom and for the fundamental principles of democratic government, remain strong in Lithuania and among its representatives here in the United States and throughout the world. Today I would like to pay my own tribute to their perseverance and to their courage.

The Lithuanian language has been called the oldest living tongue in Europe. The country is traditionally noted for the fertility of its soil, for its great beauty, its forests of pine and birch and fir. Lithuania is famous for its music and the deep roots of its culture. Above all, however, at this special time of anniversary, I would like to honor the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the great people of Lithuania and to the contributions of the Lithuanian community to cities and towns throughout our own Nation.

Sunday marked the 46th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, an act by which the great people of Lithuania demonstrated their dedication to liberty and freedom under a democratic government and in accordance with Western political traditions.

On February 16, 1918, the 20-member Lithuanian Taryba unanimously proclaimed an independent state based on democratic principles. Less than a year was allowed to pass before the bud of freedom was nipped by the advancing Red army. Undaunted by Communist occupation, brave Lithuanian fighting units joined with the Polish Army in driving the oppressor out of their country.

Lithuania's first Constitution was adopted in August 1922. It is a historic document according freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication—freedoms that we in this country all too often take for granted.

Lithuania flourished under independence. A land reform program resulted in Lithuania's becoming a nation of small farmers, just as our own country was for many long years. Business and industry flourished. Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures. The number of schools more than doubled in the 9 years from 1930 to 1939. Lithuanian literature, opera, and music flourished.

In 1939, with the dark clouds of war hovering over the world, Nazi Germany occupied the city of Memel. A rapid sequence of events resulted in the re-occupation of Lithuania by Soviet troops under the guise of "mutual assistance." On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was incorporated as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. While thousands fled from the Stalinist commissars, many more thousands were deported to the wilds of Siberia or executed as the Soviet forces retreated under German attack.

Nor did the Nazis bring the breath of freedom back to the brave and proud people of Lithuania. They proceeded to murder almost all Lithuanian Jews.

In 1944, the Soviet Army reoccupied Lithuania, substituting Nazi rule with Communist rule. Lithuanians were drawn unwillingly behind the Iron Curtain; once again their sovereignty and their freedom were suppressed.

Mr. President, Lithuania is no longer a free and independent nation, but the spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts of this sturdy people. On the occasion of the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, let us reiterate our firm commitment to Lithuanian freedom. Indeed, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and human dignity throughout the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when the Nazi leaders became avaricious enough to invade East Europe, they brought untold misery to millions of human beings, both directly by their own actions, and indirectly, because under the guise of opposing German expansion, the Soviet Union inflicted equal misery on millions of other human beings. The Baltic countries especially have suffered under communism.

We in democratic countries often forget that not everyone enjoys the developed freedoms that we do. We depend on conscientious, nonpolitical police, who respect the right to a fair and speedy trial, to writ of habeas corpus, and to

personal counsel. We have come to accept that we are innocent until proven guilty, that we have the right to assemble and debate freely, and that we cannot be forced to give evidence against ourselves.

But many people do not enjoy such freedom; for example, Lithuanians, whose 46th independence day was yesterday, February 16. In Lithuania no one was allowed to celebrate yesterday. Thus it is fitting we free people express our own acknowledgement of Lithuanian Independence Day, as an example of what freedom is.

Many Americans are of Lithuanian descent. When the Soviet Union so cruelly invaded Lithuania it drove the wisest citizens out of the country, many came to the United States, which they knew as the citadel of freedom. Surely Lithuania's loss of these people has been our gain. Here they have proven how strongly they uphold democracy and how capably they could have developed their own nation, given a fair opportunity. The hopes of freedom-loving Americans of every ancestry are with Lithuanian-Americans and their oppressed homeland today, and every day until Lithuania is free again.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the purpose of this comment today is to call the attention of the free world to a little country which is not free.

Would that we could do more for the people of Lithuania than to note that 46 years ago yesterday they did manage to end 123 years of oppression and to establish a Republic for which they had great love—and great hope.

But that Republic fell in 22 years, and since freedom has been once more only a dream to the Lithuanians.

So—Sunday will not be a joyous, but a sorrowful day in Lithuania.

Let us, at this time, extend to the 3 million residents of that country our sincere compliments on the strength they have shown, our appreciation that they still cling to the desire for freedom, and our hope that soon they may once more enjoy it.

Expressing eloquently the feeling of many fine citizens of Michigan who are of Lithuanian birth or descent is a resolution adopted by the Detroit Organizations Center Rally at a well-attended public meeting in Detroit yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The public meeting, in addition to the serious tone reflected in the resolution, saw a beautiful presentation of songs, dress, and dances traditional with the Lithuanian people. My friends of Lithuanian descent were kind to have me as their guest and I saw a vivid demonstration of the strength which is ours in America because of the rich traditions and faith which liberty loving people have brought to this Nation from overseas. Ours is a stronger Nation because of their presence here. It may be of interest to have printed in Lithuanian at this point in my remarks the program of this meeting and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION, DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS CENTER RALLY, WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, DETROIT, MICH., FEBRUARY 16, 1964

On February 16, 1918, in Vilnius, Lithuania, the Lithuanian Council representing the entire Lithuanian nation announced to the world the reestablishment of Lithuania as an independent nation with Vilnius as its capital.

For almost a quarter of a century from 1918 to 1940 independent Lithuania flourished and progressed and earned the admiration of and status in the family of the free nations of the world.

However, since 1940 Lithuania has been the victim of cruel aggression first by Bolshevik Russia, then by Nazi Germany from 1941 to 1944 and since that time the Communist colonialization of Soviet Russia.

The Lithuanian people in enslaved Lithuania and throughout the world yearn for freedom and liberty and an independent Lithuania. The emergence of the new free nations during the current era gives rise to the hope that Lithuania will soon regain its freedom. Those living in freedom cannot long deny it to others.

The hopes of the Lithuanian people are further strengthened by the knowledge that the leader of the free world, the United States of America consistently refuses to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and recognizes her as an independent nation with the rights of self-determination.

We, the Americans of Lithuanian origin living in the metropolitan area of Greater Detroit, County of Wayne, in the State of Michigan gathered at Western High School, 1,500 Scotten, Detroit, Mich., to commemorate the 46th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, at a rally sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, hereby firmly resolve to reaffirm our belief in the democratic principles of our Government and pledge our unstinted support to our President and the Congress of the United States to attain lasting peace, freedom, and justice throughout the world.

We further resolve to urge the U.S. Government to be wary of entering into any agreements with the Soviet Union which would in any way imply the recognition of Soviet rule in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia or the other captive nations and to continue its position of maintaining that Soviet rule of Lithuania and the other enslaved countries is unlawful and at the same time demand that the Soviet Union practice what it preaches regarding colonialism by immediately withdrawing all Soviet troops, ruling apparatus and colonists from Lithuania and all other captive nations, and that our Government insist that this liberation be the basic condition for the start of any further treaty negotiations with the Soviet Union.

We further resolve to urge the U.S. Congress to hasten the passage of one of close to 50 Senate and House Concurrent Resolutions now pending in committee in both Houses of the Congress requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations requesting the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prison and slave-labor camps and to conduct free elections in these nations under United Nations supervision.

We also urge that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Congressmen representing Michigan in the U.S. Congress, to members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives and to the press, radio, and television media.

Unanimously accepted and adopted at Detroit, Mich., this 16th day of February in the year of our Lord, A.D. 1964.

ALGIS ZAPARACKAS,
Chairman.
PETRAS JANUSKA,
Secretary.

[Lietuvos Nepriklausomybės Atstatymo 46-siu Metu Sukakties]

ISKILMINGO MINEJIMO PROGRAMA

(1964 m. vasario mėn. 16 d., 3 val. po pietų, Western High School Auditorijoje, 1500 Scotten Ave., Detroit, Mich.)

1. Iskilingo minejimo atidarymas—Detroito Lietuvių Organizacijų Centro Valdybos pirmininkas Ralph J. Valatka.
2. Garbės Prezidiumo pristatymas.
3. Programos vedėjas—Algis Zaparackas.
4. Jungtinio Amerikos Valstybių Himnas.
5. Invokacija—kunigas Bronius Dagilis.
6. Zuvusių už Lietuvos laisvę pagerbimas.
7. Michigan valstybės Gubernatoriaus George E. Romney proklamacijos skaitymas—Antanina Clunkaitė.
8. Detroito miesto Burmistro Jerome P. Cavanagh proklamacijos skaitymas—Zibute Zaparackaitė.
9. JAV Senatoriaus Philip A. Hart kalba.
10. Garbės svečių pristatymas ir sveikinimai.
11. Jono Matulionio kalba.
12. Rezoliucijų priėmimas—skaityto Algis Alantas. Pertrauka 15 minučių.

MENINE PROGRAMA

1. Gyvataras.....Tautinis sokis
2. Sukčius.....Tautinis sokis
3. Subatele.....Tautinis sokis

Atlieka Detroito lietuvių tautinių sokių grupė "Silaite" vadovė—G. Gobiene.

4. Kur giria zaliuoja.....J. Guadvicius
 5. Po aukštus kalnus.....K. V. Banaitis
 6. O Nemune.....Br. Budriūnas
 7. Lietuviais esame mes gime.....S. Simkus
- Lietuvos Himnas

Atlieka Sv. Antano parapijos misrus choras vadovaujamas muz. A. Matelkos.
Sveikina: Dr. Bronė Gruzdienė, dantų gydytoja 15200 Schoolcraft. VE 7-2119.

ONE BRIEF SHINING MOMENT OF FREEDOM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today we commemorate the 711th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Kingdom in A.D. 1253 and the 46th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

Brave Lithuania is a small nation who has felt the despotic heel of foreign rulership for most of her seven centuries of existence. Fought over by Poland and Germany during the Middle Ages, she was arbitrarily given to the Russian czar at the Congress of Vienna in 1815.

It was at this point that the Lithuanians first experienced the torture and oppression of modern totalitarianism. Lithuanian newspapers and books were prohibited, Russian was the only language permitted in the schools, and thousands of loyal Lithuanians who refused to knuckle under to foreign domination were either executed or exiled to Siberia.

Following the First World War the unquenchable love of freedom within the Lithuanian people burst forth in the founding of an independent Lithuanian nation. Free for the first time since the 13th century, Lithuanians were permitted the unbelievable luxury of electing their own leaders, speaking their own language, studying their own history,

and determining their own national destiny.

These rights and freedoms, which those of us in the free world often take so casually, were for Lithuanians a thrilling and, unfortunately, all too brief experience.

For after a brief span of only 22 years, the ravages and unrest of the Second World War destroyed Lithuanian independence. In 1940 the Soviet Union occupied the free republic with large numbers of troops, forced the election of a pro-Communist government, and once again began the systematic destruction of Lithuanian language, culture, and national identity.

Free Lithuania, along with neighboring Estonia and Latvia, has been a prisoner in Soviet chains ever since.

But the brief period of Lithuanian independence was a very significant period indeed. For one brief shining moment there was freedom of government and freedom of expression on the shores of the Baltic Sea. For one brief shining moment a small country was able to chart her own course for national development without having to take orders from the great totalitarian power that so threateningly overshadowed her.

The memory of this brief shining moment of Lithuanian independence is today a beacon of hope to the enslaved peoples throughout Eastern Europe and, indeed, to enslaved peoples all over the earth. The continued efforts of the Lithuanian people, both within their country and in exile, to shake off the yoke of Communist oppression is a constant reminder to us all that human freedom is still worth fighting and dying for.

It is for this reason that we celebrate, both sadly and hopefully, the 46th anniversary of the founding of Lithuanian independence.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there has just come to my attention a remarkable letter written to Mr. Valerian A. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, U.S.S.R. by Mr. Norman Cousins, the distinguished American editor.

Mr. Zorin had expressed surprise over the very strong American reaction to the arrest and imprisonment of Prof. Frederick C. Barghoorn.

How can one man create such a problem between our two great countries?—

Mr. Zorin asked.

I do not understand how this single incident can color the whole range of Soviet-American relations.

In his reply to Mr. Zorin, Mr. Cousins undertook to answer this question. Mr. Cousins gave Mr. Zorin a lecture on the meaning of America and the meaning of the American Constitution which I hope will be used repeatedly in the future by the U.S. Information Agency.

He told Mr. Zorin that "the United States is prepared to turn itself out on behalf of a single man" because "it was designed to rescue the individual from the ages-old notion that he was comprehensively subordinate, and that his

rights or sufferings or longings or needs were of little consequence alongside the wishes or needs of the state."

According to the American design, Mr. Cousins said:

The individual is primary and the state is secondary. The individual in full possession of his rights becomes the central concern of the state. This means that the state must not merely come to the defense of a solitary individual who is under attack; the state must think through the total problem of what the individual requires in order to be himself, to function effectively, to grow, to think, and to exercise rights against the state itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of Mr. Cousins' reply to Mr. Zorin be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

As a Representative of the State of Connecticut, I am proud to know that this statement originated with a resident of my State.

It also makes me proud to be able to count Mr. Cousins among my personal friends.

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

A FRIENDLY LETTER TO MR. ZORIN

"How can one man [Frederick C. Barghoorn] create such a problem between our two great countries? * * * I do not understand how this single incident can color the whole range of Soviet-American relations."—Valerian A. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. as quoted in press dispatches from Moscow.

DEAR MR. ZORIN: We understand that you raised these questions during a press conference at a time when American indignation over the arrest on espionage charges of Professor Barghoorn was reaching a powerful crescendo. The news stories said you expressed genuine bewilderment and concern and sought serious answers.

No more important or revealing questions than the ones you ask about the United States have come from the Soviet Union. In many ways, these questions are even more vital to world peace than the emergency military questions for which the hot line between Washington and Moscow was devised. Questions involving military accident or miscalculation are fairly mechanical and are subject to reasonably prompt correction or clarification. Far more fundamental and difficult are questions involving miscalculation growing out of a nation's values or its philosophical underpinnings and the propositions attached to them. The peoples of the world and not just the peoples of our two countries have a genuine stake in the formulation of policy in the Soviet Union based on your correct understanding of why the United States moved powerfully and swiftly in the Barghoorn episode. This understanding will be relevant in any future assessment you make of those things that are certain to affect or bring about major American decisions.

First of all, you should be assured that the implications of your question are quite right: The United States is prepared to turn itself inside out on behalf of a single man. Indeed, this is precisely what the United States was designed to do. It was designed to rescue the individual from the ages-old notion that he was comprehensively subordinate, and that his rights or sufferings or longings or needs were of little consequence alongside the wishes or needs of the state. The design was not a superficial one. It involved an intricate structure of government, constituted in such a way that no government official could have an easy time immunizing

himself from the consequences of his errors or in putting himself beyond the reach of an individual who didn't like what was happening.

Most important of all, the design was based on the conviction that the only justification for a national government is to prevent bullies, including the state itself, from taking advantage of the individual because he is small and alone. According to this design, then, the individual is primary and the state is secondary. The individual in full possession of his rights becomes the central concern of the state. This means that the state must not merely come to the defense of a solitary individual who is under attack; the state must think through the total problem of what the individual requires in order to be himself, to function effectively, to grow, to think, and to exercise rights against the state itself. The individual must be able to shake his fist at the state, to denounce it, to take it into court and sue it and receive a verdict against it.

