

transmitting the July-December 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1738. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period ending December 31, 1963, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1149). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 10073. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10074. A bill to amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain members of the Armed Forces who are entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay, and who served in active duty for at least 90 days during time of war or conflict, and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10075. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10076. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1964, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees transferred in the interest of the Government to a different geographical location and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of civilian employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 10077. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 932. Joint resolution to require disclosure of information concerning exports

to Communist nations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution proposing the recognition of the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., as the birthplace of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 637. Resolution to investigate solicitations of certain contributions from Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take favorable action toward the improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to recognize the problems of Guam and to take the necessary action toward solving these problems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 10078. A bill for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 10079. A bill for the relief of Elaine Minerva Hylton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Stakias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 10081. A bill for the relief of Miss Remedios R. Magtira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

713. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the House of Representatives, Republic of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to expressing support to the Government of the Republic for the policy followed by it on the Cyprus question for a unitary, independent, and democratic State free from outside intervention or threat, on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter and to declare members to struggle until the Cypriot people's just demands are satisfied; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

714. Also, petition of W. Pearl B. Phinney, R.N., New York City, N.Y., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to certain impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

715. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to suggested changes in the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

716. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his

resolution with reference to asking Congress to require the Government Printing Office to employ adequate help to improve the public sales activities of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

717. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking Congress to override the Supreme Court prayer decision by statute legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

718. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking Congress to require the Appropriations Committee to show, by annual report, exact amounts appropriated to each Federal agency or department, and list them with largest appropriations first; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 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 [Mr. METCALF].

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

Merciful Father, whose faithfulness is constant with all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions against Thy love which will not let us go, we bemoan the delusions which so often have led us to mistake shadow for substance; we confess that by false pride in our own ability to achieve we have been lulled into a cushioned optimism that the forked lightning of threatening tempests does not warrant.

And now with jarred and jolted minds we see the whole circle of the world about us grown somber and terrible with suspicion and conflict, with rumors of war, and with the smoke of a judgment which engulfs us all.

In this testing day when Thou art sifting out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat, give us the contempt for our own prejudices and the passion for pure motives and spiritual integrity in ourselves that will enable us to put on the whole armor of God as we fight for the emancipation of the downtrodden and exploited, and against the rulers of the darkness of this world and against spiritual wickedness in high places.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 21, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Commerce, and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964—
COTTON AND WHEAT PROGRAM—
REQUEST FOR PRESENT CON-
SIDERATION OF A BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 850, House bill 6196, the cotton and wheat bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a complex and far-reaching proposal, based largely on proposals submitted by Under Secretary Murphy on the last day of the hearings. The bill in printed form, along with the report, was given to us on Friday. The document room was unable to provide additional copies which could be circulated in order to obtain a reaction to the bill. Thousands of farmers in Texas, or those representing thousands of farmers or others involved in the cotton industry and the wheat industry, have asked me to do what I could to delay Senate consideration of this measure until they could find out what was in it.

I have before me a stack of telegrams from wheat and cotton producers who ask me to do what I can to delay Senate consideration of the bill until they can find out what is in it, can make their comments to the committee, can obtain its reaction to their views, and can represent their interests.

Therefore, it is my hope that the distinguished majority leader will not press for action on his request. I am now beginning to hear from my State, and I

am reasonably sure that by tomorrow I shall have a fairly accurate reflection of the attitude toward the bill, and how it should be amended, if at all.

I do not intend to press for an indefinite period of time my objection to consideration of the bill, because I should like to see it dealt with, with all deliberate speed and expedition, for some cotton legislation is needed. But under the circumstances I believe I would be less than responsible if I failed to note that if the distinguished minority leader is to press for present action on his request, I shall have to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas temporarily withhold his objection?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to echo the sentiments which have been expressed by the Senator from Texas, by pointing out that, according to my understanding, the bill contains both a cotton section and a wheat section, and that it was the cotton portion of the bill which was deliberated on and was voted on by the House, but that the wheat section was added only the other day, within the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Therefore, insofar as the wheat section of the bill is concerned, the bill has not received the stamp of approval—much less debate—by the House. I am advised that in the wheat section there are certain provisions which could have a serious impact on the feed-grain situation. Livestock prices in the Middle West now are in a terribly depressed state; and a further depression, due to depressed feed prices, could be catastrophic.

Accordingly, it seems to me unwise for the Senate to take up at this time such a bill—especially inasmuch as the wheat section has not been debated or given much consideration—until after we have had an opportunity to hear from the people in our States and from other interested persons.

Therefore, I support the view of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in response to the statement just now made by the Senator from Iowa, I believe it should be pointed out that his concern about the possible impact on cattle prices should prompt him to give support to speedy action on this bill, because one of the things that would complicate and aggravate the cattle-price situation would be failure on the part of Congress to act quickly to halt a further skid in wheat prices. The Senator from Iowa knows that anything that would result in a further drop in the price of either wheat or feed grains would be the most serious possible sort of threat to cattle prices.

One of the reasons why I am anxious to have the Senate act quickly on the bill—and the Senate must act before the first of March if the bill is to be effective—is to prevent the very danger the Senator from Iowa fears.

As for the argument about inadequate hearings and inadequate discussion and debate on the proposed wheat legislation, the bill is basically the 1962 act, which Congress debated at great length, both in the House and in the Senate. Farmers have discussed it at great length over the past year and one-half. Our committee has heard from everyone who wished to be heard on that legislation—including the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants, and all of the major farm organizations.

On the basis of that discussion, we have reported a bill—with strong bipartisan support in the committee—which merely strikes out the mandatory features which were present in the proposal which was offered last spring to the wheat farmers. The aspect to which many farmers objected was the mandatory or compulsory features.

What we are offering now is a voluntary program in which the wheat farmers of the Nation are told that they can participate if they wish to do so, or can stay out of the program without penalty of any kind, except that, of course, they would forgo price supports and certificate payments.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at this point, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that the bill includes, among other things, a provision for so-called noncertificated wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. The bill would not change existing law at that point; that provision is exactly as it was in the 1962 act.

Mr. MILLER. I wish the Senator would respond to my question. It is my understanding—and I have received correspondence to that effect—that the wheat section of the bill includes a provision for noncertificated wheat. If it does include a provision for noncertificated wheat—and I do not know because the bill has so recently come from the committee that I have not had an opportunity to read it—that provision would be at the heart of the concern of the Senator from Iowa in respect to the bill, because noncertificated wheat would then become a competitor of feed grains in my State and in other Midwestern States, and being a competitor, it would tend to depress feed grain prices and, in turn, livestock prices. Perhaps the bill would not include noncertificated wheat, but I have been advised that it would.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. First, I should like to comment on the question of the Senator from Iowa, and then I shall be happy to have the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas.

The proposed legislation would not change the manner in which noncertificated wheat is dealt with. There would be no change at that point.

The bill would provide a device whereby farmers would be encouraged to cut back on their production. It would provide a certificate and a price support program that would have the effect of raising the price of the certificated wheat. To that extent it would benefit the cattle producers. It would have the overall effect of raising wheat prices in the United States. To that extent it would be an improvement over the situation that we have today in reference to the prices of wheat and cattle.

If it is not enacted, all wheat would be noncertificated and in competition with feed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I believe we are now involved in debating the merits of the measure. I do not believe the merits are in question at this time. The fact remains that the bill has been available to us in printed form only since Friday, and then only in a very limited quantity; so the bill could not be circulated freely. Regardless of the fact that we have knowledge of what is in the bill—and perhaps it has been published in newspapers—many people would like to read the bill itself and study its contents. There is always a lingering distrust of politicians in Washington on the part of people on the farms. They wish to see what is in the bill itself. Rarely do we take up such an important measure such as a short time after it has been reported without publicity being issued on what the measure contains. Senators should have a little more time—not much more—to study the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am afraid that the Senator from Texas does not agree with us that we ought to expedite consideration of the bill. However, I do not believe he should aline himself with those who might distrust politicians, because all of us in the Senate Chamber happen to be politicians, and all of us have a modicum of honesty.