This, then, is the general idea. Many of our problems have come about not because the state has followed this design too closely but because it didn't follow closely enough. The most important causes or movements in the United States today are those that are directed against government—local, regional, or national—for being less zealous than it should be in meeting its obligations to the individual.

We can understand why you expressed bewilderment. We appreciate—and we say this not with any intent to score points in a discussion but in an effort to state a recognizable and relevant fact—that you speak from the vantage point of a society that sees history as governed by inexorable and supremely impersonal historic forces. According to this view, there are basic laws that determine which way a society and the world itself are to be shaped. The fate of a single individual alongside these vast forces is not considered to be especially critical. The individual, to be sure, is not ignored, but his rights against the state are minimal rather than maximal. The term "destiny" is seldom applied to a single man; it belongs to the society as a whole. Cases in which one man is allowed to array himself against the state, which, for all its size and power, has no more standing in court than the man juxtaposed against it—cases such as these are unknown in your nation.

Against this background, we can readily understand that you should be amazed and dismayed that an individual such as Professor Barghoorn could upset the flow of history. But this was to be expected and, under similar circumstances, would happen again. Indeed, surprise and bewilderment over the Barghoorn case would be warranted only if the United States and the American people did not fly into an uproar but contented themselves with a murmur of protest or nothing at all.

Our purpose in writing you, we repeat, is not to deliver a sermon but to put before you some speculations bearing on the serious questions you pose. We want to assure you that this is not a one-way discussion and that our pages are available to you for response, riposte, or further questions.

N.C.

THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity of hearing the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado, Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, discuss the pending land and water conservation fund legislation. I found the

chairman's remarks eminently sound and so it is I would like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues both in the Senate and the House. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Chairman ASPINALL's remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND BILL

Perhaps it would be well to remind ourselves this evening that tomorrow is Lincoln's birthday; that in the year in which he was born, 1809, the whole population of our country was less than 7¼ million people; that they were scattered over 1¼ million square miles of land; that this means we then had only 4.3 persons per square mile; and that only 7 percent of this population lived in settlements with 2,500 or more people.

If the question being asked tonight—"Should the Outdoors Be Free?"—had been asked then, it would have been meaningless. The "outdoors" was all around. It couldn't be locked up. It was free for all to enjoy.

Similarly, if at that time anyone had suggested a land and water conservation bill—the specific subject that has been assigned to me to talk about—he would have been thought somewhat wacky in the head. No one would have known what he was talking about or why he was talking about it or paid any attention to him if he had tried to talk.

The situation is completely different today. Today both of these questions are serious questions. They are pressed upon us not by any malign influence or by any malicious desire to charge people for what they think they have enjoyed free of charge to date, but by the mere fact that the 155 years that have passed since Lincoln's birth have brought about a revolution such as the world never before saw—a revolutionary increase in our population, a revolutionary increase in our means of transportation, a revolutionary increase in our leisure time, a revolutionary change in our urban/rural balance, a revolutionary change in the tempo of our life and work and play.

Today, just to make this a little more concrete, the United States, exclusive of Alaska, has a population of 82½ people per square mile—more than 14 times as dense as it was in 1810. Today, 115 million of us live in what the Census Bureau classified as "urban" places—220 times as many as lived in towns of the same size in 1810. Today the "outdoors" is not a 5-minute walk from our doorstep but, for most of us, a long drive through town and past suburbia.

Having said this much by way of general introduction, let me lay a foundation for what I want to say on my specific subject. To do so, I have to ask you to go back quite a way with me in our thinking. I do so partly because of the very title of the bill I have already mentioned—the land and water conservation fund bill—and partly because I regard the current surge of enthusiasm for public support of outdoor recreation as part and parcel of the larger and, in some ways, older conservation movement.

We on the Hill see this connection every step of the way. We see it when we deal with national parks legislation—for here recreation and conservation plainly move hand in hand. We see it when we deal with the national forests—here, too, recreation, conservation, and forestry management go together. We see it when we deal with our great water and power projects—here again the potentials for outdoor recreation are very much to the fore and are being pressed on us at every turn.

Back in the 1890's and the early 1900's when the conservation movement was getting

strongly under way, when giants like Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot and others were with us, it was such things as these—parks, forests, waterpower, and irrigation—that constituted the focal points of the conservation movement.

This movement, if I read my history correctly, was not a movement in favor of locking up our great stores of natural resources and of natural beauty and simply putting them in a deep freeze. It was a movement against waste and despoliation, a movement in favor of wise use. And while wise use, in my vocabulary, may in some cases mean a single use (our national parks, for instance), it will in more cases mean multiple use—our national forests and our flood control and irrigation reservoirs, for instance. But it will not mean, except in the rarest of rare cases, a policy of no use, a policy of preserving simply for the sake of preserving.

The use of the outdoors for recreation at the time the conservation movement got started was a minor part of the story. Certainly people wanted to enjoy the outdoors but, as I have already said, the outdoors was all around them except in a few of our larger cities, and little thought needed to be given to its accessibility, its adequacy, or its cost. Today such thought must be given. The outdoors today for most of us city dwellers is far, far away. It is getting scarcer and scarcer. It costs time and money to get to it. And it is costing more and more to preserve and restore it. These, in the final analysis, are the reasons for the land and water conservation fund bill.

Novel though some of the proposals in the land and water conservation fund bill may seem to be, congressional interest in this subject is a direct outgrowth of our earlier national experience. Direct Federal interest in the outdoors dates back to the creation of Yellowstone National Park in 1872 and the establishment of 15 reserves of forest land on 13 million acres in 1891. The lands that were involved in these two actions were, of course, public lands and questions of cost were therefore much less prominent than they are in the sort of things we are trying to do today. But this beginning of Federal interest did involve the Congress very directly. It did so not only because the cost of preserving and administering these areas and making them available to the people had to be borne by the Treasury—and let us never forget that Congress is the appropriating authority in our Government—but because they were public lands, and article IV of the Constitution provides that it is Congress that "shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

I need not remind you, however, that we are no longer in a position to dedicate unlimited areas of the public lands to recreation and other conservation purposes. The 1.8 billion acres that the United States acquired by cessions from the original 13 States and by treaties over the years between the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the Alaska Purchase in 1867 has shrunk to 711 million acres and of these only 484 million are not already given over to one Federal function or another. Moreover, 309 million of these remaining 484 are in Alaska. This leaves about 175 million in what our Alaskan fellow citizens like to refer to as the "lower 48" and particularly in about a dozen of these 48. Large as even this figure of 175 million acres may seem, the pressures on it for all sorts of developments—military bases, city growth, oilfield developments, grazing, and so on and on—is tremendous and, in many cases, meritorious.

The points I am trying to make with this recitation are three: First, that the Congress has a big job to do, both in its role as holder of the purse strings and in its role as final

administrator of the public lands. Second, that even if the public lands were more extensive than they now are and even if there were not competitive uses for them, most of them are so located that they will not give the public the "outdoors" it wants where it wants it. And third, that providing this "outdoors" is going to cost all of us more and more as the years go by.

There is, of course, a romantic view abroad in some quarters, fostered by our history and by our inability or unwillingness to keep our eyes open to the trends of the last half century, that says that the "outdoors" is and always has been and ought always to be free. This is nonsense. Either we pay for the outdoors through taxes or we pay for it through direct fees or we find some fairly godmother around to pay it for us. I doubt that the last is feasible.

All of which brings us to the land and water conservation fund bill itself.

A large part of this bill is a direct outgrowth of the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. I was not a member of the Commission but I followed its work closely and, I am glad to say, I had the opportunity to sponsor in the House the 85th Congress measure under which the Commission was created. The Commission's membership included four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate, from both sides of the aisle, plus seven public members appointed by the President. It brought in its unanimous report—a report well worth your reading—in January 1962. This report pointed out many of the factors in our national development that I have already spoken of plus a lot more. It took a long look into the future, as it was directed to do by its organic act. And it made various recommendations the most important of which either have been included in legislation already adopted which gives the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Interior Department the tools it needs to do its work or are included in the land and water conservation fund bills that are still before the Congress.

The stated purpose of this bill, as it has been reported to the House by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is "to assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens of the United States of America of present and future generations . . . such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as may be available and are necessary and desirable for active participation in such recreation and to strengthen the health and vitality of the citizens of the United States . . ."

To do this, it proposes the creation of a land and water conservation fund from which appropriations will be made, as needed, to finance part of the costs of planning, acquiring land for, and (in some cases) developing outdoor recreation resources throughout the United States.

The bill proposes three permanent sources of money for the land and water conservation fund:

(1) That portion of the present so-called gasoline tax which is derived from fuels used in motorboats. This, we think, will yield about \$25 million a year.

(2) Proceeds from the sale of surplus Government real estate. This will probably yield about \$50 million a year.

(3) Proceeds from admission and user fees collected from those who make recreational use of our national parks, national forests, and other installations. It has been estimated that this, after it is fully underway, may yield \$60 to \$70 million a year.

Let me assure you, in case you think differently, that these are not noncontroversial and that it was not easy either for the administration or for us on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to work them out.

Particularly is this so for the admission and user fee provisions of the bill. We were besieged on all sides with requests for this, that, or the other exception. We were plagued with the charge that this is a new tax on the people. We heard, and we still hear, the argument: "The parks and the forests already belong to the people. Why should we pay for them again?"

Fortunately, our committee rejected these arguments and came out with a fair, reasonable, and moderate bill—a bill which had the support of our late President, John F. Kennedy, and has the support of our present President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

One thing the bill does, as far as fees are concerned, is to lay a foundation on which we can get some semblance of uniformity of practice by the various Federal agencies that are in the recreation business—the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and our various water resources agencies. Some of these bureaus have been charging fees for years, some of them charge fees at some places and not at others, some of them do not charge at all. If it does nothing else, the provisions of the bill which lay this foundation for uniformity will be a great blessing.

The bill, moreover, offers a bargain to the American people. It authorizes an automobile sticker which will admit the owner and all his passengers into virtually every Federal recreation area in the country for a maximum of \$7 a year. When you compare this with \$2.25 for a carton of cigarettes, or \$5 for a fifth of bourbon, or \$6, the present price for admission to Yellowstone National Park alone, I think you will agree with my earlier statement that we came out with a fair, moderate, and reasonable bill.

For those who do not wish to buy an auto sticker—and I emphasize that the purchase of such a sticker is entirely up to the individual—the bill provides for admission fees to individual recreational areas. We anticipate that these may range, depending on the area and the types of recreation it affords and the amount of Federal investment in it, from 25 cents to a dollar or two. They will, in other words, compare more than favorably with the price of admission to a football game or a movie.

As I said before, the yield from all these fees and from various types of user fees may add up to \$60 or \$70 million a year. This will not even begin to cover the cost to the taxpayers of the recreational opportunities the United States now furnishes. It will, for instance, be only about half of our appropriations to the National Park Service alone, and this doesn't take account of appropriations for the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service for their recreational functions.

But it will help. And it is, in my judgment, an essential element in persuading the Congress that these good works are worth continuing and expanding. Certainly we cannot expect the enthusiasm we should have for our future Cape Cod National Seashores, our future Padre Island National Seashores, our future Point Reyes National Seashores if we are unwilling to have the direct beneficiaries—those who use them—pay at least a part of their cost. Certainly, also, we cannot expect much enthusiasm for nonreimbursable allocations of costs on account of the recreation potentials in our future Lake Meads, our future Lake Texomias, our future Grand Coulee Dams if those who make use of these installations for recreation are unwilling to carry a part of the load.

But the land and water conservation fund bill goes far beyond helping to finance Federal land acquisition for recreation. Indeed, our committee recognizes, as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recognized, that the States must play a "pivotal" role in this business. Accordingly, more than half of the money that will be

appropriated from the fund will go to the States to be used to match State funds available for planning their recreational development, for land acquisition, and for development. Two-fifths of the funds available to the States—two-fifths, that is, of a potential total of \$90 million a year—will be available for distribution equally among all 50 of them and three-fifths will be allotted on the basis of need, with primary attention to their populations, the use of outdoor recreation facilities by residents of other States, and the extent of Federal outdoor recreation programs within the State. This provision for sharing Federal funds with the States is intended to spur on their own local developments and to take some of the burden off Uncle Sam. The recreation field is large, the need is great, there is more than enough for all of us—the United States, the States, and local governments—to do to make the program a success.

Madam Chairman, there are any number of details about the land and water conservation fund bill that I could get into, but my time is about up. I think I have said enough about it to indicate its background, its principal provisions, and the good it will do. I am far from saying that it is a perfect bill. All of us recognize that legislation involves compromises, especially when it touches the pocketbook nerve, and that compromises are rarely fully satisfactory. Even after the bill has passed the House, it may not be a finished product. The Senate will have its say and, if it disagrees with us on any points, the conference committee will have to reconcile them.

No; it is not yet a finished product. But this bill, or something reasonably like it, is an absolute "must" in my judgment. Without it we will have reached what may well be an impasse. With it we can go forward. I think, despite the dissents I have heard, that the great majority of American citizens will gladly support it. I hope you will, too.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the National Canners Association met in annual convention in Dallas early this month.

Among the principal speakers was Hon. Richard W. Reuter, special assistant to the President and Director of the food-for-peace program. Mr. Reuter spoke of the recent addition to the program which came into being when the Barlett amendment was accepted to the foreign aid bill, adding fish to the commodities which can move abroad under the same circumstances and provisions as other food. Likewise, Mr. Reuter told the importance of Public Law 480 in helping to feed the world's hungry, in building good will for the United States, and in disposing of our surpluses. His speech was so pertinent, so informative that I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

Mr. REUTER: I am very grateful for this opportunity to talk to you about food for peace; or is it now fish for peace, as my Budget Bureau associates seem determined to call the program. You may be interested in what we are now doing as background for what we might be doing in the future together.

This program is many things to many people. For some, it is a device for disposing of farm surpluses. Probably it is best known as a humanitarian expression, sharing of our abundance with the world's hungry millions.

There is a growing recognition of it as a powerful instrument of foreign policy. Food for peace is this and more. It has proven to be of importance in strengthening our balance-of-payments position. It is becoming increasingly recognized as a tool in the financing of economic development of new nations. Of particular interest to this group, however, is the fact that more and more segments of our own economy are discovering that, through food for peace, they can create new markets overseas. I'd like to emphasize this today—because it is this aspect of the program that has led many to believe that there is a validity to including fish and fishery products under food for peace. Should such support of long-term market development justify the cost—governmental and private—of bringing fish under the program, we may look forward to raising further the nutritional standards of the world. Certainly protein—particularly inexpensive protein—is needed by millions. The question for consideration is whether we can develop a program for fish under Public Law 480 that can accomplish effectively our goals without undue cost. You in industry and we in Government are both interested in finding solutions that allow a maximum normal trade development and a minimum Government financial involvement. You will consider this thoroughly in your discussions tomorrow, I am sure. I can probably be most helpful here by setting forth the rationale of food for peace as we now administer the program.

President Johnson is determined to attack poverty, and the causes of poverty. In his first address to the Congress as Chief Executive last November, President Johnson called on the country "to carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease in other lands and in our own." Again, in his state of the Union message last month, he spoke of several ways by which we must advance toward world peace and freedom, and this was one of them: "We must make increased use of our food as an instrument of peace, making it available—by sale, trade, loan, or donation—to hungry people in all nations which tell us of their needs and accept proper conditions of distribution." This was in line with the President's pledge before a world audience at the United Nations in December: "The United States wants to cooperate with all the members of this organization to conquer everywhere the ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, and ignorance."

Gentlemen, freedom from hunger is the key to this conquest. And freedom from hunger is your business—as much your business as it is mine. I am proud of my job. I know you are proud of yours. Americans eat better than any people in history and spend a smaller percentage of their income on food than any people in history. Last year it was 19 percent—the first time any nation spent, on average, less than one-fifth per capita income on food. I think it is time we got back to being proud of the great job that our farmers are doing. The increases in efficiency of production of farm commodities have far outstripped the advances of even our efficient industrial production. The President, in his farm message Thursday, pointed out that while we have problems, they are the problems of abundance rather than scarcity.

The great challenge of today is a paradox: For the first time in history we have the ability to produce enough food to give everybody in the world an adequate diet; and yet, half the people of the world go to bed hungry every night. We worry about surpluses, yet millions do not have enough to eat.

The World Food Congress, held in Washington last June, brought together almost 1,400 people from countries on every continent to face this problem and to declare

that a world half fed is not good enough in the 20th century. It was thrilling to me, having had a lifetime of work in this field, to see people from around the world accepting this challenge as a world problem, for together we may be able to solve it. And, I think it is going to be solved only if we work together.

We talk sometimes almost glibly of one-half to two-thirds of the people in the world being hungry. One of the World Food Congress studies suggests that out of all the nations of the earth, about 16 are well fed—some 519 million people, or 15 percent of the world population. Twelve nations have inadequate diets—diets which are short of animal protein; they constitute another 15 percent of the world population. And of all 89 nations existing in the world at the time of the study, 61 of them—almost two billion people, or 69 percent of the world's population—were classed as poorly fed or hungry.

There is actually a danger of becoming hypnotized by the mere figures and forgetting the implications and the impact of this upon human beings. The have-not nations with their growing food deficits find it hard to understand the preoccupation of the have nations with their growing surpluses.

The FAO Conference in Rome in December, following up on the resolutions of the World Food Congress, called for new patterns of trade in agricultural commodities. (The United States is one of the few countries that separates fish from agriculture in its governmental activities.) We will be hearing a great deal more of this call for new trade patterns at the World Trade Conference in Geneva this March; and, of course, later in the spring at the Kennedy round of the GATT negotiations. These meetings merit your most serious attention.

But think for a moment of our recent technological breakthrough in production of agricultural commodities. We return to our challenge. In a decade we have cut down hunger from three-fourths to under two-thirds of the people on this earth. This is a dramatic achievement—we could be very proud of this, if the balance were still not so staggering.

Despite all our progress, in absolute numbers, more people are hungry in 1964 than ever before in history. Yet, it is still true that for the first time in the history of man, it is possible to foresee the elimination of hunger and malnutrition resulting from a lack of food. In fact, the economic research people in the Department of Agriculture have been able to project, with some presumed accuracy, the time and resources it will take to accomplish this goal.

Scientific advances in agriculture provide the farmers of the world the necessary know-how and material to grow the needed extra food. Within the next 20 years we can have the food. But the economic machinery for distribution and financing does not yet assure us we can get this food to the present have-not areas. The expansion of marketing, and more specifically the method to accomplish this, is now the key problem. And this, I presume, applies as much to the food we derive from the sea as it does to the food we get from the farm.

As the most advanced agricultural nation, and the largest exporter of food, America has a stake in the achievement of this goal—the elimination of hunger—second only to that of the world's hungry millions themselves. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, with his unique energy and a marine's persistence, has attempted to awaken the world to the need for the kind of trade and aid effort necessary to close the gap between the food-surplus and food-deficit areas. It is a world problem, yet traditionally each nation treats food supply—and particularly its agriculture—as a domestic problem. Self-sufficiency in food is an appealing national goal

for developing countries. But the result frequently is protection and higher prices for basic foodstuffs. This can only postpone the day when all people have enough food available to them. American products must have access to markets on a fair competitive basis—as other producing nations must have reasonable access to U.S. markets. But it should be a two-way street. We cannot long endure if it is expected that America does the aid and others the trade.

For those in the American food industry, an important fact to keep in mind is this: As our own standard of living improves, we may change the quality of our food consumption but the quantity we change very little. Despite our serious pockets of poverty, there are few in the United States who do not consume enough food to "fill" them. Our per capita expenditure for food increases as diets improve, but our per capita quantity of food use remains pretty much at the saturation point; in general, domestic food consumption is rising about equal to population increases. It is clear, then, that the future market for American food production lies in satisfying the needs of the hungry millions in other countries. For every \$100 increase in the standard of living of people overseas, we have been selling \$1 more of agricultural commodities. Foreign aid, as it has increased economic levels of developing countries, has served us well in developing enlarged markets for our agricultural production. Our export of agricultural commodities today accounts for 14 percent of our farm production and in some commodities, such as wheat, more than half of our production goes to the export market. Almost one-fourth of America's total exports are in agricultural commodities and both total volume and percentage have been rising. Calendar 1963 saw again a new record—\$5.6 billion export. This year we should hit the \$6 billion mark, with over \$4.2 billion through normal commercial export channels and the balance through food for peace, or Public Law 480, programs.

For agriculture and, I would say, to a somewhat lesser degree, for the fishing industry, the future lies in export marketing. (Parenthetically, I would suggest that meeting this challenge can be as important to achieving the goals of our foreign policy as it can be to revitalizing our rural economy or our fishing industry.) There is no surplus production as long as there is need for our produce. The problem really is how to bring the hungry millions of the world into the marketplace. If we accept this world marketing view, then our food for peace program assumes a new urgency, and a new significance. Its humanitarian values have long been accepted—and become no less important. But the market development and economic assistance roles of present sales techniques may indicate an economic validity to Public Law 480 that has tended to be obscured by our traditional surplus disposal psychology.

The food for peace program is an effort to use our food resources as an asset rather than a liability. The big job will be done by increased trade. But to buy, people must have money. We have found the way to use food to help in economic development. Today, almost one-third of all U.S. economic development assistance overseas is provided by our food for peace program—in food and food-generated currencies.

Since 1954 when Congress passed Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, the United States has shipped overseas each day—Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays included—every day for almost 10 years—the equivalent of three 10,000-ton shiploads of food. (Currently we are moving food for peace commodities at the rate of three and one-half ships a day.)

Under the donation phases of the program alone we are providing, in partnership with

America's private oversea relief agencies, some form of supplementary ration to more than 100 million people a day. About 75 percent of these are children.

The administration is trying to use food creatively, and with an adequate quid pro quo. Relief—unless recipients are also strengthened to become independent—does not of itself solve problems. It is important even in donation programs to have a plan that can assure an end to the need for donated foods.

Under title II, we are using food as wages to provide work on civic projects—farm to market roads, school buildings, irrigation ditches. The worker receives food for his family plus a small cash payment provided by the host government. Some skills are taught and useful projects are completed. But, most important, is the development of a self-help psychology and a rebirth of the idea of the dignity of work. Over 100,000 jobless in Latin America are now "employed" on these projects.

Civic action programs with host military forces have related these military groups to needed community development projects. Food—from Public Law 480—has helped to make these efforts possible. But the major impact programs have probably been school lunch schemes. Over 40 million children receive American food in their classrooms. Under the Alliance for Progress, for example, we soon will be reaching more than 10 million school children—one out of four children of school age in all Latin America. This is an increase from 3.9 million in June 1962. In 18 months, the program has more than doubled. And all of the supplementary costs for distribution and preparation are being paid by the host country. This is truly a joint program that is making a major contribution to education—and to the health of a new generation.

However, it should be emphasized that all of these donations-supported programs account for less than 30 percent of the total of food-for-peace shipments. Local currency sales (title I), dollar credit sales (title IV), and barter today account for more than 70 percent of all Public Law 480 programing. These techniques have proven of major significance in getting U.S. food to potential consumers who cannot yet buy under normal commercial trade terms. As you in the canning industry know, Congress recently opened the way to bring domestically produced fishery products, other than so-called fish flour, into the food-for-peace program. Such product or products declared surplus by the Secretary of Interior may be sold for long-term dollar credit. Title I sales—those for local currency—may not begin, however, until 1965. Fish concentrate is ineligible until approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

In writing fish into the law, the congressional authors noted that foreign governments from time to time have asked for canned fish products under food for peace to supply protein deficiencies. In effect we now have the authority to put fish on "the shopping list." It does not intend to authorize taking fish products into CCC stocks. The new amendment would put fish on the same basis as frozen beef, canned pork, canned hams, variety meats and fruit. It would permit our Government to meet these requests to the extent that fishery products may be in surplus. I can report as soon as this amendment became law the appropriate staff people in both the Interior and Agriculture Departments got to work appraising the situation in fishery products. They are plowing new ground, so to speak, and in this they will need the full cooperation of the fisheries and canning industries. We do not yet know the procedures including the budgetary procedures of just how this new authority might be used; and whether it will be used at all, of course, depends to some degree on you and your own interest in it.

Senator BARTLETT who is with us at this convention is determined to regain for America our traditional strong fishing industry. This will take a number of steps but markets for the catch, hopefully for a much broader variety of catch, is an important factor. Senator BARTLETT, Senator MAGNUSON, Senator KENNEDY, Senator SALTONSTALL, Congressman McINTIRE of Maine have all talked with me about the possibility of using this Public Law 480 device to help develop markets for fish products as it has been used to develop markets for agricultural products. Congress has passed enabling legislation because they feel the Public Law 480 machinery could be used. It is now up to us—the trade and the executive branch—to determine whether this is so.

As you evaluate the feasibility, first of sales for long-term dollar credit and later, possibly, of local currency sales, you may be interested in our experience in these categories of sales with respect to farm commodities. We began shipping under title IV about 2 years ago. In the 1962 fiscal year, title IV shipments totaled only \$19 million. But in the last fiscal year they had jumped to \$56 million.

Title I shipments have been rising since the inception of Public Law 480. In the last calendar year we shipped an estimated record \$1.1 billion worth of commodities at world market prices for local currencies. Most of these are price supported commodities already in U.S. Government hands under farm programs. With the currencies received we are accomplishing many worthwhile U.S. goals:

We're paying bills that otherwise would take dollars. This fiscal year, Public Law 480 will help our balance of payments picture by about a third of a billion dollars.

We're providing military support for American allies. In Vietnam and Korea, defense assistance grants have helped to strengthen direct opposition to Communist penetration of the free world.

We are providing loans for economic development that help strengthen the economies of more than 50 countries. And as these loans are repaid the money becomes available also to pay U.S. bills. AID now programs these local currencies along with dollar appropriations to expand the usefulness of our development assistance funds. Food made possible the equivalent to three-fourths of a billion dollars in development assistance last year.

We are providing some \$80 million worth of currency for loans to private enterprise to extend American business abroad. (This story should be much better understood by urban leaders as a recognition of the broad U.S. impact of the food program.)

And, of particular interest to this group, we are providing funds for market development work. Cooperative marketing programs are pioneering new techniques for public and private sector cooperation. (Great Plains Wheat, Western Wheat Associates and Bulger Associates are good examples.) This partnership in market development may be of particular interest—and importance—to the National Canners Association. This activity under Public Law 480 certainly merits your careful assessment. The marketing team you are sending out next month, of course, is a first step. But, many of the agricultural groups are doing nutrition education and product use training as part of the job of long-term market development.

Disregarding for the moment all the other values, gentlemen, these programs—both donations and sales—are market development programs for American food products. The most dramatic evidence of this market development potential has come from our newest group—Bulger Associates. Bulgur—a processed wheat acceptable to rice-eating peoples—is a new commercial product first

used in any volume by the Public Law 480 program. Bulgur wheat was first distributed through title III donation programs. (You might call it market sampling for a new product); it then moved into Public Law 480 sales programs; and just recently it sold for the first time overseas for cash—in the Congo and in Peru. More commercial sales are expected within the next few months, also in Africa and South America, as a result of an extensive sales trip made by Walt Graber, the executive of their new trade association. An interesting aside is that bulgur proved so popular in our international program it has now been included as available for U.S. school lunch programs.

This relationship of food to development and eventual market growth is to a large degree a new concept. We still have a long way to go to get broad acceptance and understanding of the importance of this approach. But I am convinced that Public Law 480 must constantly have as its ultimate goal the expansion of trade and the development of normal markets. Only by such expansion can we eventually close that food gap.

At a food for peace conference in Quito, Ecuador, last May we made an attempt to develop a pattern of cooperation among U.S. officials in the field (Agriculture-AID-State) to see if we could use our own food resources more effectively in the development process, and at the same time to relate this to the development of indigenous food resources.

One of the disturbing realities that confronted us as we met in Ecuador was the fact that only 500,000 people in that country of 4 million are consumers. Three and one-half million people never really take part in the economy of the country, never really go to the marketplace.

Is not this really our basic problem, then? How do we bring the consumers, the potential consumers of the world, into the marketplace? It will take cooperation by other potential surplus-producing countries. But I think we are making headway. Public Law 480 has proven remarkably versatile in contributing toward our goal. Instead of hurting our trade, the Public Law 480 programs have actually helped expand normal commercial trade. If we use the authorities of the food-for-peace program properly, I believe we can continue to make real headway toward the goal of a soundly based freedom from hunger.

We will be making a fundamental error if, as we talk of possibly bringing fish into the program, we do so with the thought merely of bailing out a particular pack crisis, or worse, if we look on it as a subsidy to fishermen or processors.

The fish amendment to Public Law 480 is not designed to set up an industry relief program. Its sponsors sought a goal of long-term market development that might generate new waterfront activity. Can the 480 machinery in existence be used to revitalize the fishing fleets of the United States by helping to create new markets for their catch? But this concern must also be related to the budgetary prospects of the U.S. Government.

In this, the American canning industry has a big stake.

I have tried today to put food for peace in a somewhat larger context than the general public image of surplus disposal, in the hope that I could challenge you to help find out if we can use this new authority. I believe that the international asset of food is so great today—in a world determined to create freedom from hunger—that we should use to the utmost this asset given us through our skill in farming and perhaps, too, in fishing.

Certainly, food is a relatively inexpensive weapon of great power in the arsenal of democracy. And I firmly believe that this food distribution program, creatively used, has in it the factors that can help, in the long run,

to develop rich new markets for our food production.

In closing his U.N. speech, President Johnson said: "Man's age-old hopes remain our goal—that this world, under God, can be safe for diversity, and free from hostility, and a better place for our children and for all generations in the years to come. And therefore, any man and any nation that seeks peace, and hates war, and is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and disease and ignorance and misery will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them, walk with them every step of the way."

This is a pledge, and a challenge worthy of America.