The bill was reported from a regular standing committee of the Senate by a vote of 10 to 3. The bill has been on the Calendar 4 days now. The bill was discussed last Friday. Last Thursday, during colloquy with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois stated as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would say on behalf of the majority leader that at least on four separate and distinct occasions we have conferred with respect to bringing up the farm bill. At the very first of those meetings, I told him there was some opposition on this side, and there was the expressed hope that perhaps it could be deferred until after civil rights came up for consideration in the Senate.

At the second meeting I had occasion to confer with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], all of whom have quite an abiding interest in the farm bill. As a result of the many conversations that have taken place within the past 2 days, it was quite agreed that the farm bill could be laid before the Senate as of tomorrow—

This was last Friday—

after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

I should like to interpolate by saying that the statement was made in good faith, and there were circumstances over which the minority leader had no control which intervened. Continuing to read:

So I think we have composed all of our differences on this side, in the hope that we can dispose of the farm bill, and, for as long as it takes, the military procurement bill, about which there is some urgency, and then proceed to civil rights. Then we will stay on civil rights. I think that it is the distinguished majority leader's intention, once we take up civil rights, to stay with it until we either resolve the issue or discover there is no sword sharp enough to cut the Gordian knot.

That statement was made last Thursday evening. Senators have had the weekend to examine the bill. Objections were raised last Friday. They were legitimate objections. The bill has been studied. The responsibility is ours. We are supposed to speak for the people in the State which we represent. I believe that the Senate is an honest body. I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is an honest committee. They have done a good job. I compliment the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who was so active in reporting the bill, even though he is vehemently opposed to certain parts of it.

So I would hope that we would keep the discussion on a fairly high plane and recognize the position in which the leadership finds itself, and do what we can to honor the reporting of the bill by a standing committee of this body.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to clarify what I said. I did not mean to cast any aspersions on the Senate. I do not believe that we could find any more honest an assembly of 100 persons anywhere than exists in this Chamber. People back home like to see what is being proposed in Washington. They do not like to accept everyone's word for what is going on. In a democratic process, it is good that they desire to see for themselves. I have received a large sheaf of mail and many telephone calls from my people stating, "Hold it up longer until we can give you our reaction."

It occurs to me that if we were to allow 2 or 3 more days in which to obtain an accurate reflection of the attitude of the people, we might have much easier going than if we started consideration of the bill immediately.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Texas is very shrewd. He knows what he is doing. I can understand his position. I, too, have received letters and telegrams, both for and against taking up the bill. Regardless of my position, which is in favor of the bill in this instance—but even if I were opposed to it—I would make every effort to bring before the Senate a bill which had been reported

by a standing committee and which had received due consideration by that committee. As far as the people in the States, which we have the honor to represent, are concerned, it is up to us to make our decisions as to whether the proposed legislation is good or bad, vote accordingly, and then return home and be prepared to take the consequences, whatever they may be.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have in my hand 455 telegrams received over the weekend urging immediate consideration of the proposed wheat legislation. Practically all of them favor this or some variation of the pending program. This is the largest number of telegrams I have received in a period of time since the Taft-Hartley law was considered and passed approximately 10 or 12 years ago.

The telegrams give some indication of what farmers are thinking. Headlines appearing in North Dakota newspapers yesterday were not very good for the Republican Party, for they stated that Republicans and the Farm Bureau are blocking consideration of wheat legislation. I am not one of that kind of Republicans. I think that wheat legislation should be considered immediately. Those who favor the Farm Bureau proposal should offer it as a substitute. If they desire me to do so, I shall offer it as a substitute. The Farm Bureau promised wheat legislation, and it is time that we get to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names of the signers of the telegrams to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Emanuel Tebelius.
Oscar Solberg.
Harris Disrude.
Wilfred Tuomala.
Marvin Tuomala.
Albert Reiswig.
Ben Mickelson.
Rudy Mickelson.
Mr. & Mrs. Walter Martz.
Esmond Co-op Creamery.
Abner Disrude.
LeRoy Bechthold.
Minnie Tuomala.
Bert Gumeringer.
Art Tuomala.
Jerry Perdaems.
S. M. Young.
Isadore Kostelecky.
John Deck.
Richardson Farmers Union Elevator Co.
Mike Adamski.
Edwin Brodehl.
Richard Weldmeier.
David Disrude.
Leonard Smetstad.
Farmers & Merchants Exchange of Esmond,
N. Dak.
Lodver Lo.
Fred Williams.
Horner & Horner U-Save Store of Esmond,
N. Dak.
Myron Disrude.
Paul Ross.

Vernon Disrude.
 Ray Becker.
 Bruce Theel.
 Olaf Lindbo.
 Maurice Desroch.
 Fred Darling.
 Edwin Keller.
 John H. Ben.
 President and board of directors of Farmers Union Cooperative Oil Co. of Jamestown.
 Esmond Equity & Trading Co.
 Harold Mindeman.
 Munster Elevator.
 Tolley Skar.
 Louis Hitz.
 Francis O'Connor.
 Lewis O'Connor.
 Gordon Johnson.
 John Molitor.
 Gaelon Johnson.
 Carl Amb.
 Ernest Odegard.
 Chester Lalum.
 Geo. Nelmeier.
 Ray Reiner.
 Bernard Zimprich.
 Robert Thorson.
 David M. Olson.
 Walter Peterson.
 Edwin Krambeer.
 Whitman Farmers Union Oil Co.
 Ralph Zimprich.
 Paul Tarasenko.
 Harold E. Switzer.
 Harry Anderson.
 Gaylord Olson.
 Sterling Ingwalsen.
 Adolph Doeblen.
 G. G. Henne.
 J. V. Leppard.
 Earl R. Larson.
 M. J. Engen.
 Buxton Farmers Union Elevator Co.
 Arthur J. Stevens.
 George Sandvik.
 Douglas Hankel.
 Ivan Sears.
 Lloyd Sondreal.
 R. Walter Olson.
 Oscar Sturlaugson.
 Joe Olson.
 Harold Michels.
 Elwin Sears.
 Hugo Matton.
 Hatton Grain Terminal Association.
 Jens Ashland.
 Arne Stafne.
 Melvin Miller.
 O. Reuben Nash.
 Stanley McDougall.
 James Hjelseth.
 Mancur Olson.
 Gottlieb Hartman.
 Ronald McLean.
 Roy Sears.
 Regan Farmers Union Co-op.
 Everett Mattson.
 Cavalier Farmers Co-Op Elevator.
 M. O. Danielson.
 Osborne Wangen.
 Ben Strehlow.
 Lester Appel.
 Gerald Dahl.
 Arlo Olson.
 Albert Kotahek.
 Whitman Co-op Association.
 Orle Huizenga.
 Clayton Larson.
 George Grilley.
 Andrew Urness.
 Harry C. Whalen.
 Gordon Hacanson.
 Regan Farmers Union Co-op.
 Oberon Farmers Union Co-op Elevator.
 Eino Mattson.
 Don Brown.
 Curtis Bergrud.
 Ernest M. Hanson.

Lloyd Myhter.
 Frank W. Johnson.
 Hans J. Wangen.
 Leeds-York Farmers Union Local.
 Hugo Henke.
 Donald Ralston.
 Les Brown.
 Arthur Vangness.
 Robert Mattson.
 Douglas Rath.
 Mr. and Mrs. Albert Becker.
 Mr. and Mrs. Charles Sipma.
 Adams County Farmers Union.
 Arthur T. Ophaug.
 Kenneth Anderson.
 Elmer Aanerud.
 Gordon Olson.
 Art Des Lauries.
 Howard Bangen.
 Oscar Ladoen.
 Silas Sjol.
 Harold Olson.
 Golden Valley Farmers Grain Co.
 Albin Haugen.
 Clifford Daleness.
 Archie Sullivan.
 Mr. and Mrs. Bill Meyer.
 William Willamson.
 Albert Madsen.
 Levi Emmel.
 Oscar H. Olson.
 Harry Bergquist.
 Emil Reinholdt.
 Paul Chally.
 James Hultstrand.
 Karl Henderson.
 George Stensland.
 Selmer Amundrud.
 Charles Samson.
 Ray Westby.
 Alfred Robb.
 Garland Skare.
 Omar Johnson.
 Lloyd Erickson.
 Donald Aune.
 Robert Laumb.
 Pete Swensen.
 Mrs. Daisy Schuman.
 Floyd Hauge.
 Clarence Steen.
 Robert Benson.
 Alvin Nelson.
 Robert Soderholm.
 Darrell Husle.
 Isak Hystad.
 Dale Johnson.
 Byron Duerre.
 Clifford Erickson.
 Harold Anderson.
 Denver Rosberg.
 Sverre Houge.
 Knute Bondeli.
 Holbert Schimke.
 Eddie Schmid.
 Albert F. Pachi.
 C. J. Dalzell.
 Carl Fugelstin.
 Nels Berger.
 Perth Farmers Elevator Cooperative Association.
 Lloyd Peterson.
 Seymour Bjorlie.
 Farmers Union GTA.
 Judson Farmers Union Mercantile Co.
 Carl Klattman.
 Carl Helbig.
 Kurt Zeutschel.
 Lawrence Hoesl.
 Glen Dettman.
 Carl Held.
 Paul Sormula.
 Alfred Scoba.
 Toivo Henning.
 P. E. Ellichuck.
 Ted Hagerott.
 Phillip Eckroth.
 Glenn Hogan.
 Oscar Selle.
 August Dahme.

Maynard Klier.
 Wilton Farmers Union Oil Co.
 Clifton M. Marple.
 Farmers Union Elevator Co., Wheelock.
 Art Horne.
 Elnard Juhala.
 Rudolph R. Hemmann.
 Pittsburg Farmers Union GTA Elevator.
 Walter Bartholome.
 Epping Farmers Union Grain Co.
 Grant Settingsgard.
 James D. Bopp.
 Raymond Gieser.
 Ernest C. Ross.
 M. H. Skaley.
 Ed Orgaard.
 William Voegel.
 Ralph Herseth.
 Lynn Ziegler.
 Knute Bondeli.
 Gerand Larson.
 Irving Naas.
 Oscar Glundberg.
 Arnold Hill.
 Gordon W. Schumacher.
 Ronald Ostby.
 Ted Johnson.
 Leslie Peterson.
 Melvin Narum.
 David W. Morris.
 Arnold Larson.
 Glenn Hopkins.
 Elvin Johnson.
 R. J. Dinwoodie.
 Orvin Gunderson.
 R. E. Olson.
 Charlie Miller.
 Christ M. Christianson.
 Herman Muhlbardt.
 L. C. Bohmback.
 Jack Cowan.
 Kenneth Presthus.
 T. R. Hanson.
 L. S. Bo.
 John Anderson.
 Arnie Saari.
 Ivan Erickson.
 A. H. Berg.
 John Hendrickson.
 George Schlenk.
 John Grann.
 Adolph Neuman.
 Russell Coutts.
 Axel Halberg.
 Robert Neameyer.
 Leo Miller.
 Otto Broeder.
 Virgil Bucholz.
 H. N. Tuck.
 Clarence Larson.
 Mrs. Fred Kuebler.
 Mr. and Mrs. F. B. Aniel.
 Clements Farmers Cooperative Elevator.
 Mr. and Mrs. Roy P. Redman.
 Ted Scheresky.
 Ed Hortenstine Gays.
 Oscar Wahlund.
 Edwin Christianson.
 Watford City Farmers Union Oil Co.
 R. C. Domres.
 North Towner Farmers Union Local.
 Ivan Peterson.
 Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Holtz.
 Orville Samuelson.
 George Olson.
 David Ford.
 Milton Stevens.
 Harold Garnass.
 Wallace Lien.
 C. D. Ellingson.
 Wendell White.
 Senator Bronald Thompson.
 Wegenast Brothers.
 Herbert O. Johnson.
 Ed Salzieder.
 Earl O. Isaacson.
 Ernest Dallman.
 Howard Salzieder.

Harvey Wixo.
Lynn Ralston.
Oren Hillebrand.
N. Arthur Thompson.
Art E. Erickson.
Bjarne Hegstad.
Melvin Hjelmstad.
Virgil Swenson.
M. O. Danielson.
Maurice Hanson.
George Ruud.
Sivert Hjelmstad.
Martin Halvorson.
Ted Omoth.
Howard Nielson.
Erling Anderson.
Morris Hoggie.
Ever Hanson.
Sigurd Olson, Jr.
Sigurd Olson, Sr.
Lloyd Jordre.
Isaac Kindem.
Henry Widdell.
Raymond Muss.
Leo Schultz.
Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Flesche.
Clarence Martin.
Earny Ronningen.
Robert Soderholm.
Bernard Soldberg.
Hilmer Rice.
Ray Emanuelson.
Elmer Sears.
Ernest Martinson.
W. A. Knain.
Tom M. Moen.
Oliver Ruzicka.
Christ Klein.
James and John Krogstad.
Melvin Wippler.
Kenneth Stennes.
John H. Novak.
Ray Ginsbach.
Jerald Lotvedt.
Gilmore Ness.
Bennie R. Grove.
Frank Klein.
S. A. Torgerson.
Orlando Odegard.
Magnus M. Lysne.
Knute Loyland.
Melvin Moench.
Arnet Weinlaeder.
Roald Lysne.
Wayne Ophaug.
Dale Mangin.
Raymond H. Mitchell.
Clarence Schermer.
Glenn Miller.
Lud Laroson.
O. B. Knote.
Walter R. Hageman.
Ole L. Olson.
Robert A. Bush.
L. F. DeHaven.
Lawrence Sandbeck.
Ernest Pietsch.
Johnny Ott.
Billy Thorson.
Cavaller F. U. G. T. A.
Hector Johnstone.
Dwight Holmes.
John Adamski.
R. S. Hardy.
Tony Krance.
Jack Soeby.
Robert J. Chrne.
Emil Gendreau.
Alex Wisenthal.
Cliff Ford.
Maurice Dunnigan.
Stanley Metelman.
J. I. Shepard.
Harley Kessner.
Tony Pfeiffer.
Selmer Haugen.
Ross Van Horne.
Harvey Piper.
Ray Emanuelson.

Arthur J. Stevens.
Adolph Lysne.
Jesse Rae.
Joseph Soderberg.
Gilbert Spillum.
Edwin E. Olsen.
John Stenberg.
Ted Volk.
Joyce Knudsvig.
Ernest Emanuelson.
Lars A. Larson.
O. T. Holdal.
Oscar Franson.
Olaf J. Ophaug.
Lee Bennington.
Albert Kven.
Ernest Borgeson.
Walter Vollmers.
Orville I. Anderson.
Joseph Kratochvil.
Robert Kylio.
Fred Mahoney.
Oscar Selle.
Earl Ronan & Sons.
David Holje.
John Brown.
Bennie O. Dahl.
Norman Gjellstad.
Clarence Okerson.
Lester F. Anderson.
Steve Dostal.
J. G. Brown.
Edwin Plutowski.
Norman Westrum.
Tilford Hegg.
Melvin Klein.
Joseph Rose.
Chester Johnson.
Leland Davis.
Leo Schultz.
Orville Bragg.
Sentinel Butte Farmers Elevator and
Directors.
The Farnhams.
Alva Gladue.
Mel Solberg.
Douglas Hoffman.
Francis Perdaems.
Wayne Powers.
Milton Samson.
Gideon Bietz.
Wallace Jahnke.
Mr. and Mrs. Dale Shoeder.
George Ehlers.
Harold Arndorfer.
Fred Ehlers.
Melvin C. Djornholt.
Russell Earsley.
Clayton Runk.
Earl Rosenow.
A. K. Stolzman.
Lauvern Shoeder.
Mr. Dan Murphy.
Mr. John Bakken.
Norman Jellstad.
Al Lutgen.
Isak Hystad.
A. H. Burkle.
Norman Moen.
J. Allen Ogren.
Andrew Johnson.
Orville Ogren.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the discussion of the pending business, many pertinent facts have not yet been presented, either to the Senate or to the public. It is time that they should be. I think that the 450 farmers who sent telegrams to the Senator from North Dakota would be interested in what I have to say.