Thank you.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, among the numerous accomplishments of the 88th Congress in the field of health has been the increased interest in and action on mental health and mental retardation; therefore it is appropriate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carry an excellent speech by Mr. Mike Gorman, director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, before the Legislative Conference of the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD, together with certain press clippings on the same subject.

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

THE NEW MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGE FOR ALL AMERICANS

The gauntlet was thrown down by our martyred President less than a year ago when he sent to the Congress the first message on mental health and mental retardation ever submitted by a Chief Executive of this Nation. In that message, he said:

"This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. The time has come for a bold new approach."

The Congress responded to the challenge and enacted into law a bill providing Federal matching funds for the construction of mental health and mental retardation centers in the heart of the community. In affixing his signature to this legislation on October 31, 1963, former President Kennedy noted:

"The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to all who have made this legislation possible. It was said, in an earlier age, that the mind of man is a far country which can neither be approached nor explored. But, today, under present conditions of scientific achievement, it will be possible for a nation as rich in human and material resources as ours to make the remote reaches of the mind accessible. The mentally ill and the mentally retarded need no longer be alien to our affections or beyond the help of our communities."

There is really no way in which I can adequately convey to you the historic, precedent-shattering importance of this legislation. In very simple terms, it repudiates two centuries of isolation and custodial confinement of the mentally ill, and it proclaims their inalienable right to skilled and compassionate treatment in the milieu in which they live, love, work, and aspire.

Describing this legislation as "one of the boldest programs in the field of mental health in the history of the world," Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY told the annual convention of the National Association of Mental Health last November that if the 1st session

of the 88th Congress had achieved nothing more than the passage of President Kennedy's mental health program, it could lay justifiable claim to a memorable record.

The task before all of us now, here in Massachusetts and throughout the Nation, is to translate these new concepts for the care of the mentally ill from broad generalities into specific programs.

In the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Go put your creed into your deed."

Let us remember that we must honor a solemn commitment to the Congress and to the American people in putting this community mental health concept into effect.

As a first step you are engaged here, as are your sister States throughout the country, in comprehensive planning designed to develop solid foundations for new mental health services tailored to meet the specific needs of each community. Judging from the tenor and intensity of the panel discussion earlier today on progress to date in these planning efforts, you are well on your way to a new and exciting blueprint for mental health services in this Commonwealth.

This is a precious opportunity which must not be missed. Noting that this is the first time such a total planning effort has been made in any health area, Dr. Robert Felix observed recently that "the mental health field, which for so long lagged behind other health areas, has an opportunity to demonstrate on a national scale the value of comprehensive, long-term planning in a broad medical-social problem area."

Hundreds of professional workers will be involved in hammering out these plans over the next several years, but they must be augmented and guided by thousands upon thousands of citizens who care so deeply that they will insist upon a clean break with the custodial past.

In testifying before a congressional committee last year, I said that in the same manner as we talk of the right of a child to a good public education, we must talk of the right of every individual who needs it to early psychiatric treatment designed to make him a happier and more effective individual. Dr. B. H. McNeil, commissioner of mental hospitals of Ontario in Canada, summed up this minimum medical demand concisely when he said recently:

"Adequate treatment should be available for all psychiatric patients as early as possible, as continuously as possible, with as little dislocation as possible, and with as much social restoration as possible. Treatment should be available on the job, but if that is not possible, with the patient still living at home, and if that is not possible, it should be done in the community, and if that is not possible, then without breaking the ties which commit the patient to his community."

As a statement of our national objectives in the mental health field, I commend to you the words of Dr. Felix, who told the Congress last year that "public mental hospitals as we know them today can disappear in 25 years" if all levels of government and the public at large unite in this great endeavor.

In his historic mental health message of February 5, 1963, to the Congress, President Kennedy predicted that the number of patients in State mental hospitals could be halved in the next decade or two if we intensified our treatment efforts both in these hospitals and in the community.

When the first significant reductions in State mental hospital populations occurred in the 1950's as a result of the introduction of the new drugs, self-appointed guardians cried out that this was a "flash in the pan"—it couldn't last because the "inevitable" trend since 1773 had been an annual rise in the number of hospitalized patients.

Figures recently released by the National Institute of Mental Health show a truly remarkable reduction of 54,000 patients in

our State mental hospitals over the past 8 years—from 558,000 in 1955 to 504,000 in 1963.

This historic reduction of almost 10 percent in the population of these human warehouses is not only far in excess of what those of us who were attacked as "irresponsible optimists" predicted years ago in congressional testimony, but has been achieved in the face of a constantly rising flood of new admissions. Furthermore, instead of a tapering off of this downward trend in the size of institutional populations, there has been a marked acceleration—the drop of 12,000 patients in 1963 set a new record, breaking the previous record drop of 11,000 in 1962.

Apart from such obvious dividends as a reduction in overcrowding and the freeing of scarce psychiatric personnel for more intensive work with acute cases, this heartening trend has resulted in enormous economic savings to the States. Above and beyond the fact that a higher per diem expenditure can now be concentrated on fewer patients with a resulting increase in discharges, the dramatic reversal of the seemingly inevitable annual rise in number of hospital patients has eliminated the necessity for \$2 billion of planned hospital construction costs during the past decade.

We must devote particular attention to the several millions of Americans who need psychiatric treatment, but cannot get it today because it is too expensive. There is no point in establishing a chain of community mental health centers designed to apply psychiatric band-aids to neurotics from middle- and upper-income groups. We must first of all guarantee treatment in depth to those who are seriously ill.

We have been much too gentle in calling health insurance plans to task on this point. Many health insurance plans still discriminate against the hospitalized mentally ill. Furthermore, as we move out into the community, we face a real challenge in convincing these health insurance plans that it is wiser and far less expensive to cover the patient on a short-term ambulatory basis than in an expensive hospital bed. In a long and somewhat wearying experience dealing with executives of these plans, I am convinced that they will take no forward steps of this kind unless the public pressure is intense.

We must supply that pressure. We face an exciting challenge in providing psychiatric services for emotionally disturbed children. Here again, we have often settled for the bare minimum—a separately designated ward in an overcrowded State hospital or, infrequently, a 10- to 20-bed unit which is almost immediately overloaded with a backlog of cases.

Several months ago, I spent a day visiting the Massachusetts Mental Health Center here in Boston. Its buildings are not very prepossessing, but its services to suffering mankind are magnificent. With a full-time staff of 14 psychiatrists, plus 59 psychiatric residents, it handles 4,000 patients a year. Its doors are open to all, yet it has no long waiting list. In its emergency walk-in clinic, it handles more than 2,000 patients a year. It assigns patients to its various services—the 24-hour hospital, the day hospital, the night hospital, or the emergency clinic—on the basis of psychiatric need, and not on the basis of ability to pay or the comfort of the staff.

Federal and State training programs more than doubled the number of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, and psychiatric nurses in a decade—from about 22,000 in 1950 to 45,000 in 1960. The current training program of the National Institute of Mental Health is supporting close to 4,000 trainees a year, and a most conservative estimate indicates that there will be 85,000 professional workers in the key mental health disciplines available to this country by 1970.

During the past 5 years, thousands of family physicians, pediatricians, and other nonpsychiatric specialists have enrolled in formal, postgraduate courses designed to increase their psychiatric skills. These physicians, who will be given the opportunity to hospitalize their emotionally disturbed patients in the new mental health centers, will provide an enormous complement of additional skilled manpower.

We must point out that the direct and indirect costs of mental illness and mental retardation now exceed \$3 billion a year. The States alone spend more than a billion dollars a year for the maintenance of large institutions for the care of the mentally ill. These present costs are a tremendous drain upon our economy. More important, the loss of effective functioning people is a constant hemorrhage which this democracy can ill afford.

We have impressive documentation to the effect that early, intensive treatment, while more expensive on a day-to-day basis, is considerably cheaper per patient than long-term custody at supposedly "economical" rates.

Because of the nature of our affluent society, many of us who have testified before Federal and State legislative bodies for increased financing of intensive treatment services have been forced on many an occasion to restrict our case to the economic savings which accrue from support of such services. Over the years, a very good case has been made against the unimaginative construction of huge State mental hospitals which eat up tax dollars at a staggering rate, but the issue of economic savings has a relatively low priority in the field of mental health.

The overriding consideration is the treatment and return to society of thousands upon thousands of sick individuals. This is the true measure of our worth as a society.

Dr. Kenneth Appel, that great psychiatrist and humanitarian who sparked the formation of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, recently described the great challenge facing this democracy in putting the unused talents of people to work in the service of their suffering brethren in these moving words:

"It is an irony that the silent people, the helpless people in our mental hospitals and in our communities need human contacts; and the thousands, yes millions of the unemployed or retired need useful work to do. Yet our human and social engineering, our economic engineering, has not developed ways and means of bringing these two great needs together to supplement each other."

However, when we talk about increased financing of mental health services so that thousands upon thousands of mental patients can be returned to productive living, we run up against the hoary argument that public taxation has reached a confiscatory level and that the individual citizen is groaning under a tax burden which he is increasingly unable to handle.

Have we indeed, as a people, been increasing our expenditure for public services at a rate which is too burdensome for the individual taxpayer?

In his beautifully documented study "The Question of Government Spending," Francis M. Bator notes that in the years from 1929 to 1959, nondefense spending as a percentage share of the nondefense output of our economy rose only slightly:

"We have been committing in the post-war period only a slightly larger fraction to such communal uses as schools, roads, sanitation, urban renewal, etc., than we did in 1929 and a smaller share than in 1939 and 1940."

When we consider the rapid rise in our population—a record growth of 3 million people in a year—added to a sharp jump in

individual personal income, we cannot but conclude that the so-called heavy burden of increased taxes for public services is an undocumented myth.

What are we spending our money on these days? A 1962 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey reports that our gains in income have far outstripped our basic living costs since 1947; we now spend a smaller share of our income on the basic necessities—food, clothing, and shelter.

In 1961, for example, we spent \$20 billion on recreation; \$11 billion for alcoholic beverages; more than \$7 billion for tobacco products, and \$3½ billion for TV sets, radios, and phonographs. We also managed in that same affluent year to spend \$323 million for chewing gum. Over and above these and many other expenditures, we managed to accumulate the record sum of \$78 billion in savings and in durable assets.

Now, and much more to the point, how much of our booming personal income did we spend on these onerous State taxes about which we hear so much talk? In 1961 we spent, measured in constant dollars, 4 percent of our personal income for State taxes as against 3.7 percent in 1948. In other words, in a period of 13 years there was a rise of only three-tenths of 1 percent in the portion of our individual incomes which went to State government in the form of taxes.

How much did we spend on mental hospitals as a percentage of our personal incomes? In 1961 we spent eighteen-hundredths of a percent of our personal income on mental hospitals, as against seventeen-hundredths of a percent in 1948. In very simple terms, in 13 years we devoted only an additional one-hundredth of a percent of our personal incomes to the support of mental hospitals.

State governments in 1961 devoted 28 percent of their funds to highways. In that year, as a nation, we spent \$10 billion for highways. Furthermore, the Department of Commerce recently estimated that the accelerated national highway program inaugurated in 1957 would, upon completion in 1972, cost the American people \$55 billion.

While a higher percentage of your State budget goes to mental health activities than in most other States, it is pertinent to note that this percentage is drawn from a much narrower tax base than in most of your sister States. For example, although you are the 10th wealthiest State in the country in terms of per capita income, you are 28th in the amount of money spent per person on State government, and 41st in per capita State taxes as a percentage of individual personal income.

Rather than document this assertion from outside sources, I quote the following from an official publication entitled "The Massachusetts State Budget in Brief":

"Massachusetts is one of the wealthiest States in the Nation. The income of Massachusetts citizens continues to rise and taxes imposed by the State government are relatively moderate when compared with other States . . . Massachusetts citizens, at the present time, have roughly twice as much money left over after taxes as in 1945."

Without going into a detailed discussion of the budget of the department of mental health, which is responsible for more than 27,000 patients scattered among 18 different institutions, I submit that your per diem of \$6 a day is far from sufficient to supply adequate staff, decent housing, and wholesome food to those unfortunates who are wards of the Commonwealth.

Your investment in mental health services is hardly commensurate with the extraordinary leadership you have provided over a century and more to the mental health movement. The first president of the American Psychiatric Association was from Mas-

sachusetts, as is the current president. In the last decade alone, you have given the American Psychiatric Association three of its most outstanding presidents—Dr. Harry Solomon, Dr. Walter Barton, and Dr. Jack Ewalt. You can still draw upon the wisdom of Solomon and the kinetic energy of Ewalt, but we in Washington are fortunate these days in being able to tap the long experience of Barton.

During his tenure as president of the APA in 1957–58, Dr. Solomon focused his major attention upon the inadequacies of the big State mental hospital.

"The large mental hospital is antiquated, outmoded, and rapidly becoming obsolete," he declared in his presidential address in 1958. "We can still build them, but we cannot staff them; and therefore we cannot make true hospitals of them."

The courageous observations of Dr. Solomon received detailed confirmation in the final report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. This commission, located here in Boston and brilliantly led by Dr. Ewalt, proclaimed the need for a chain of community psychiatric facilities throughout the length and breadth of this land.

You are deeply engaged in this endeavor at the current moment in Massachusetts. In addition to major centers planned for Lowell, Fall River, and Springfield, you contemplate several additional centers in this city. It is also gratifying that the legislature, after a momentary indiscretion, followed the leadership of Governor Peabody in providing for an expansion of your famous Massachusetts Mental Health Center. I followed some of the debate over this matter in the Boston papers, and was truly astounded to find several members of the Massachusetts Medical Society quoted as branding this desperately needed expansion as "socialism." This sort of verbal witchcraft is most inappropriate to a factual discussion of the need for additional physical facilities to care for suffering people, particularly emotionally disturbed children, the mentally retarded, and the aged.

You are engaged in a comprehensive 2-year planning effort to determine just where and when you will locate additional mental health centers throughout the State. In eventually supplanting the large mental hospitals, I hope that you will give careful attention to Dr. Solomon's oft-repeated recommendation that moderate-sized facilities in the form of colonies or homes be used to care for those chronically ill individuals for whom, at the present time, we have no effective treatment. As the English have proved over the past decade, these colonies or hostels, can be run with a minimum of staff and a maximum of compassion if they are kept small enough.

Time does not permit an adequate expression of the extent of the debt all of us in the mental health field owe to you here in Massachusetts for your many experiments in new ways of handling mental illness. I am particularly impressed with the success of the pilot projects at Boston State Hospital and at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in the prevention of hospitalization through the use of improved screening techniques combined with home treatment services. Here in America, where all the family, legal, and medical pressures seem to unite in a conspiracy to force the patient into the hospital, there is a tremendous lesson to be learned in your demonstration of the many family and community strengths which can be drawn upon to keep the patient functioning outside the hospital. Furthermore, you tear down the veil which has shrouded public psychiatry in an atmosphere of fear, mystery and isolation when you provide for home visits by medical students and residents and when you work closely with family physicians in joint therapeutic efforts.