Since there seems to be some doubt about the effect upon the income of wheat and cotton producers, should Con-

gress fail to enact any new legislation, it would seem in order to set forth pertinent facts at this time.

In my opinion—and that opinion seems to be borne out by the evidence—the Secretary of Agriculture has adequate authority under existing law to maintain wheat and cotton price supports at a level comparable to this year's prices if he deems it advisable.

Presenting the wheat situation first, let me say that the data I shall offer were obtained from the most recent official figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I shall try to present such material in terms that can be understood by anyone whether or not they are farmers.

The wheat marketing year runs from July 1 to July 1.

The supply and demand situation is, of course, the basis of any good legislation or administrative action.

On July 1, 1963, there were on hand 1,189 million bushels of wheat in the United States. The production for the year 1963 was 1,133 million bushels. Imports for the year in the form of feed and other wheat products amounted to 5 million bushels, making a total supply available for the current marketing year of 2,327 million bushels.

The disappearance of wheat for the current year is estimated by the Department to be 1,602 million bushels, of which 602 million bushels will be used domestically and 1 billion bushels exported.

Deducting the amount of wheat used at home and the amount exported from the total available supply, the Department finds that when July 1 1964, comes around the total supply on hand will be 725 million bushels, or 464 million bushels less than last July 1.

Since it would be impractical to base legislation or administrative action on the record of the current year alone, it is necessary to look ahead through the coming year to the beginning of the wheat marketing year which begins on July 1, 1965, or 16 months from now.

Again, the supply and demand figures should weigh heavily in our consideration.

Starting on July 1, 1964, with a carry-over of 725 million bushels, we must add the prospective production for this year in order to get the total supply available.

Thus far the only estimate on production is for winter wheat.

If the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimate of winter wheat production is borne out, there will be 959 million bushels produced this year. Add to this the most generous estimate of 275 million bushels of spring wheat, and we have a total production of 1,234 million bushels, which, added to the carryover, would make a total supply of 1,959 million bushels.

Now, what will be our requirement for the year ending June 30, 1965?

The Secretary of Agriculture properly contends that for security reasons we should maintain a reserve of a year's domestic supply, or 600 million bushels.

Then, he estimates exports for the coming marketing year at 650 to 700 million bushels.

Since we will use domestically another 600 million bushels, it appears that for home use, for export, and for security reserves we must have a supply of not less than 1,850 to 1,900 million bushels, which is only 50 to 100 million bushels less than the anticipated total supply, according to the figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In the face of these figures, we might conclude that the U.S. producers, consumers, processors, and exporters of wheat are "sitting pretty."

This assumption is not warranted.

First. We cannot assume that the 725 million bushels carried over is all fit for human consumption. No such miracle has ever occurred yet. To be safe, we had better deduct 50 million bushels for shortages and deterioration.

Second. In estimating exports, the Secretary obviously did not include any continuation of exports to Russia and other Communist countries.

It is understandable that the Secretary could not safely include sales in his estimate, but, as the newspapers say, "a reliable source" advises me that Eastern European countries are already undertaking to negotiate for next year.

Even though such sales might be reduced 100 million bushels from this year, we would have to boost the official estimate of requirements by another 200 million bushels.

Third. Department estimates are not infallible.

The administration desires new legislation.

It is understandable that the Secretary of Agriculture should present his testimony to Congress in the most persuasive manner possible.

However, if we look back to the spring of 1963, before the referendum on the wheat program then proposed, we find the U.S. Department of Agriculture solemnly and officially advising the producers that if the program were rejected, there would be a crop of 1.5 billion bushels this year.

The USDA planners missed their mark by 20 percent, which, to say the least, was not very good estimating.

They also told the farmers that there would be 70 million acres of wheat planted for the 1964 crop. It appears that there may be a maximum of 53 million acres, which means they missed the mark by about 30 percent in that estimate. In the estimate on exports, they missed the mark, even further, by 66½ percent. All of that teaches us that the Department estimates are not always infallible.

In the light of known facts and past experiences, we can safely assume that the supply of quality wheat will not equal the demand for the coming marketing year and that it will be necessary to cut into our security reserves rather heavily.

With virtually the entire carryover of old crop wheat in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and with the estimated production of new wheat being less than the prospective demand,

it would seem that if the CCC withholds Government-owned wheat from the market, the law of supply and demand alone should guarantee a good market price to producers.

Apparently, the Secretary does not share this view—and there may be substance to this difference of opinion.

It is, of course, possible that wheat buyers might persuade many farmers to sell for a lower price than that warranted by supply and demand.

The predictions of dollar wheat made by Department officials last year would lend itself to this purpose.

In the event that no new legislation is enacted and in the event that the law of supply and demand alone will not assure fair farm income, there is a way under existing law by which the Secretary can maintain the price of wheat.

Section 332, paragraph C, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, provides that when there is a "national emergency"—and we are not at that stage yet—or a "material increase in the demand for wheat"—and we definitely are in that position now—the Secretary may terminate the national marketing quota.

If marketing quotas are terminated the Secretary may require compliance with acreage allotments as a condition of eligibility for price support and, therefore, he has the authority to establish acreage allotments for 1965, in the event that he does not proclaim a marketing quota.

If a marketing quota is not proclaimed, section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides that the support price for wheat to those who comply with acreage allotments, if the Secretary required such compliance, will be from 75 to 90 percent of parity, or from \$1.89 to \$2.27 per bushel, as determined by the Secretary.

It is perfectly obvious that with the current year's crop running 465 million bushels behind the demand and with a material increase in the demand for wheat, the Secretary is in an excellent position to maintain a highly satisfactory income to the wheatgrower.

It is also obvious that with production running behind disappearance, we must either increase production or cut down on exports.

Mr. President, I have been asked whether the Secretary could apply the new support prices and acreage allotments to this year's crop, three-quarters of which is already planted. He could not do so. But it is perfectly obvious to anyone engaged in business that with the CCC owning all the old wheat available on July 1, and the new crops running 2 or 3 hundred million bushels below requirements for the coming marketing year, and with a support price of, we will say, \$1.89 to \$2 announced for the 1965 crop, there would be a scramble for the 1964 crop which would probably guarantee the best prices that the wheat-growers have had in years.

Turning briefly to the proposed cotton program, we find a situation which we have hardly considered before in relation to farm programs.

At present, the price of cotton to the farmer is supported at approximately 32½ cents per pound. The Secretary has authority to continue supports at this level under existing law.

The bill reported out by the Senate Agriculture Committee would authorize supports under different circumstances ranging from 30 to 34½ cents per pound.

I have a feeling that farm income would not be affected too greatly by this change, although it might result in some changes in the area of production.

The most far-reaching provision of the bill is that which provides a subsidy to the textile industry of the United States.

This subsidy would probably amount to around a half billion dollars a year and ostensibly would permit American manufacturers to compete equitably with or even undersell textile manufacturers of other countries in world markets.

There are many questions raised by this proposal which are not directly related to farm programs, although our cotton farmers will be affected by what we do.

First. Will the new policy of subsidizing the mills result in a further drop in the world price of cotton, thereby creating a need for still higher subsidies?

Second. Will this action on our part increase the probability of a world trade war?

Third. Having established a policy of directly subsidizing the textile industry, do we go on from there to other lines of manufacture? What about flour millers and manufacturers of aluminum or copper products and so on—and heaven knows what the end might be.

Fourth. If we subsidize our export manufacturers, will we then be willing to do away with tariff protection and import quotas so that American consumers will be able to buy on a competitive market?