The 40-bed, all-purpose center for intensive treatment is an appealing concept. Maybe through these centers we can rekindle some of the warmth between staff and patients which Charles Dickens described in 1842 after a visit to what is now the Boston State Mental Hospital:

"Every patient in this asylum sits down to dinner every day with a knife and fork; and in the midst of them sits the gentleman (the superintendent)."

Isn't this personal contact the essence of what we are trying to create when we talk of a chain of small, well-staffed, community centers?

The tasks facing you are many, and foremost among them is the job of convincing the people and their elected representatives that additional mental health expenditures are both desirable and warranted. I like what John Powers, your State Senate President, told the delegates to the Governor's Conference on Action for Mental Health here in this city in May of 1962:

"Tell the people your story as you have told it to me," he urged them. "Tell them of the hundreds of thousands of pitiable human beings whom their money can restore to dignity."

In his magnificent Inaugural Address in January, 1961, our late President told us that the road would not be easy:

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

Here in Massachusetts and throughout this great land, let us continue.

[From the Boston Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 4, 1964]

MORE FUNDS URGED FOR MENTAL HEALTH— CURE CALLED CHEAPER THAN CARE

(By Loretta McLaughlin)

The man experts call the country's "greatest modern missionary for mental health" came to Boston yesterday "to raise hell about the lack of money for mental health here."

Mike Gorman, who wrote "Every Other Bed," and focused national attention on the extent of mental illness, insisted:

"It's cheaper to treat the mentally ill, and cure them, than it is to carry them on relief or care for them in institutions for a lifetime."

A \$100 MILLION BUDGET

He urged approval of Mental Health Commissioner Dr. Harry Solomon's \$100.2 million budget for 1964 as he addressed a legislative dinner sponsored by the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health, Inc., at the Sheraton Plaza.

In answer to those who say the community cannot afford to treat the mentally ill the same as the physically ill, Gorman said:

"We must make a strong factual case. The fact is the direct and indirect costs of mental illness and mental retardation now exceed \$3 billion a year nationally."

The necessity for wide community involvement in mental health was stressed by planners, psychiatrists and educators at the MHA's afternoon conference on the "new era in community mental health."

Harold W. Demone, Jr., director of the federally supported mental health planning project for the State, recognized the need to use lay people and civic organizations if any comprehensive mental health programs are to be effective.

Dr. Erich Lindemann, MGH psychiatrist-in-chief, looked ahead to possible crash programs that would "conquer mental illness the way we conquered polio or typhoid fever."

Three new community health centers in Lowell, Fall River, and Springfield are ready

for construction, Dr. Solomon reported. These, like three in Boston, will function as adjuncts to general hospitals in those cities.

Governor Peabody, who served as head of the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health, Inc., in 1957, addressed the dinner. More than 50 legislators were included among the 900 guests.

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 4, 1964]

ASK WAR ON MENTAL ILLS—CURE CHEAPER THAN ON RELIEF

(By Herbert Black)

It is a lot of nonsense to say Massachusetts is broke and can't afford modern, progressive mental health programs to keep people out of institutions, a nationally known authority declared here Monday.

Mike Gorman, of Washington, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, told a legislative conference at the Sheraton Plaza, "It is cheaper to treat and cure the emotionally disturbed, than to carry them on relief and keep them in institutions."

More than 600 attended the conference and dinner, including 50 legislators. It was sponsored by the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health and the State's department of mental health.

Gorman declared that Massachusetts is the 10th wealthiest State in the Union in terms of per capita income—but 28th in amount of money spent per person on State government. He declared part of the trouble is the narrow tax base from which money for mental health is drawn.

Dr. Harry C. Solomon, State commissioner of mental health, sought \$100 million for mental health for fiscal 1965 (June 1964 to June 1965). Governor Peabody's budget allows \$80 million. The 1963 budget was \$73 million.)

Gorman also declared that the State's \$6 a day allowance for 27,000 patients in 18 institutions was too low to do the job. With a larger amount, he declared, intensive personal care could get people back to productive life.

While critical of shortages of funds for mental health in the State, Gorman praised the legislators for raising salaries of mental health workers—giving the State a chance to compete with other States for psychiatric personnel.

Governor Peabody said the importance of organized and continuing mental health programs was emphasized by the death of President Kennedy.

"Had we known when Oswald first was treated, what we know now (about care and treatment of the emotionally ill), this tragedy might never have happened," he said.

A panel of authorities emphasized at a 3-hour afternoon session that all the resources of the community must be thrown into the battle against mental illness.

This includes the clergy, school authorities, pediatricians, social workers, settlement houses, hospitals, political leaders, and interested citizens—not just psychiatrists—panel members declared.

Among the panelists were Dr. Sprague W. Hazard; Harold W. Demone, director of the Massachusetts Mental Health Planning Project; Dr. Malcolm S. Knowles; Dr. Erich Lindemann; Dr. Harry C. Solomon; and Gorman.

Dr. Walter I. Tucker, of the Massachusetts Medical Society, raised the question whether mental health patients should not be in community rather than State mental health centers. Demone answered that all points of view were being considered by the planning project task forces.

Pilny Jewell, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health, presided.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE BILL WINS SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM CONVENTIONS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a valuable political institution has been created in the State of Oregon through the platform conventions of county, district, and State subdivisions of the Democratic Party of Oregon. The Democratic organization in my home State is unique in its development of the platform meeting, at the local level, as a means of determining the party position on issues of major importance.

Every 2 years, meetings are held throughout the State by the Democratic Party organizations for policymaking purposes. These sessions, held during January and February, give real meaning to our political process because they represent an expression of the citizen's expectations from his government. The resolutions adopted at these platform conventions provide guideposts for future action. Here is a real voice of the people, in my opinion.

I have been particularly gratified by the strong platform planks on resource conservation and recreation which have been enacted at the convention sessions this year. For instance, the platform adopted January 18, 1964, by the Democratic organization in Multnomah County, my home county and the most populous in the State of Oregon, had the following resolution preamble:

The Democratic Party, looking far beyond our present day needs, recognizes that unless careful planning is done now, there will be a dire shortage of facilities and scenic beauty for recreational purposes for the perpetual benefit of future generations.

The platform plank stated further:

We reaffirm our endorsement for the Oregon Dunes National Seashore and urge that this legislation, S. 1137, as reported out by the Senate Interior Committee, receive favorable attention by Congress without further delay.

Members of the committee and the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who reported favorably on the Oregon Dunes bill should be heartened by this declaration of approval from the county organization which represents the largest number of Democratic Party members in the State of Oregon.

On February 8 and 9, the Fourth Congressional District Democratic Platform Convention was held at Coquille, Ore. This is the congressional district in which the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore is located. The platform stated:

The Democratic Party endorses the Duncan-Neuberger bills for an Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

The platform planks adopted at the various county Democratic conventions reflect the widespread, almost universal, acceptance in Oregon of the proposal for giving our State a new national park unit, for creating a new tourist mecca amidst the scenic grandeur of the Oregon seacoast. But, Mr. President, the desirability of establishing the Oregon Dunes

National Seashore is not a partisan issue. The proposal has a long history of bipartisan approval, going back to the administration of President Eisenhower. In 1960, President Eisenhower requested authority from Congress to establish three National Seashores—at Padre Island in Texas; Cape Cod in Massachusetts, and Oregon Dunes, in Oregon.

I am reminded, also, that at hearings held in Eugene, Ore., on May 4, 1963, by the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, the official spokesman for Oregon's Republican Governor Mark O. Hatfield stated:

It is now time for action on Oregon Dunes.

I am in accord with that viewpoint, Mr. President, and ask consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the text of platform planks relating to the Oregon Dunes adopted at Democratic conventions in Oregon counties of Lincoln, Lane, Linn, and Douglas.

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

PLATFORM PLANK OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF LINCOLN COUNTY

Whereas tourism and recreation is now rated as Oregon's third largest industry, and Whereas the National Park system constitutes a major part of a nation's recreational system providing rest and relaxation for millions of people annually, and

Whereas the National Park System area in Oregon is small when compared to our neighboring States of Washington and California, and

Whereas many people, including National and State leaders, have urged the incorporation of the Oregon Coast Dunes area into the National Park System, and

Whereas Senator NEUBERGER and Representative DUNCAN have introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate, providing for the Oregon Dunes Area as a National Seashore area; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Democratic Party of Lincoln County in convention assembled in Newport, Ore., these 8th and 9th days of February 1964, That we approve the proposal to establish the Oregon Dunes Area as a national park as provided for in Senator NEUBERGER's and Representative DUNCAN's bill; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., and to Representative DUNCAN, United States House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

LANE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, JANUARY 25, 1964, AT EUGENE, OREG.

5. Recreation: We feel that recreation opportunities on federally controlled lands should be improved and extended, including camping facilities and trails. More locally, our State and county parks departments should continue their program of land acquisition and development. Marine parks should be considered. Full cooperation should be given the antilitter campaign and regulations should be more strictly enforced.

We continue to support the expansion and strengthening of the National Park system. Particularly we support the establishment of an adequate Oregon Dunes National Seashore, embracing the spectacular dunes south of Siuslaw River and incorporating other lands necessary for a balanced and attractive recreation and scientific area.

National forest facilities should continue to be developed for accommodation of tourists interested in the wide range of recreational opportunities existing in Oregon.

We support the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in its activities, including the studies of wild rivers.

We recommend legislation restricting public nuisances such as obnoxious advertising signs and excessive noise from airplanes and other motorized vehicles.

LINN COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM (1964)

We urge the establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Seashore. We believe that Oregon's scenery is one of her most important resources. A thriving recreation industry depends upon this resource. While further recreation industry is needed to diversify and stabilize Oregon's economy, sound planning is also needed to assure that Oregon's scenic resources are fully safeguarded in new industrial developments. We believe that all governmental units should join in a cooperative effort to identify remaining scenic resources and to devise coordinated plans to safeguard these resources.

Be it therefore resolved: To add our support to the Duncan-Neuberger park plan.

DOUGLAS COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM (1964)

We endorse the principles embodied in the proposal to establish an Oregon National Seashore Recreation Area.

DR. ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of our most thoughtful citizens is Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, now director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

On last Thursday I had the privilege of participating as a guest in a discussion at the center in Santa Barbara, Calif., on the problem of arms reduction and the American economy. I came away from this experience with a new appreciation for the leadership which Dr. Hutchins has provided down through the years in stimulating constructive thought in the United States.

Recently, Dr. Hutchins celebrated his 65th birthday—an event generously noted by the Washington Post editors.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the January 17, 1964, Washington Post, entitled "Challenger," be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHALLENGER

Robert Maynard Hutchins celebrates a 65th birthday today with no apparent diminution in the youthfulness, zest, and incorrigible optimism with which he faces the future. Because he looks at things as they are critically and often disparagingly, he is sometimes mistaken for a cynic but, in fact, he is preeminently an educator—which is to say he believes in the perfectability of man.

In education, Dr. Hutchins has always been an innovator, an experimenter. He brought fresh life to the Yale Law School when he became its youngest dean in 1928. He breathed fire into the University of Chicago as its president and chancellor. And he now conducts the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara as a standing and continuing challenge to contemporary life.

Dr. Hutchins' chosen instrument is the dialog. "I believe the discussion method is the only one that produces real education," he says. "It brings about a clarification." The center, under his direction, is not engaged in academic research or instruction. It tries, as he put it, "to provoke and pro-

mote thought by discussion to symbolize and advance the civilization we are seeking, the civilization of the dialog."

Inherited ideas and institutions need reevaluation. And it is to that task of reevaluation—of reinterpretation in the light of today's situation—that the center addresses itself. Dr. Hutchins' birthday is a good day to say thanks to him and to acknowledge the invigorating usefulness of his restless questing and questioning.

EGG PRICE DROP SERIOUS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last week the price of eggs broke seriously in the markets of the Nation. I received a large number of telegrams from South Dakota about the situation, and immediately contacted the Department of Agriculture, which will shortly start buying eggs for school lunch and other purposes to support the market.

Heavy marketing of eggs and weak prices at this time was foreseen, but the depth of the drop was surprising and I have watched the situation carefully for a clue to the cause.

In the Friday, February 14, edition of the Poultryman, trade paper of the industry, I found the explanation of the most expert observers for the seriousness of the drop. The lead story in the Poultryman was on the egg market and stated that the price break was "due to heavier production and extra volume to satisfy futures contracts."

On an inside page, the Urner-Barry report said:

Surplus eggs and selling pressure have disrupted the New York and Chicago wholesale [egg] markets.

Egg receipts in the New York market included both fresh shipments and short-held cars delivered against January futures contracts, the analysis explained, adding:

Offerings of these short-held cars are reported priced at various discounts below the spot-market levels, and this has exerted a depressing, disruptive, and undermining influence.

Mr. President, I have written the Secretary of Agriculture thanking him for his prompt decision to support the market and requesting information on the effect of futures trading in the present situation. In this letter, I have raised the question of need for congressional study of this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD the two articles to which I have alluded and a copy of my letter to Secretary Freeman.

I feel strongly that the study of vertical integration and chainstore marketing of food products suggested in the President's farm message should be made, and that futures markets should be examined very carefully at the same time.

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

EGG SURPLUS KEYS PRICES AT NEW YORK MART—FURTHER SLUMP ON TUESDAY INDICATES OVERSUPPLY; PROMOTIONS SLATED

NEW YORK.—Too many eggs, due to a combination of heavier production and extra volume to satisfy futures contracts, is the reason behind the weak egg market.

Tuesday's drop here, preceding the Lincoln's Birthday market holiday, was another step that has made February a glum month for eggmen. No appreciable price increase is in sight until Easter approaches.

Although receipts of top grade eggs here were not considered to be heavy, they were more than ample for needs. This, coupled with the surplus of midwestern eggs, continued to exert selling pressure.

Marketmen reported that retail orders this week were generally good. Chainstore features are anticipated and prices may reflect some favorable results from these efforts.

Weather generally has been favorable for production. This week's snowstorm, which moved up through Virginia, the Eastern Shore, and New Jersey dumped at least 6 inches in many areas, but its effect on production was deemed negligible.

The South has experienced higher production during the past few weeks and local eggs are in plentiful supply as well.

Most eggmen appeared willing to settle for Tuesday's level until the expected Easter demand results in improved prices.

EGG MARKET UNDERMINED BY SURPLUS, LINKED TO SHORT-HELD FUTURES LOTS

NEW YORK.—Surplus eggs and selling pressure have disrupted the New York and Chicago wholesale markets. Confidence has temporarily evaporated, but there is no ground for pessimism. Lenten demand lies just ahead.

Heavy selling pressure has come from surplus offerings of midwestern top whites and mixed colors. Receipts here from the Midwest have been heavy, and include both fresh shipments and short-held lots delivered against the January futures contracts, traded on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Offerings of these short-held cars are reported priced at varying discounts below the spot-market levels, and this has exerted a depressing, disruptive, and undermining influence. Before heavy deliveries of fresh eggs on the futures contracts began in Chicago, those in storage there had been reduced to 24,900 cases. But by the final delivery date, January 31, stocks had been built to 125,400 cases. Of this total, probably 80,000 cases were of eggs delivered in the last week of January. These now pose a threat to the market.