I am not raising these questions in opposition to the cotton provisions of the bill because I am not sure what should be done.

It may be that the time has come when we should fight vigorously to maintain and expand our foreign markets.

I am sure of one thing, however, and that is when we decide to subsidize industry to the tune of what may turn out to be billions of dollars, let us be honest about it and not pretend we are doing so for the benefit of the little farmers.

If this bill passes, then the Secretary of Commerce should be authorized to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of the subsidy and appropriations made to the Commerce Department for that purpose.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has received 450 telegrams, and I am sure they come from bona fide farmers. I have received telegrams from some of the largest banks and manufacturers in the country, in support of the bill. So there is another angle to the proposal, other than merely to help the farmers.

In proposing to consider H.R. 6196 at this time, the majority leader is quite

properly attempting to carry out the policy of his party. The fairness of the majority leader and his respect for the rights of all Senators has become classic.

In objecting to consideration of the proposed legislation at this time, other Senators are acting in accordance with their judgment and their conscience.

My purpose in setting forth pertinent facts at this time is to assure the wheat and cotton growers of this country that regardless of whether new legislation is passed or not, there is no need for them to suffer a loss of income or a lowering of prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture is fully aware of the situation and I have no doubt will exercise his authority in a competent manner.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. TOWER. Is it correct that the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished majority leader is still pending?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to address myself to a comment made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Although there have been accusations to the effect that I have been much influenced by the Farm Bureau Federation, I have had very little contact with the Farm Bureau Federation. My position is at variance with their position, so I should like to disabuse the minds of those who believe otherwise.

Mr. President, I am constrained to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate turn to consideration of Calendar No. 850, H.R. 6196, the cotton-wheat bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TOWER, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am not saying that I will object tomorrow, but I am constrained to object today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Iowa withhold that objection? I understand that other Senators have comments to make, so that they may have the right to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa withhold his objection?

Mr. MILLER. I withhold the objection for that purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I probably shall not object, this issue is more than one of farm programs—it is also one of farm income. As we begin discussion of these farm programs, I believe we should also realize what is happening to farm income.

It is estimated that for the year 1964 farm income will be \$11.6 billion. In 1963 it was \$12.2 billion. In 1960 it dropped to \$12 billion from 1947 which was \$17.3 billion, the highest income the farmers have ever received. We cited the \$400 million loss of income last year as a result of livestock prices. If no action were taken on the wheat program and there should be a lower margin of \$1.25 to \$1.30 a bushel, it would mean another loss of \$600 million.

Therefore, it seems to me that the issue in the Senate today is whether there is to be farm income, and not particular types of farm programs. The idea is to protect the farmer. We should remember that the parity ratio or the farm program goal for agriculture has dropped to its lowest level since 1939. It is important that we begin to look at some of the figures.

Farming costs are at record highs. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] discussed the programs and the possibility of the Secretary of Agriculture being in a position to take action. While wheat supplies will not be excessive on July 1, 1965, that is the end of the 1964 marketing year. The Secretary of Agriculture will have to determine this spring whether production in 1965, together with the carryover, will result in an excessive carryover on July 1, 1966, if he does not proclaim marketing quotas on the 1965 crops.

I believe this is of immediate concern to us. When we realize that the farmer has to buy in a domestic market, that he buys his labor in market that has a minimum wage and other fringe benefits, that he has to pay for his transportation and his utilities based on Federal statutes that guarantee a profit cost of operations, and that he buys his utilities, energy and gasoline in a market that has quotas and import limitations, it seems to me, Mr. President, based on all the information we can get, that some action must be forthcoming, if we are to protect the farmers' income this coming year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by my good friend from Vermont with respect to wheat prices. The program he suggests would, of course, be possible for 1965. However, the present wheat bill would affect the 1964 crop. Unless Congress acts, there is no doubt in my mind that wheat will be selling for \$1.35 or \$1.40 a bushel. That would certainly affect the income of wheat farmers. Inasmuch as wheat farmers have already turned down the program, under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to

deal with price supports even if he desires to do so, because the law prevents it. That is because the wheat quota provisions have been voted down.

The wheat bill as now presented to the Senate does not differ from the present law, except that it is on a voluntary basis, rather than mandatory.

With respect to cotton, I was voted down in the committee. However, notwithstanding that fact, I did not object to taking it up. It is true, as my good friend from Texas has said, that the cotton provisions would change a great deal of what is now the present law. Further, the cost of the new program in my opinion would be much greater than has been alleged by the Department.

There has been a great deal of figure juggling; and I am prepared, when the time comes, to show—and I believe I can successfully show it—that the cost of the proposed program would be much greater than that of the present program.

New features have also been added to the bill. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a substantial surplus of cotton at the present time, the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted, during the current year, to increase acres for export over and above the quota by up to 10 percent, if he sees fit to do so. That will contribute to the production of much more cotton than we need.

There is no doubt that the export cotton would come into competition with the vast amount of cotton we now have in surplus.

For the years 1965, 1966, and 1967, there is no limitation in the bill as to the number of acres the Secretary of Agriculture could permit to be planted in excess of the allotment. That cotton, in my opinion, would also come into competition with our surplus, which we now have on hand, and prevent it from moving out of CCC stocks.

Another new feature is the provision permitting cotton producers to cut back on production and receive payments of up to 15 percent above the support price.

Still another, and the worst provision in my opinion is the requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture pay a domestic subsidy to other than producers in the same amount as the export subsidy. Today, that subsidy, paid on all domestic consumption, would be \$42.50 per bale, or a total of \$357 million.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding these facts, as I have said, I was voted down in committee. However, I did all I could possibly do to get a bill before the Senate. It is before the Senate. In my judgment, we should take the bill up at this time and vote it up or down, or amend it in one way or another.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my first comment is to indicate to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that much of what he has said in his statement is most constructive and helpful. I do not take exception to many of the points he has made. I said this the other

day with respect to his address of about 2 weeks ago. I believe his address on the agricultural situation was most helpful and informative.

However, if wheat legislation is not passed there will be a direct and, I believe, unquestioned possibility that there will be an increase in wheat acreage.

It is one thing to anticipate a drop in wheat prices and to adjust our wheat acreage accordingly, and possibly not adjust it very much, but when we experience a \$1.25 and a \$1.30 price for a bushel of wheat, there will be no end to the amount of wheat planted.

We saw that happen with respect to corn. We cut back the price support levels on corn, and eliminated restrictions. I did not vote for that program, but it did become the law of the land, because a majority of the Senate voted for it. We saw millions more acres planted, and the most fantastic production of corn. We thought that by lowering prices, we would have a built-in discipline or control, on a voluntary basis, on producers, which in turn would result in lower production. Nothing has been proved more false than that assumption.

I listened to the junior Senator from Iowa indicate some concern about the so-called noncertificated wheat provision in the bill.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] made some reply to that statement. It is my understanding that unless the wheat bill which is on the calendar is passed, for all practical purposes, all wheat produced in the crop year 1964 will be noncertificated and will be at a price related to the feed value of corn, at about \$1.28 to \$1.30 a bushel. Therefore, we would have wholesale competition with the feed-grain program.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Secretary of Agriculture, as matters now stand, would set the support at \$1.26 a bushel, which is several cents below what the noncertificated wheat would bring under the bill, as proposed. Therefore, instead of having about 75 percent or 80 percent of the wheat moving at a price of around \$2 a bushel, we would have the whole crop supported at not more than \$1.26 a bushel. That is the basis of the estimates by the Department of Agriculture and by the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Kansas. In other words, we would experience a drop of about \$600 million in income for wheat farmers if we do not act between now and the end of this month to implement the legislation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I am permitted to do so, while reserving my right to object, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Inasmuch as the Senator from Minnesota has raised the question, as I have already indicated, I have not had an opportunity to read the bill. I have been advised that there is a noncertificated wheat provision in the bill;

therefore, I would like to have more information about it. What the Senator from South Dakota has said he has said in good faith, and that is also true of what the Senator from Minnesota has said.