Since dealers have expressed both loudly and widely their loss of confidence in the market, the average buyer has held purchasing to a minimum for more than a week. Further pressure on the price structure is not unlikely.

Offerings of smaller sizes are relatively light. A few more mediums were available during the past week, and some chains have featured them.

Hen turkey prices remained unchanged during the past week, but sentiment weakened noticeably. Lower offering prices have failed to attract business. Only limited purchasing for Washington's Birthday is expected. Purchasing for retail sale has been light on consumer-sized toms, 14 to 22 pounds, but limited stocks contribute to a steadier feeling.

A lessening of sales to suppliers and further processors has cut into the market strength of toms over 22 pounds. Rolls, roasts, and major parts continue in good demand. Frozen fowl are meeting seasonally good sale. Rock Cornish hens and roasters move well.

FEBRUARY 14, 1964.

HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First, I want to express my appreciation to the Department for your very prompt decision to buy eggs for school lunch, relief food programs, and sur-

plus removal to offset the serious drop in prices which has just occurred. I know that the Department's prompt decision to start buying as early as possible is appreciated by thousands of producers in my own State alone.

Second, I am enclosing a reproduction of two articles from the Poultryman for Friday, February 14, a poultry industry trade paper. As you will note, the lead story reports that a surplus "and extra volume to satisfy futures contracts, is the reason behind the weak egg market." The second story attributes the decline to a surplus and "short-held futures lots."

I would appreciate all the information the Department can give me as to the effect of futures trading and futures transactions in this serious decline of egg market prices. If there is not sufficient information available to the Department to determine the effect of futures trading in relation to the decline, I expect to ask for a congressional study to be made and would appreciate your views and advice in relation to the need for such congressional action.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

FAILURE OF ECONOMIC QUARANTINE OF CUBA

MR. HART. Mr. President, the Detroit News in its editorial yesterday spoke the hard truth about our efforts effectively to apply economic quarantine to Cuba. We can wish it were otherwise, but we serve ourselves poorly to pretend this effort goes well. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD.

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

U.S. QUARANTINE OF CUBA A FAILURE—TRADE CURBS DON'T WORK

The U.S. economic quarantine of Cuba is a failure because other nations won't let it work. The other nations are not confined to the Soviet Union, Red China, and their respective camp followers. The quarantine breakers now include our major cold war allies.

They refuse to accept our thesis that Americans are, because of their responsibility for hemispheric defense, in effect in a military confrontation with Castro. They rate him as an undoubted nuisance to us, but not a menace. He is not in their front yard, so they can afford to be relatively objective.

They are willing to agree that there is some validity to our contention that an American quarantine can make Castro so costly to Khrushchev that Moscow will throw in its hand and not try to underwrite more Red-inspired revolutions in Latin America. But their counterargument is that a trade boycott only stiffens Cuban resistance to us and tends to present Khrushchev as the only friend of the Cuban people.

The visit of Britain's Sir Alec Douglas-Home to Mr. Johnson, and their publicly admitted failure to settle their differences about whether it's wise to trade with Cuba—or any other Communist nation—revealed in stark simplicity the growing divergence between this Nation and its allies. At issue is not only how to wage economic cold war, but whether that sort of war should be waged at all.

Our wheat deal with Moscow did not alone trigger this split. Trade between free West Europe and Red East Europe is increasing steadily in a reversal to a traditional European pattern. Canada stepped in and completed massive grain deals with both Russia and China.

The British, who have no surplus food to sell anyone, promptly sold \$11 million worth

of buses to Castro, brushing aside our protests. And Canada, France, and West Germany were already doing business with Havana, while Spain, Italy, and Japan joined the lineup for trade deals with Cuba.

Something else sparked the rush. Castro completed a deal with Khrushchev that guaranteed a market for Cuban sugar until 1970. A firm price of 6 cents a pound protected Castro against world market price fluctuations. Khrushchev was really Castro's "sugar daddy." Havana had money to buy the world's goods that America denied it. Our economic quarantine of our offshore island was now in disarray.

"Trade boycotts don't work," Sir Alec Home said bluntly in Washington. Except in war, they don't. West Germany trades with East Germany and is rushing through deals with all the satellites. De Gaulle will trade with anyone—particularly, now, Red China. The Common Market won't hesitate to do business with its Communist neighbors. And with the Soviet Union launched on a \$4 billion-a-year fertilizer crash program to bail itself out of its agricultural mess, those who have what Khrushchev can buy will be beating a trail to his door.

In a sense, the failure of our Cuban quarantine can be salutary. In microcosm it presents a problem for us that is worldwide. Our allies may not be behaving as we would like, but they are not going to buck a trend. It is this Nation that will have to face a readjustment in policy.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

MR. HART. Mr. President, I have been requested to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions of the National Council of the Federal Bar Association, the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and the United Nations League of Lawyers, memorializing the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. These resolutions are not only appropriately worded, but they bear a significant message from the legal profession in respect of a great President who believed in the rule of law rather than the rule of men.

The activities of the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association deserve to be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. I have a short prepared statement on these activities, and I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the aforementioned resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association is composed exclusively of attorneys serving the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The 300 members of the chapter include Senators, Representatives, committee counsel, congressional staff assistants, and Library of Congress lawyers.

In addition to an active program designed to meet the need of congressional lawyers, the chapter conducts a wide variety of activities for the benefit of all members of the Capitol Hill community. One of the most outstanding projects in the chapter's service to staff aids is its congressional orientation programs. During this Congress, briefings have been held on major legislation, such as the tax bill; the provisions of the franking laws; the intricacies of legislative parliamentary procedure; the handling of cases involving the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and the services of the

Office of Legislative Counsel and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The chapter has inaugurated a series of programs designed to help staff members develop proficiency in the drafting of bills and statutes. This series will also serve to enable congressional staff aids to analyze and interpret the adequacy of proposed legislation. The first speaker in this series was Dr. Charles Zinn, House law revision counsel and principal architect of the United States Code, who spoke on "How To Use the United States Code."

The chapter's monthly luncheon programs are open to all Members of Congress and their staff, whether or not they are lawyers. During the past year the chapter sponsored such timely and provocative programs as: Representative John V. Lindsay, Republican, of New York, on "Congress, Congressional Staffs and Conflicts of Interest"; Senator John S. Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama, "Supreme Court Decisions on Prayer in the Public Schools"; Theodore Sorenson, special counsel to the President of the United States, "Decisionmaking in the White House"; Jack Anderson, Washington correspondent for *Parade* magazine, "Capitol Hill Confidential"; Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury, "The President's 1963 Tax Program"; Representative Arch A. Moore, Jr., Republican, of West Virginia, "Aid to Indigent Criminal Defendants in Federal Courts"; Representative John E. Moss, Democrat, of California, "Congressional Access to Information"; Roscoe Drummond, nationally syndicated columnist, "Does Congress Have a Future?" and W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, "Foreign Policy Today."

In order to promote a deep understanding and better relations between the executive and legislative branches, the chapter has instituted a series of informal luncheons featuring the general counsels of the various executive agencies and departments. First speaker in this series was Arnold Ordman, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board. A program designed to foster better relations between the legislative and judicial branches is being planned for the month of March. The chapter will be hosts at a special reception honoring the Federal Judiciary during the Judicial Conference to be held here in Washington on March 16, 1964.

The Capitol Hill chapter in May 1963, sponsored a Law Day hearing, in conjunction with the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, on the topic "Law in a Totalitarian Society." Special guests of the chapter at the hearing were several high school classes in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland area. The witnesses at this hearing included Dr. Sidney Jacoby, professor of law at Georgetown University and special counsel at the Nuremberg trials, on Nazi Germany; Dr. William Solym-Fekete, former member of the Hungarian Parliament, on Communist Hungary; and Dr. Luis E. Aguilar, former professor of philosophy of law at Cuba's Oriente University, on Castro Cuba. The statements and evidence included in the hearing were profoundly indicative of extreme deprivations of liberties in totalitarian states, and of the cherished traditions of democracy among freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Law Day, U.S.A., May 1, 1964, is not in the too distant future. It behooves all Members of Congress, especially those who are members of the legal profession, to think seriously about the fundamental tenets of our legal way of life and of our duties not only to our Government but to our profession of the law.

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great American President, dedicated to principles

of the rule of law, of freedom, and the equality of men; and consecrated to their fulfillment. He was a strong and qualified leader and an inspiring head of the Executive Department. Let it be recorded here that we so regarded him, and that we share the depth of the sense of loss and sorrow of all Americans because of his tragic and untimely passing.

Let it further be recorded here that he has by his devotion, courage, and determination set for us, as lawyers and as servants or former servants of the general government, an example which will continue to urge us toward these goals through all the time which can be foreseen.

PRAYER

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of people; give unto the Lord glory and strength. Honor and majesty are before Him; strength and beauty are in His sanctuary.

Let us pray.
Blessed and glorious Lord God Almighty, by whose power, wisdom, and love all things are sanctified, enlightened, and made perfect, be merciful unto us. We beseech Thee to cause Thy face to shine upon us.

O Thou who art the Creator and lover of all men, by whom all souls do live, we give thanks to Thee for having permitted John Fitzgerald Kennedy to dwell and work among us, recalling all in him that made others love him. We thank Thee for the goodness and truth that have passed from his life into the lives of others and made the world richer for his presence. We bless and praise Thee for the example he has given us of personal integrity and courage and of hope and love and devotion to duty for this our country, and of love and concern for Thy people everywhere, not only for their physical well-being but also their intellectual and spiritual well-being, and for his constant desire for and effort to bring Thy peace to this world.

Grant we beseech Thee to his widow and children and to the other members of his family the comfort of Thy presence and the ministry of Thy Holy Spirit, renewing within them the gifts of patience and enduring love. Grant that Thy strength and consolation may be given them and endue them with holy thoughts and a loving hope.

We thank Thee that deep in the human heart is an unquenchable trust that life does not end with death, that the Father, who made us, will care for us beyond the bounds of vision, even as He has cared for us in this earthly world.

O Lord our God, in whom light for the darkness resideth for the Godly, we pray Thee in this troublesome time to grant that the spirit of wisdom may save our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, from all false choices, and that in Thy light he may find light for his guidance, and in Thy straight path he may not stumble.

We beseech Thee O God to forgive those national sins which do so easily beset us, our wanton waste of the wealth of soil and sea, our desecration of natural beauty, our heedlessness of those who come after us if only we be served; our love of money, our contempt for small things and our worship of big things, our neglect of backward peoples and minority groups, our cults of hate for those whose views differ from ours and our pride of life. We humbly beseech Thee that we may prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Endue with the spirit of wisdom all those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government 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; and, Beloved Father, grant each of us guid-

ance to recognize and strength to bear our individual responsibilities.

Now unto the King Eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.

UNITED NATIONS LEAGUE OF LAWYERS

Whereas the sudden and untimely death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy occurred on November 22, 1963, at Dallas, Tex.; and

Whereas President Kennedy had long actively supported the purposes and objectives of the United Nations to the furtherance of which the United Nations League of Lawyers is also dedicated; and

Whereas President Kennedy has performed outstanding service in furthering the humanitarian purposes of the United Nations not only in the United States of America but throughout the world by supporting national and international programs to eliminate disease, to eliminate unjust discrimination between peoples based on race, color, creed, or national origin, to provide education and to house and promote the welfare of the young and the aged; and

Whereas President Kennedy was for many years a strong leader in activities designed to promote world peace and has brought about adoption of measures such as the nuclear test ban treaty, the Alliance for Progress and has taken steps in support of the splendid work and the continuance of the United Nations; and

Whereas the death of President Kennedy has caused great sorrow and a feeling of loss to people throughout the world who had been encouraged by his devotion, courage and determination in support of the objectives above set forth and of the rule of law in the world:

Resolved, That we, members of the United Nations League of Lawyers, hereby express our feeling of concern over the crime against the United States and against free peoples throughout the world that was committed in the assassination of President Kennedy, and our feeling of sympathy to his family and to the people of the United States of America, and at the same time hereby memorialize and commend to high esteem the memory of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

RESOLUTION OF THE CAPITOL HILL CHAPTER OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION MEMORIALIZING THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Whereas the late President of the United States John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great President and leader who was dedicated to the principle of the rule of law; and

Whereas he sponsored, supported, and was dedicated to measures to improve the welfare and equality of mankind and to insure peace in the world; and

Whereas this chapter of the Federal Bar Association feels that all functions of the chapter of a social or quasi-social nature should be canceled during the official 30-day period of mourning for the late President of the United States; and

Whereas this chapter has scheduled a December monthly luncheon meeting and has made preparations together with the Empire State chapter for a large reception in the New York Yacht Club, New York City, on the evening of December 18, 1962, in honor of the Federal judiciary; and

Whereas as lawyers, the members of this chapter wish to express our sympathy in the great and tragic loss of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this chapter hereby memorializes and commends to high esteem the memory of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a truly great President of the United States.

It is directed that the aforementioned events of the chapter be canceled and that

a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the widow of the late President as a token of sympathy and of great respect.

CITATION TO CHARLES H. STODDARD BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on February 4 the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts gave a conservation citation to Charles H. Stoddard, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. I am delighted that this has occurred because it is evidence of the increasing effectiveness with which this Bureau is performing an important conservation role. In the Western United States there are over 180 million acres of public lands which it administers.

We have as our basic responsibility the preservation of a fertile mantle of soil on our Nation. I have long believed that to do this we must protect our water resources by controlling runoff and conserving the use of water. On the great rangeland area managed by this agency, there is a paramount need to make certain that the grass resource is used for the benefit of livestock and wildlife in a manner which meets our conservation obligations.

One of the finest ways in which the Bureau of Land Management can develop an aggressive and effective program of soil and water conservation is through close working relationships with ranchers, farmers, and other landowners. One of the most effective groups with which the Bureau can work is the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. For these reasons I am delighted to see that the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts has given a citation for conservation achievements to the Bureau of Land Management and to its Director, Charles H. Stoddard.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the citation in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS CITATION TO CHARLES H. STODDARD

For his consistent efforts to develop an effective conservation partnership between soil and water conservation districts and the U.S. Department of the Interior in areas of intermingled public and private land ownership throughout the country;

For his continuing recognition that local people and local institutions are a source of strength in the long campaign to protect and develop the Nation's natural resources;

For his perceptive studies in the field of farm forestry and his invaluable encouragement to soil and water conservation districts in asserting their contribution to forest management and production; and

For his evident and gratifying determination to act forcefully in behalf of conservation and multiple use of the Nation's reserved lands in constructive alliance with local conservation districts and other organizations directly concerned:

We, the officers and directors of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, are honored to present to Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Bureau

of Land Management, the Distinguished Service Award of this association.

Given in Kansas City, Mo., on the fifth day of February 1964.

MARION S. MONK, JR.,
President.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE ON HEALTH

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, President Johnson's message on health to Congress on February 10, I believe, is one of the most comprehensive and important statements regarding widespread domestic needs that I have seen proposed.

The message appropriately related to all our citizens, old and young, rich and poor, for a first-class nation cannot afford to have second-class services for some of its people. We need to promote progress in every way possible in all the fields of medicine: in the training of needed medical and nursing personnel, in the construction of necessary facilities, and in the development of new and better drugs. And we need to make the benefits of this progress available to all our people, at low cost or free if they are poor, at a fair cost if they are not.