However, the statement that the Secretary of Agriculture will set the price at a certain figure, and that there will be a decline of \$600 million in farm income, is based on the situation which existed several months ago. That is an estimate which the Senator from Vermont has already shot down. The estimate was that there would be a very great increase in production. If the premise is false—and the Senator from Vermont has already proved it to be false—I believe perhaps the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota and the Secretary of Agriculture had better start recalculating their figures before they tell us that there will be such a drop in price and such a loss in income as they have indicated.

I believe we are premature in taking up the bill. That is why I felt constrained today to object to taking it up tomorrow. I believe we ought to allow at least a day to elapse.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I am not making any wild predictions as to calculations or estimates.

Unless some legislation is passed, under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has to adjust the price support levels downward. I know—as the Senator from Vermont has said, and rightly so—that certain administrative decisions can be made which may help to alleviate this situation. I am not trying to be dogmatic; in fact, I believe that ever since the defeat of the wheat referendum the Senator from Minnesota has been one of those who have called for administrative action, and I have indicated that there ought to be new legislation. I have not been conducting myself in a dog-in-a-manger attitude. I do not believe in punishing those who rejected the proposal that was extended to the farmers. I am interested in farm income. I would be less than honest if I did not say I am deeply concerned about farm income. I have every right to be deeply concerned about it. I am not an expert on the subject of cotton, and I do not pretend to be an expert in the field of wheat. But shortly the conference report on the tax bill will be before the Senate, and it is calculated to stimulate the economic structure of the United States.

I know of no person who has estimated that unless we pass a cotton bill or a wheat bill, we shall have anything else but lower prices set on accumulated surpluses of cotton and wheat. If that is the case, farmers will lose a part of the benefit of the tax bill by reason of our refusal to act on a timely basis on wheat and cotton. It will not do much good to act on wheat and cotton in July. Let us

stop deluding ourselves, because we are not fooling any farmer. If we do not act on the wheat and cotton bill very shortly—in fact, we should act on it today; we should have acted on it last week—we shall have trouble.

In all good conscience, let us remember that shortly we shall have a highly controversial issue before us, namely, the question of civil rights. Unanimous consent is required to proceed with the wheat and cotton bill. It may require a week to debate it. I think we should look into it. Very frankly, I had intended to introduce a wheat bill different from the one reported to the Senate. I believe mine is better. I had a different proposal with respect to cotton. There are some proposals on cotton that I believe to be acceptable. But, be that as it may, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] said, we should consider these proposals and vote them up or down.

If the Farm Bureau has a proposal that it wants enacted, let us bring it up and vote on it. If the Senator from Vermont has a proposal, he can offer it as an amendment. If any other Senator has such a proposal, he can offer it as an amendment. The only issue is: When shall we take up the bill?

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Minnesota, like many other persons has naturally been giving credence to the figures and estimates set forth in the 45-page document which was broadcast over the wheat area by the Department of Agriculture last spring. Although it was assumed that there would be an overplanting of wheat—and this document said if the farmers voted "no," 70 million acres of wheat would be planted—it now appears that about 53 million acres will be planted, which is 2 million acres less than the 55 million acre minimum national allotment up to now. But to assume there is to be a big increase in the planting of wheat, one must assume that many farmers will be stupid enough to give up the growing of corn and soybeans, which pay them \$75 to \$100 an acre, in order to plant wheat at \$35 an acre. Farmers are not built that way. That is why this year they are planting less than the minimum they could have planted 2 years ago by 2 million acres.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us not be too sure about that, because all of the plantings are not in.

Mr. AIKEN. If the entire States of Minnesota and North Dakota were planted in spring wheat it would be possible only to catch up to the minimum allowed 2 years ago.

The Senator from Louisiana very properly pointed out that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot announce a \$2 support price for wheat for the 1964 crop. Unless the Commodity Credit Corporation sees fit to dump its holdings on the market come the first of July in order deliberately to depress the price, the supply of free wheat is going to be 20 percent less than the demand for the coming marketing year. When the free

supply is 20 percent less than the demand, it is a seller's market. I do not believe Lyndon B. Johnson will ever permit the Secretary of Agriculture to crush the farm price for wheat or any other farm commodity, if he can help it. I think he is too smart for that. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture wants to do that, either.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota, along with the Senator from Vermont, has been urging that there be a tightening up on the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have never believed that the Commodity Credit Corporation ought, willy-nilly, to run through the marketplace. I believe its purpose is to supplement, not to supplant. I join the Senator from Vermont in that belief. But I wish I could be as hopeful about the more conservative estimates that the Senator from Vermont makes.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the President or the Secretary of Agriculture will let this terrible thing happen or cause it to happen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont is one of the wisest Members of this body, especially on the subject of agricultural policy. That is why we all listen to what he has to say. I must say, with all due respect, that even those who are opposed to the proposed legislation—and I have heard from many of them who are opposed to it—are concerned that there will be a rather sizable crop and that it will have a depressing effect on the market. I do not know whether the price will go down to \$1.30 or \$1.25 in the marketplace, but we are surely skating on thin ice. We can take some remedial action. I see no reason to take a risk.

Mr. AIKEN. The predicted 1964 crop will be a little less than what the Secretary now predicts will be the requirements for the coming year. But the Secretary quite obviously omits all possible sales to Russia or other Communist countries, which amounted to something like 300 million bushels this year. I believe that very probably it will not be as much next year. Regardless of what the Senator may say, reliable sources tell me that those countries already are looking into the prospects for buying next year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to describe to the Senate exactly what will happen if the wheat bill is not passed. It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that farmers will have \$400 million more in their pockets if the bill is passed than they would have if the bill were not passed.

The Senator from Vermont was discussing the income of farmers. The income of farmers will be \$400 million less if this bill is not passed than it would be under the bill. The reason is that it is calculated that domestic food wheat may sell for as much as 16 cents a bushel less if the bill is not passed.

Therefore, the bill should be passed. Farmers are already preparing to plant their spring crops. They will be plant-

ing them in only a few days. So the passage of the bill is highly important. Every day that we can save will mean one more day of benefit to the farmers who are planting wheat.

The bill is important for cotton farmers, too. They will want to know how many acres they can plant this year.

It is my view that the bill would be of great benefit, especially to small farmers throughout the South.

So I urge the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to join in starting a movement to have the Senate take up the bill on Tuesday. We can have another day in which to study it.

I am learning that the telegrams reaching my office—I called my office only a moment or two ago—are more than 10 to 1 in favor of the bill. If they continue to come in such numbers, I think the Senator from Iowa also would like to check on his mail. I am sure that when the wheatgrowers of the Middle West and Northwest have learned that they will receive more money, the telegrams in favor of the bill will start pouring in on him.

I urge Senators not to object at this time to the taking up of the bill. Let us discuss whether it is a good bill. Every feature of the bill can be discussed after it has been taken up. I do not think that this is the proper time to discuss that question, but it is the proper time to stress to the Senate that every day counts in determining whether to consider a bill that will benefit the farmers of our Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I yield, if I may, to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to believe in the accuracy of the figures submitted by the Senator from Vermont, and I should like to believe his optimistic viewpoint about what the Secretary of Agriculture could do about wheat prices and about what wheat prices would be. Winter wheat farmers did not overseed as much as expected. I understand that ordinarily they overseed about 12 percent, but that this year they overseeded about 14 percent; and the amount they plow down remains to be seen. Ordinarily they overseed for grazing purposes and to keep the land from blowing. This year, in the absence of new wheat legislation, I think they would not plow down very much.

In the spring wheat area, certainly the surplus of wheat has greatly increased. This year we had an alltime record, in storage, on January 1 of 179 million bushels. We had an estimated carryover, until Russian sales of around 1,100 million bushels. Even if the Russian sales materialize, we are going to have at least 750 million bushels; and that, on top of only a rather small crop, would mean a price-depressing surplus next year.