The relationship between rising health hazards and urban centers of population is clearly established. So is that of ill health and poverty. Rhode Island, which is almost all urban in its structure, has a high rate of unemployment and a high percentage of persons over 65 who will benefit greatly if we can marshal our forces in Congress and enact the President's program. It can be enacted, we know it should be enacted, and we must dedicate our efforts to see that it is enacted. My pledge is to that goal.

LOW SALARIES OF OVERSEA TEACHERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, ever since 1960 teachers in our overseas schools under the Defense Department have been seeking to secure salary adjustments to observe the principle of comparability with stateside teacher pay adopted in the Overseas Teachers Pay Act of 1959. They have repeatedly run into excuses, delays, and denials of their requests, even though a Defense Department study itself some time ago made a recommendation for an increase in per-pupil expenditures from the present \$285 to \$325.

The "Washington Report" to the Christian Science Monitor recently recounted the anger of the teachers in these schools, which comprises the Nation's seventh largest school system. They finally were granted a \$2-a-week raise this year, the first since the \$2 increase given in 1960. During the same period, according to the National Education Association, teacher salaries in the United States have risen by 15.3 percent. On receiving the small increase, teachers have been returning the money to the Defense Department as an insult, in effect saying "If this is the best you can do, keep it."

On Wednesday a delegation from the National Education Association and its Overseas Teachers Association is meet-

ing with Assistant Secretary Cyrus Vance on this problem. On the answers from that meeting depends the question of legal action they have been empowered to initiate to secure the carrying out of the mandate of the Overseas Teachers Pay Act of 1959. Since the president of the NEA is Dr. Robert Wyatt, of Indiana, I have taken a personal interest in this problem and sincerely hope that the Defense Department may be willing to settle the matter with justice for the teachers after all the lengthy delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Christian Science Monitor report printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON REPORT: \$2 TROUBLE

(By Josephine Ripley)

Ever get a raise you wanted to return with a "can you spare it" note?

American teachers overseas have, and they are sending it back to Uncle Sam in indignant rejection.

These are the teachers in schools for the children of military personnel. They are teaching in some 285 schools in 25 countries.

Letters returning a \$2-a-week raise are arriving with embarrassing regularity on the desk of Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and some are even going to President Johnson at the White House.

Teachers feel they are entitled to more; that they were promised more under the Overseas Teachers Pay Act of 1959; that an adjustment is long overdue; and if all Uncle Sam can give them by way of a raise is \$2 a week, he needs it more than they do.

So far, nearly \$2,000 has been returned. The Pentagon is attempting to send it back with "nice letters," as someone put it. The teachers are not appeased.

They point out that Congress voted in 1959 to bring their salaries up to those received by teachers in comparable schools in the United States.

Immediately following this, in 1960, they received a \$2-a-week increase. They were disappointed that it wasn't more, but they felt further increases would follow. They didn't; they stopped.

Then the Defense Department eked out another \$2 raise for the 1963-64 school year. This was when the teachers blew up. The revolt started in Madrid when American teachers there affiliated with the Overseas Federation of Teachers, began stuffing the \$2 in envelopes and sending them back.

Almost simultaneously, American teachers in Ankara, Turkey, affiliated with the Overseas Education Association had the same idea.

Now it is an organized drive, with teachers from all over the world joining in this emphatic rejection.

The Pentagon claims that the "arbitrary" \$285 per pupil limitation on funds available for the Defense Department's overseas dependents schools makes it impossible for them to make any substantial adjustment in salaries.

The National Education Association, which is backing teachers to the hilt, says the \$285 limitation has no bearing on the case, and that it has not prevented salary increases in the case of school administrators.

The NEA earlier warned teachers against taking overseas jobs because of the low, out-of-line salaries. The Defense Department took it lightly claiming the NEA warning had only helped to interest teachers in overseas schools. There was no dearth of applicants.

But officials may be less casual about it now.

Although the 1965 budget increases the per pupil expenditure in overseas schools to \$295, the NEA points out that this is an increase of only 3.5 percent and too little to take care of the salary increase due teachers.

Overseas teachers are paid from \$4,435 to \$6,215. The average salaries in large urban school districts—with which overseas salaries are equated by policy directive—range from \$4,941 to \$8,480. Teachers salaries in the United States have risen by 15.3 percent since 1960, says the NEA.

It has been estimated that teachers overseas "have lost more than \$4 million in the past 3 years due to the failure of the Department of Defense to pay the salaries rightfully due them." This is the way William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA figures it.

The NEA deplors school conditions overseas, describing them as "of the horse and buggy era" while the Military Establishment with which they are associated "is geared to an age of space exploration."

The overseas school system is the Nation's seventh largest. It employs 7,262 teachers for 170,000 children from the 1st through the 12th grades.

"We are not asking special favors for the teachers of overseas dependents schools," says Mr. Carr, "but we are asking that a law of Congress be respected and that the discriminatory treatment now accorded to these teachers be replaced by justice."

Until it is, teachers overseas are intent on "rubbing it in" by returning a raise they feel is too little, too late, and too bad.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Richard P. Gifford, in Lynchburg, Va., on the subject of the separation of church and state.

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

GIRDING FOR THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE TODAY

(An address by Richard P. Gifford in Lynchburg, Va.)

"Our father's God, to thee,
Author of liberty,
To thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

—Written 1832.

The State Commissioner of Education in New York declared in 1963 that henceforth the above stanza of "America" could no longer be sung as a part of official school exercises. This decision was an extension of the "freedom" from official prayer ruling in the New York State Regents Prayer case. That the highest level position in the field of education in the largest and most influential State in the Union could reach this conclusion from the Supreme Court rulings is a disturbing revelation of the general lack of understanding of the relationship of church and state and of the basic structure of freedom. Even those, on the other side of the issue who have objected most violently to the Supreme Court ruling, have failed to understand the basic issues. While they fight skirmishes for prayer, they may lose the battle for freedom.

The basic objective of this paper will be to bring recognition to the fact we are in a battle for freedom—a battle of ideas for which we must put on an armor of understanding, education and dedication.

THE SETTING FOR THE BATTLE

The history of man can be considered a record of his struggles to achieve a full, free and happy life. He has continually fought with his fellow man with words or with clubs to convince him that one path to the ultimate goal was better than another. At mid-20th century, however, the clubs available have become so large that a few can annihilate all mankind, including the protagonist. The nature of the general and continuing war for ultimate liberty is, therefore, changing. The "battles" now are being fought with ideas. Sometimes the attack is from outside and sometimes from within. Sometimes it is open and obvious; other times it is furtive and sinister. Almost all are being fought under the banner of freedom—but it remains for the bystander to determine what freedom and whose freedom.

ENTER THE REGENTS PRAYER CASE

It was under this banner of freedom that in 1958 a group of U.S. citizens sought "freedom" from the practice of prayer in the public schools of New York. Their argument was based on the concept of separation of church and state as documented in the first amendment to our Constitution. The case ultimately found its way to the U.S. Supreme Court, and on June 25, 1962, it ruled in favor of the plaintiff.

The Court ruled simply that the State, in this case the New York State Regents, could not prescribe a prayer for use in the opening of the schoolday. The ruling did not involve relief from physical oppression nor did it force others to lay down arms; it simply asked the State to cease asking its children to say something.

And, yet, the outcries of indignation were the greatest in the Court's history. That this seemingly simple quest for a "freedom" unleashed an era of volatile and expansive public debate can, however, be a most rewarding product of our governmental system. For out of it, we have been given an opportunity to reexamine our political heritage. This naturally has led to study and evaluation of the relationship of Christianity to our political system. In this study, if we follow through, we will find a basic understanding of freedom to guide us through the stormy political era of many quests for freedom being made and yet to be made under alluring but fraudulent banners.

THE CHURCH AND STATE RELATIONSHIP THROUGH HISTORY

If we go all the way back to prehistoric times and make some suppositions about the earliest social groupings of multiple families, as determined from informative artifacts, we would first find a society built on authority of physical strength. Then, slowly but surely, sagacity in development and application of the human resources of the group became an equally significant factor. Some people discovered the multiplying force of "motivation" of others and made good use of it to obtain their objectives. "Motivation" was built on various form of superstitious practice developed and encouraged by the leader. It was not long before the superstitions became rules and regulations of a god system with the leader firmly established as being favored and in direct communication with the gods.

In the earliest recorded history, almost all political systems were, in a sense, theocracies. Religion was the binding force of a nation. The king, in order to have access to this unseen force, naturally had to be a part of the religious system. Either he was the overall head and the spokesman for the gods or he provided all power of his official office to support a religion—so long, of course, as that religion provided support for him.

This basic relationship between church and state continued to be standard practice even in the earliest Hebrew nations and, later, in the earliest Christian nations. One

has only to recall the long recorded history of Western Europe from A.D. 400 to about A.D. 1600. Monarchs were subject to sanction, approval and sometimes control by the church. The monarchs, in sense, were only lay administrators for a religious hierarchy.

There were, of course, frequent revolts from this relationship. The most interesting of these revolts, as measured by the impact they had on our history, were those in England and early America.

The first challenge to the authority of the church came in 1172, when Henry II chose to solve his problems by arranging the murder of Thomas A. Becket. The latter, as Archbishop of Canterbury, had championed church rights when the King sought jurisdiction over the clergy. Following additional conflicts in the Holy Roman Empire, the papacy actually rebounded with new energy and, under Pope Innocent III, papal power reached its height in all matters of state. It was not until the second half of the 14th century that the conflict arose again in England. It then arose in the interest of rights of a national church versus the papacy.

It was at that time that John Wycliffe translated the Bible into English and pushed for the rights of all men to have access to the Scriptures. He was supported in these efforts by Edward III; but the church decried him as a heretic and his life was lived out in a retirement of escape. The seeds for the future split from Rome had, however, been planted. And, in addition, the concept of the common man having an individual right to read the Bible for himself was destined to have tremendous impact on future history, particularly with the advent of the printing press and additional support from such men as Huss, Luther, and Calvin.

But the undercurrent of religious reform did not really burst forth in England until Henry VIII challenged the power of the pope over the latter's refusal to dissolve his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. By declaring himself head of the Church of England, Henry VIII sparked developments beyond what appeared to be only a political struggle. He effectively supplied early encouragement for the spiritual revolution of protestantism in England that was just then developing.

When Parliament gave King Henry VIII the title of Governor of the Church of England by the Act of Supremacy in 1534, the first phase of the conflict between church and state had been concluded. England had dissolved its allegiance to a broad church power and in its stead developed a church of her own. At the same time, the Act of Uniformity established standards of worship along with fines and penalties for disobedience. The ties between the state and this new church were, if anything, even stronger than those to Rome had ever been, but the position of the monarch was clearly on top as governor of the church.

LIFE UNDER STATE CHURCH

Concurrently, however, there was a significant new movement of education in religious affairs that was made possible through wider dissemination of printed copies of the Bible in English. William Tyndale had been a prime mover in this technique of education and had once said to a bishop, "If God spares my life, I will cause a boy that driveth the plow shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost." As more and more people discovered Christianity for themselves, and as the new Anglican Church tended to retain some of the offensive characteristics of the Roman Church, a multiplicity of new church groups or denominations naturally arose.

The state, in support of its national church, actively suppressed the rise of any new religious views. But, in 1649, the pressure for change became so great that Oliver

Cromwell was able to take over in a form of dictatorship. Although a Puritan, he proclaimed religious liberty for all—except, of course, those who believed in "popery or prelacy." And, in this denial of liberty, the followers of Cromwell were particularly savage.

When the monarch and the Church of England were restored in 1658, the most natural escape for those still seeking greater religious freedom lay in coming to the New World just then developing from colonies established in Virginia and New England. The vast majority of early colonists, who sought religious freedom, established virtual theocracies that did provide freedom for one church at the price of suppression of all other churches. It was a sort of one-way freedom.

One hundred and fifty years later, at the time of the forming of the Union after the Declaration of Independence, only 2 of the 13 States allowed religious freedom—Rhode Island and Virginia. All others demanded certain beliefs, ranging from belief in divine inspiration of the Bible to complete acceptance of a particular religious establishment.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

It was at this time that the second conflict between church and state became more clearly defined. The stories of both Rhode Island and Virginia provide good background for the development of the new concept of separation of church and state that finally found its way into our Constitution.

The seeds for the concept of separation had been planted back in the early days of the Reformation. In 1581, Robert Browne, who organized the First Congregational Church, stated, "A true church is a company or number of believers who by a willing covenant made with their God are under the government of God and Christ." He further contended that civil government should be respected but have no authority over the church.

In 1611, the Baptists, under the leadership of J. Smythe, issued a declaration of faith, which stated: "The magistrate is not to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion."

Shortly after the founding of the Puritan theocracy in Massachusetts, Roger Williams put these thoughts into action when he defied its authority. He argued against the union of church and state and the right of civil authorities to punish violation of the first five commandments. He also argued for treatment of the Indians as human beings with their rights to land to be respected. In 1639, he helped establish a new colony in Providence, R.I., under the Baptists. This colony accorded religious freedom to all with an equal share in government.

Virginia started with the same church-state relationship as existed in England. In 1619, the Church of England was declared the state church to be supported by general taxation. Other religions were not oppressed but neither were they given any support from the state.

The prosperity of Virginia in its first 150 years built an extremely well-educated and well read aristocracy, who studied the works of the many Protestant reformers and the works of Bacon and Locke. From these studies, such men as George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison developed further the concept of religious freedom. In 1776, the Virginia Bill of Rights contained the following in article XVI:

"Be it enacted by the general assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever; nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in

matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

Then, in 1785, Jefferson composed and pushed for enactment of the Act for Religious Freedom in Virginia, which stated: "That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity, toward each other."

It was the sense of this act that was carried over into the third article of the Bill of Rights, which later became the first amendment to our Constitution, which states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The authority of this amendment was later brought to the local level in the 14th amendment.

This brief summary of what took place does not, however, do justice to the tremendous amount of thought, discussion, and writing done in the 17th and 18th centuries on the reasonableness of the philosophy of separation of church and state. Far too many had experienced, both in Europe and in the new Colonies, the curtailment of freedom exercised by churches which were backed by the power of the state. In forming the United States, not only were they seeking independence from a foreign and despotic ruler, but also they were seeking a method of government that would prevent future curtailment of individual liberties, whether derived from a secular or religious base.

With incorporation of the first amendment to our Constitution, the second major conflict in church-state relationships was concluded. The concept of separation of the two powers became the law of the land. This philosophy has now stood for almost 200 years, being tested only in terms of the degree of separation, as in the New York State prayer case.

While the first amendment would appear to be quite explicit, there are those who argue that prayer does not establish a religion. There are others who argue that any official reference to God is in conflict with the first amendment. And there are still others who are content to stand on the sidelines, viewing the entire matter as an exercise in splitting hairs.

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE TODAY

Let us now examine the church-state issue with the backdrop of history as related and determine for ourselves the depth and significance of this modern controversy.