So I cannot believe that the position taken by the Senator from Vermont is accurate—namely, that the Secretary of

Agriculture could declare there was an emergency on the basis that there is a shortage of wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. No, that is not true—Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In order to declare an emergency, he would have to determine that by 1966 there would not be a surplus; that would be the only way by which he could put into effect from 75 percent to 90 percent supports, as the Senator has said.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture would only have to find that there had been a "material increase" in the demand for wheat.

Furthermore, the figures I used were official U.S. Department of Agriculture figures; and I think they are more accurate than the ones issued before the referendum last spring.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. He would have to determine that there would not be a surplus carryover on July 1, 1966. That is exactly what happened to dairy commodities and cotton; and when the Secretary of Agriculture Freeman increased the price supports it resulted in more surpluses. By no stretch of the imagination could he declare that there was not a surplus, and thus put into effect price supports of from 75 percent to 90 percent and acreage allotments. But even if he did with no mandatory controls that would result in a horrible increase in the surplus—a greater surplus than ever before.

Mr. AIKEN. The figures I used were absolutely correct; and the citations of law I submitted were found by the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I asked them to find the provisions of the law which authorize the Secretary to proclaim and also to terminate marketing quotas. The figures I used were from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, except I had to estimate 200 million bushels more for exports, which he did not include in his estimate, because he could not include it. That is not known, for there has not yet been a deal with the Communist countries, but they are dickering; let us be sure of that. They want to buy almost as much as they did last year, but not quite as much.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I should like to have the opinion of a competent attorney put into the Record, in order to support a case for the position that the Secretary of Agriculture could support prices for wheat, next year, by from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity, without a new law.

Mr. AIKEN. That is exactly the procedure I followed; I obtained the views of a competent attorney—one who knows agriculture from top to bottom; and he is not a farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have had demonstrated here the importance of debate on the farm bill, because it is clear that there are honest differences of opinion; and we should have this bill here before us, and it should be before us, not in connection with a point of order or in connection with a reservation of the right to object, but, instead, as a measure which is on the

calendar, and is called up from the calendar, and is before the Senate, for action.

In the estimates made on either side, certain "ifs" are always included. In making his estimates just prior to the referendum, the Secretary of Agriculture had in mind some "ifs," too—relating to the increased acreage which would be put into production if the referendum were defeated.

Now we hear some say, "If the Communists continue to buy"—and, by the way, as things look at the moment, they may be buying, but there may be no deliveries. I have not yet heard of any reconciliation of that problem, which affects shipments of the supplies. And if the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] were to gain a little more power in the Senate, the "if" about purchases by Communists would be out, once and for all.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in just a moment.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The other "if" is that if Western Europe were to have a crop failure, the United States would export about as much as it did this year. But no one can count on a crop failure in Western Europe.

Furthermore, if there is a drought in the United States, there will be decreased production. But that is another "if."

I think the point the Senator from North Dakota is trying to make is that even with the most reliable estimates in regard to the wheat carryover and production, I believe it will be well nigh impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to invoke section 322, paragraph (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, relating to a national emergency; at least, I believe there would be quite a stew and quite a series of complaints if that were to be done.

The Secretary can tighten up some of the procedures in regard to the disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; I think that is a possibility. I believe he could set the resale price on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks a little higher. But those would be only palliatives, not cures; and they do not in any way limit the accumulation of additional surpluses.

The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Louisiana were referring not only to the price structure, but also to the production itself and the accumulation of further surpluses; and that applies to cotton.

It is true that the Secretary of Agriculture, acting for the President, can continue the same price support or loan rate upon cotton; but he will also accumulate vast amounts of cotton in storage.

Without trying—again—to be an expert on that matter, let me say that I would hope the Senate would permit us to take up this farm bill expeditiously. I believe we should take it up this afternoon.

As soon as the majority leader returns to the floor—following some confer-

ences—I shall urge that he try, once more, to see whether the Senate will agree to take up the bill today.

The report on the bill has been on the desks of Senators since last week. I recall the time when the Senate took up a bill which related to as much as \$50 billion for defense procurement—legislation which affected the very life of the Nation—even though copies of the bill had been on our desks for only a few minutes; and then some Senator asked for unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill, and it was then considered. I recall a time when proposed legislation more far reaching than this measure was passed even though the printed report was not on the desks of Senators.

So, although I have my view in regard to certain controversial legislation, such as the civil rights bill, I believe we also need cotton legislation and wheat legislation, and I do not think we should stall it in any way. We have a difficult parliamentary situation; and the sooner we get at this proposed legislation, the better.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was just wondering. I am sure this proposed legislation is important to some people, and so is the civil rights bill. Why not take up the civil rights bill first, and get it out of the way; and then take up the farm bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would love to have that done, and my heart goes out to the Senator from Vermont. But the trouble is the calendar. I have reason to believe—on the basis of experience in the Senate—that when the civil rights bill is called up, following both the first reading and the second reading, and when the bill then is brought up by motion, we may be here a few days discussing it; and I also have a feeling that the planting season for wheat may well be over by the time we have completed our discussion of the civil rights bill. In fact, I am worried that perhaps the harvest will be over by the time we get through with the civil rights bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished acting majority leader has made the suggestion that perhaps when the majority leader returns, he will renew his request to take up the two-pronged farm bill. The Senator from Texas has objected. He registered a firm objection. The question is whether his objection stands for the day or whether objection must be made every time the request is made, because I would feel compelled to protect the distinguished Senator from Texas—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to inform the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Texas was told by the distinguished majority leader that any new unanimous request that might relate to the cotton and wheat bill would only be made after the Senator from Texas had been informed, because there are some other procedures that might be followed. So I can assure the Senator that no effort will be made to embarrass anyone, but there will be an honest effort made to find if we can get some date certain, at least, to take up the farm bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it ought to go further than that. If for any reason the Senator from Texas is tied up in a committee meeting and would not be available—

Mr. HUMPHREY. He will be brought back.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He should be present in the Chamber when the request is made. I shall protect him. I must protect him, because he registered a bona fide objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. The minority leader is absolutely correct. All rights will be protected. I understand that a further effort will be made to bring the cotton and wheat bill before the Senate; and all Senators who are interested in it will be informed by word of mouth, ringing of bells, Western Union, smoke signals, or in some other way.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may clarify a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a clarification.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The majority leader changed his request so that the bill would be considered tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Then the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] entered an objection temporarily. He withdrew it in order that there could be discussion of the request. I believe that is what is before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I propose to object after the discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is merely accommodating Senators who wished to make some remarks.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. First, there was the objection to taking up the cotton and wheat bill today. The majority leader asked unanimous consent that it might be brought up tomorrow. I said that I would enter an objection at the appropriate time to taking up the bill tomorrow. I do not know what I shall do tomorrow. I do not know what the Senator from Texas will do tomorrow. That is the situation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, who musters more power on the wheat sale every day.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much. I join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to the extent that I hope we can get before the Senate for discussion the proposed wheat legis-

lation and cotton legislation at the earliest possible date. I agree with him. I hope the Senate schedule will be arranged to accomplish this.

I agree also that it is a pretty precarious farm program that must rely on the presumed sale of wheat to the Communists. I commend the longshoremen for having displayed more regard for the best interests of Americans and the free world in connection with credit sales to Communist countries than has been demonstrated by the State Department, because they have refused to deliver what the State Department has authorized us to sell on highly speculative credit terms. But that is entirely a separate question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator made that point very well.

Mr. MUNDT. At some other time it should be and will be discussed more fully. I hope an appropriate farm bill can be enacted, for I follow more closely the line of reasoning of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] that the wheat farmer would prefer to have the Department of Agriculture directed to do thus and so than to rely on the optimistic hopes of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] that the Secretary of Agriculture will voluntarily do what is required on his own volition.

I feel that a government of laws is always superior to a government of men. I wish to write specific provisions into the law. I think the proposed farm legislation can be substantially improved by proper amendments. This, I submit, is sound Republican philosophy.