First, we should make note of the trend of history—at least the history of Western man. As related, church and state started out combined in the authority of a single leader of the nation. As religions crossed borders and became common to more than one nation, a separate hierarchy and final authority for the church had to be established. For a while, individual nations could work with this common religious authority, but when it appeared that the power of the national leader was being lessened by the leaders of the church, there naturally arose a series of conflicts which ultimately concluded with the establishment of varying degrees of national churches with or without ties to a common religious source. In most of these national churches, the governing authority was given to the state.

Under both these arrangements—state and an international church or state and a national church—there had been continual harassment and abridgment of individual freedoms of conscience. When the church's powers of persuasion proved ineffective, the

authority and power of the state twisted the screw. It was not surprising, therefore, that the general quest for freedom would seek to separate the authority of the state from sanctioning or supporting any one church. This is where our Founding Fathers took their stand and this is where we stand today.

Note that the authority over conscience started at the top in partnership with the state. Then it slowly came down to either a very local level or to the individual himself. Where will it go next? Will each person evolve his own authority of conscience? Or will some new authority be established?

Surely, unless there is some common authority within group living, some polarity in the consciences of all beyond the details of civil law, there will be no true freedom. Therefore, by arguing for or against separation of church and state, we are being swept into a basic battle for freedom—a battle to be fought by words and ideas from legislators, judges, ministers, and all concerned people.

FREEDOM UNDER WHOM?

Here are the battle lines: On one side, there are those who argue for absolute separation of church and state. To obtain maximum freedom of conscience, they argue for the elimination of all references to religion of any sort in all official state actions. Interestingly, there are many in the Christian Church who support this point of view on the basis that the church should not have to depend on any secular authority for it to do its work in trying to establish guides and goals for individual consciences. The absolutists in separation find support for their views in the first amendment and the lack of any mention of God in the Constitution. They contend that only with complete separation can we avoid all attempts by the state, no matter how seemingly inobtrusive, to control the conscience of free men.

On the other side, there are those who argue for separation up to a point. They argue that this Nation was founded under the concept that there was still one higher authority than the state (or, more correctly, the people who formed the state). They contend that our Founding Fathers, when granting religious liberty, sought only to eliminate the favoring of any one sect of the Christian church rather than to eliminate belief in God. For evidence of the basic beliefs of the Founding Fathers, they can refer to such quotations as:

Those in the Declaration of Independence: "To which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them." "Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

From Jefferson's "View on the Rights of British Americans": "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time; the hand of force may destroy, but cannot disjoin them."

From Jefferson's seal: "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God" (attributed to Ben Franklin).

From John Adams to Abigail, July 2, 1776 (after adoption of resolution for Independence): "It ought to be celebrated as a day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty."

During the Constitutional Convention, Ben Franklin said: "We have been assured sir, in the sacred writings that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel."

And there are many, many more. This group also argues against absolute separation on the basis that the elimination of all mention of a Supreme Being in any official notices would, in fact, support the "religion" of "atheism."

The basic issue these two factions are fighting over, however, is freedom—or, more descriptively, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." What is the ultimate in the freedom? Is it the right for everyone to do as he pleases—to be master of his own destiny to the maximum extent possible? Such a fictitious utopia would, of course, be no utopia at all. It would be a jungle in which the stronger feeds on the weaker. The situation can be diagrammed as a multiplicity of vectors in a common area—all bumping into or crossing over one another.

Ultimate freedom will certainly not be found via this route. What is lacking is some force to polarize the vectors in one basic direction. Then, at least all can exist together without conflict and friction.

Freedom can only be found under some force. The source of this force and the degree to which it willingly directs our lives then becomes the determining factor for the extent of true freedom obtained.

Now, let's relate the previous descriptions of the antagonists in this modern church-state issue to these observations regarding freedom.

On one side, we have a group that endorses no polarity except that established by the state itself through civil laws. This type of polarity in its ultimate is very little different from a dictatorship—the only difference remaining with us for now is the right of a majority of the vectors to lean in a certain direction and thereby be able to influence the future polarity of the entire group.

On the other side, we have a group that endorses a polarity of conscience established through the authority of God. This group argues that we are a Nation founded under God and, hence, each of us answers to one authority higher than the state. This same group contends that with this willing acceptance of polarity of conscience there is less need for polarity to be supplied by the state. They argue that in the ultimate, with the arrival of God's Kingdom on earth, there would exist true freedom with no need for civil laws.

THE ATTACK ON FREEDOM UNDER GOD

We are, therefore, at a critical and, unfortunately, little-understood crossroad. Do we seek freedom under man governing with the consent of the governed, or do we seek freedom under God? Some consider the most recent Supreme Court rulings as signs that we have already made the decision. If one reads the rulings carefully, however, he will find that this is not so. The Supreme Court made no ruling on this basic concept; it ruled only that an official prayer in school was in conflict with the 1st and 14th amendments. Voluntary prayers are still permitted and a test case on this was just recently successful in a Federal district court.

A more direct attack on the heart of the issue is just now entering the court system. A group of parents in California have complained against the use of the phrase "under God" contained in the official pledge of allegiance. This phrase was inserted by congressional action in 1954 by those who had the foresight to see this major issue in formation. There are, of course, many other references to religion that we can expect to be under continued attack; among these are: the second verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner," which contains the words "In God is Our Trust"; our coins and paper currency contain the phrase "In God We Trust"; both Houses of the Congress employ chaplains and open their sessions with an invocation and prayer; our courts open and close each session with the supplication "God save the United States and this honorable court"; the phrase "In God We Trust" appears over the chair of the Speaker of the House of

Representatives; the great seal of the United States shows a symbolic all-seeing eye, etc.

There are many more references in use supporting the concept of this being a nation under God, but should the California case be successful in removing "under God" from the pledge of allegiance, then we can expect almost all of these symbols and reminders to be attacked and removed one by one. The prayer cases were vulnerable, because they tended to go beyond supporting merely the existence and authority of God. This is not the case in the present attack, and for all practical purposes those who believe in the need for recognition of an authority higher than man himself, now find themselves defending the last yard.

Still, this battle for freedom under God can and must be won. To do this, we must follow these three steps:

First, we must understand fully the nature of the conflict; read the opinions in full, read the commentaries, discuss the issues, and speak out.

Second, we must let our legislators know how we feel. There are many bills before the Houses designed to head off any further attacks against the concept that this Nation was founded under God.

Third, we must stand up and live for our beliefs in God and in His word that became flesh. We must not fail to do what we would want to do in His name and for His sake. Failing to take action that we know is right in the eyes of God only invites civil law to supplant the authority of God.

No better warning of the present situation has ever been given them than that written over 100 years ago by a keen political analyst who looked at us from the outside. In his writings on "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville said:

"When the religion of a people is destroyed, doubt gets hold of the higher powers of the intellect, and half paralyzes all of the others. Every man accustoms himself to have only confused and changing notions on the subjects most interesting to his fellow-creatures and himself. His opinions are ill-defended and easily abandoned; and, in despair of ever resolving by himself the hard problems respecting the destiny of man, he ignobly submits to think no more about them. Such a condition cannot but enervate the soul, relax the springs of the will, and prepare a people for servitude. Not only does it happen, in such a case, that they allow their freedom to be taken from them; they frequently themselves surrender it. When there is no longer any principle of authority in religion, any more than in politics, men are speedily frightened at the aspect of this unbounded independence. The constant agitation of all surrounding things alarms and exhausts them. As everything is at sea in the sphere of the mind, they determine at least that the mechanism of society shall be firm and fixed; and, as they cannot resume their ancient belief, they assume a master.

"For my own part, I doubt whether man can ever support at the same time complete religious independence and entire political freedom. And I am inclined to think that, if faith be wanting in him, he must be subject; and if he be free, he must believe."

Gentlemen, let us solemnly vow to gird ourselves for this most crucial battle for freedom. As the fourth stanza of "America" states, God is "the author of liberty." Without our Christian heritage, which guarantees freedom under God, we would become just another state to rise and fall in man's search for ultimate freedom. Let us put on an armor of understanding, education and dedication and go forth to our legislators, our ministers and to all our fellow Americans. Let us defeat this attack on the very essence of true freedom.

FILM BASED ON THE LIFE OF DR. NORMAN VINCENT PEALE TO BE SHOWN FOR SENATORS, REPRESENTATIVES, AND STAFF PERSONNEL ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has recently been my privilege to view a worthwhile motion picture based on the life of one of America's most widely respected religious leaders—Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. The film, "One Man's Way," was produced by United Artists and will premiere in Washington, D.C., in late February.

Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, and I have secured Dr. Peale's consent to hold an advance screening of this film for Members of the Congress, their staffs, and committee personnel. The showing will be on Wednesday, February 19, at 4:30 p.m., in the Auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, room G308.

Each of us is familiar with the meaningful ministry of Dr. Peale and his active efforts to strengthen the spiritual and moral life of our Nation. His dramatic and heart-warming story is professionally presented in a manner which will provide inspiration and challenge for the entire family. The well-known young actor, Don Murray, performs in the starring role, and is supported by an experienced Hollywood cast.

Mr. Murray, a favorite of many audiences, will be present in person at the screening. He is warmly remembered by theatergoers for his performance in "Advice and Consent."

We trust that legislators and staff members will take advantage of this opportunity to meet Don and to see a most enjoyable motion picture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration be permitted to sit for the remainder of this week, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 18, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Howard E. Haugerud, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1967. (Reappointment.)

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice Stephen Alles.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Wilfred A. Hearn, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy for a term of 4 years with the rank of rear admiral.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Kenneth O. Sanborn, 1363A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dwight O. Montleith, 1205A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, 1321A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr., 1514A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, 1801A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard P. Kloeko, 1327A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Paul W. Scheidecker, 1354A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Kieffer, 1409A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Clyde Box, 1535A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, 1682A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington, II, 1694A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jerry D. Page, 2052A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., 3424A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold E. Humfeld, 3857A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George S. Brown, 4090A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Seth J. McKee, 4279A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John C. Meyer, 4496A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Major S. White, 19056A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., 19101A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Jack E. Thomas, 1187A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bertram C. Harrison, 1425A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Douglas C. Polhamus, 1428A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Neil D. Van Sickle, 1442A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., 1583A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, 1631A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John S. Samuel, 1638A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry C. Newcomer, 1641A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph L. Dickman, 1656A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph T. Kingsley, Jr., 1702A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. McCoy, 1705A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lewis W. Stocking, 1709A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Elbert Helton, 1727A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John A. Rouse, 1807A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter B. Putnam, 1825A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles G. Chandler, Jr., 1842A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Pinkham Smith, 1859A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Vincent G. Huston, 1865A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Campbell, 2000A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Hubert S. Judy, 2032A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Ford, 2065A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ariel W. Nielsen, 2067A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lewis E. Lyle, 4115A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Manss, 2713A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John H. Bell, 4185A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Michael J. Ingelido, 4295A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence F. Loesch, 4300A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John D. Lavelle, 4359A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Donald W. Graham, 4361A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, 4368A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harry L. Evans, 4619A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Cooper, 4861A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Wisman, 4990A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jay T. Robbins, 5029A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Cody, Jr., 5126A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Duward L. Crow, 18061A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Crumm, 8663A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., 8709A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., 8956A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Raymond T. Jenkins, 19154A (colonel, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James W. Humphreys, Jr., 19928A (colonel, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John N. Ewbank, Jr., 1381A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Milton B. Adams, 1712A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Elder, 1772A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Veal, 1902A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, 1958A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. McPherson, 2068A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald F. Keeling, 3827A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. O'Neill, 4155A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton R. Close, 4343A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. Sherrill, 4910A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, 8981A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack E. Thomas, 1187A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Neil D. Van Sickle, 1442A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John S. Samuel, 1638A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Elbert Helton, 1727A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter B. Putnam, 1825A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Vincent G. Huston, 1865A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Campbell, 2000A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ariel W. Nielsen, 2067A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Raymond T. Jenkins, 19154A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John H. Bell, 4185A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Crumm, 8663A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., 8956A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Martin Menter, 1249A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Hugh B. Manson, 1800A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Harry A. French, 1981A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William W. Wilcox, 1991A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas S. Jeffrey, Jr., 2057A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Ernest A. Pinson, 3117A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Everett W. Holstrom, 3986A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard N. Ellis, 4001A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas H. Crouch, 19192A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Chester C. Cox, 3985A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. John M. Talbot, 19171A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Kenneth C. Dempster, 4633A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Everett A. McDonald, 4654A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Frank B. Elliott, 4681A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Gordon F. Blood, 4766A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Edward H. Nigro, 4889A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Glen J. McClernon, 5217A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas N. Wilson, 5255A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. John B. Wallace, 4426A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., 8660A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Lee V. Gossick, 8679A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard D. Reinbold, 8927A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William C. Garland, 8934A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Howard E. Kreidler, 9177A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Norman S. Orwat, 9489A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William W. Berg, 9961A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Jammie M. Philpott, 13694A (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1964

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Chair laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., February 17, 1964.
 I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
 JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
 Speaker.

Rev. Edward Abromaitis, Holy Cross Lithuanian Catholic Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
 O God, in Your divine plan of creation, You have entrusted this earth to man. You have endowed him with an intellect

and with a free will, thus giving him dignity and willing him happiness.

You have blessed these United States with spiritual and material greatness. The Founding Fathers of this great Nation have written the Constitution, wherein the dignity of man is extolled, by emphasizing the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In Your divine plan, You have assigned specific missions to individuals.

Bless this distinguished body of Representatives whose mission is to attain the common good of all their people, and that of the whole world.

Give these Representatives wisdom and understanding, counsel and fortitude, knowledge, piety, and fear of the Lord.

Help them to stand as a bright light, as a city seated on a mountain, as a living example to the other nations of the world, proving that the force of an ideal is greater than the ideal of force.

For centuries history tells us that many nations and millions of people have been oppressed and enslaved. The inborn rights of man, freedom of action, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, of religion, and of assembly have been taken away from them.

Lithuania has also suffered this great sadness, for she and her people are oppressed and enslaved. She, too, was once a big and mighty nation. She has always been a peace-loving nation. History tells us that she played a great part in saving Europe.

Today Lithuania on her 46th anniversary of independence is powerless and in great sorrow. She desires to be delivered. She reaches for a helping hand from the distinguished leaders of America. Do not forsake her.

O God, shower Your blessings upon her and number her among the free, peace-loving nations. Let the dawn of freedom rise and shine on Lithuania and on all the oppressed nations of the world.

Master, hear our prayer, and let our cry come unto Thee.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 13, 1964, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 10, 1964:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

On February 11, 1964:

H.R. 9076. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 82) entitled "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. PROUTY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, February 21, 1964, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs]?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today through Friday of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CANDIDATES FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7356) to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 4342 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4342. Cadets: appointment; numbers, territorial distribution

"(a) The authorized strength of the Corps of Cadets of the Academy is as follows:

"(1) 40 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examinations from the sons of members of the armed forces who were killed in action or died of wounds or injuries received or diseases contracted in, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated by, active service—

"(A) during World War I or World War II as defined by laws providing service-con-