Mr. President, in that connection I send to the desk an amendment of my own to the proposed farm bill (H.R. 6196) as reported by the Senate committee. In the main, my amendment provides that—

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may not—

I repeat—not—

not sell wheat owned or controlled by it at less than 115 per centum of the current price therefor, plus reasonable carrying charges.

That would do one of the things which the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing. This could be the most significant factor in the proposed new farm bill from the standpoint of giving our farmers a better price for their wheat production. It also moves in the direction of taking the Government out of competition with the private trade channels and individual farmers in the marketing of wheat at rising price levels. It is a salutary amendment. I hope that the Senator from Minnesota will support it at the proper time. I believe it is one of the things which would improve the bill and increase chances of passing appropriate, effective, and timely wheat legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I have a similar amendment. I hope we can team up on the question.

It is good to have the Senator from South Dakota supporting the things I believe are right.

I would have felt much more influenced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont if I had not felt the massive power of the Senator from South Dakota when he took us over the traces on the matter of credit insurance on the sale to the Communist countries. So I am a little worried and confused by the cross current of argument between the Republicans on this question of proposed wheat legislation. But I wish to join the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], as I have done 101 times before, for the benefit of farm producers. I believe the effort will be all to the good.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Texas is not present in the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois has pointed out the agreement he had with the majority leader to be advised before a unanimous-consent request is again advanced. That agreement also covers notice in the event there should be a motion made in connection with taking up the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes. I assure the Senator that the majority leader never has done and never would do such a thing when the Senate is not fully notified of his intention to do so. Moreover, that valiant guardian of the public interest, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], is present to make sure that Senators behave.

SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since my distinguished friend from Minnesota alluded to the fact that the so-called Soviet wheat was not moving too freely, it ought to be pointed out, first, that they were going to charge us 66 cents a ton harbor fees as against the regular 22 cents until we unearthed a 1903 treaty.

Second, there was the assurance that payment would be cash on the barrel-head, until the transaction stretched out into a commercial venture with commercial credit running over a period of 18 months with export-import guarantees.

Third, it should be pointed out that not only did the late President of the United States give assurances about shipping in American bottoms, but Mr. James Reynolds, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, gave an unqualified assurance that that would be done. It is easy to understand why the maritime unions are up in arms. Only yesterday Mr. Meany commented on the fact, because here was an assurance from a responsible agent of Government as to what the Government was going to do. Then it begins trimming on its own assurances. Other things have entered into the picture to make it something of a nightmare. So when the story is told, let us tell the whole story and get all the facts before the Senate and before the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not wish my good friend from Illinois

to think I am not in full disagreement with what he said, because much of what he has said is on the line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All of what I said is on the line.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Much of what the distinguished Senator has said is on the line. If we can obtain agreement that much of what we say is on the line, it seems to me that we have secured a major victory. I was about to say "concession," but one cannot concede if he agrees.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All of what I said was on the line.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, having heard from the distinguished Republican leader why the estimates of the Senator from Vermont are wrong, I want to yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I said nothing about the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only problem is that the "ifs" and "ands" of the estimates of the Senator from Vermont were based on the fact that we were working on a normal, healthy basis of trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union on wheat. I do not think the able Senator took into consideration the fact that the ships did not get off the track. Of course, I know that ships do not travel on tracks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My distinguished transportation expert from the State of Minnesota has alluded to the Soviet wheat transportation, and I wanted to be sure that the whole story became a part of the record.

Frankly, it is something of a mess—and all four letters in that word can be spelled with capitals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that after having heard the Senator from South Dakota, and now having listened to the eloquent and penetrating argument of the Senator from Illinois, and the sage arguments by the Senator from Vermont, whose estimates were based and predicated on wheat sales to the Soviet Union as one way of reducing wheat stocks, I am convinced that he did not consider the possibility that such sales would be erased from the calculations.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us hope they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from North Dakota have made a case, in consequence of the supply of wheat and demand for it, which have an effect on price, which demands legislation.

I say the Senator has completely disproved the estimates of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota, at the time he had offered and was doing his best to secure the adoption of the proposal that went to the Banking and Currency Committee, never quite knew how prophetic he was going to be, because none of the insurance authority of the Export-Import Bank has been used except with

respect to two dribbling shipments to Hungary. So the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was quite prophetic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under that argument, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was making much to do about little or nothing, because some of us said at that time that the Soviet Union was not going to ask for credit.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Quite different from making much to do about nothing, the "to do" the Senator from Minnesota alludes to has brought about a salutary effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the purpose of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has tried, through many ways and means—I will not say they were devious, but they were effective—to see that all the negotiations would result in a great big goose egg.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As they say down in Tennessee, it was one of the greatest nothings that ever happened, so far as the country is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I have been very interested in the discussion and argument of the outcome of the wheat agreement. There was a very interesting discussion last fall. The Senate acted on that question, and approved the Export-Import Bank guarantee of the credit, which, in effect, was approval by the Senate of the sale.

There has been a great deal of criticism recently, and I thought in an off-hand remark by the Secretary of State, talk about private boycotts of sales. In effect, it seems to me as a result of the agitation by those who oppose the wheat sale, as demonstrated now by the labor unions, the conduct of our foreign relations has been taken out of the control of the administration and the Senate—insofar as concerns the Senate's part in having approved the wheat sale. In this case the labor union has negated the foreign policy as announced by the administration and as approved by the Senate. I think this is a dangerous thing to do, and that we should deplore it in the strongest possible terms. This is an effort to achieve indirectly what was sought to be achieved directly, through the challenge of that bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it all adds up to the fact that if this situation continues, and if the sale does not go through, there will be no further sales. It will mean that supplies of wheat which have been gathering in the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory will continue to mount. If the sale is off, supplies of wheat will continue to grow and mount in size. The price will go down.

If the price to the producer and farmer goes down, we shall be in economic trouble.

I am hopeful the sales will go through. I am hopeful that exports will expand. If they do not, much of what the Senator from Vermont has said bearing on market price and the sale will have no basis. But there are some uncertainties; and it is those uncertainties that plague us.

I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first, I agree wholeheartedly with the observations of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it is a shocking situation when a handful of labor leaders in effect take over the foreign policy of the United States.

On another matter, the Senator from Vermont very properly pointed to the unreliability of some of the estimates on which we attempt to base our actions.

I think we should agree that what we must do is make a judgment based on the best possible information we can obtain.

Without speaking directly to the point raised by the Senator from Vermont, I remind Senators that there have been at least six studies by agricultural economists as to what would happen to the farm economy in the absence of any farm program. There have been various studies showing that if we do not pass a wheat bill it will have a harmful effect on our livestock market, as well as wheat itself. The studies all indicate what will happen if agriculture is thrown on a free market, or something near a free market.

The latest study was made at Iowa State College, a distinguished agricultural institution in the State represented by the Senator from Iowa. This study projected what would happen in the absence of farm programs to stabilize both production and price of agricultural commodities. This is what the experts have found:

First of all, farm income by the year 1967 would fall by approximately \$5.7 billion, or a drop of 40 percent. Corn prices would drop to 85 cents a bushel. Wheat prices would drop to 94 cents a bushel. As a consequence, the price of cattle would fall to about \$15.80 a hundredweight, or \$6 below the price for 1962.

Estimated hog prices then would be \$13.50 a hundred, and so on. This means a total drop of some 40 percent in net agricultural income. I believe the best estimates that are available to us from the Department have made it quite clear that if we fail to act, the best we can hope for in wheat prices for 1964 is around \$1.40 to \$1.45. The support price, I should like to emphasize again, will be only \$1.26 or 50 percent of parity. So I wish to say to those who are concerned about livestock prices that the surest way we can undercut livestock prices and knock the bottom out of the cattle and hog market is to delay action on the bill to the point where it cannot be effective in time to benefit the 1964 crop.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I will agree it is the surest way to undercut livestock prices. It has been amply proved already by admitting unrestricted imports of meat products from other countries into the U.S. market.

Mr. McGOVERN. I will agree with the Senator that that is one problem.

Mr. AIKEN. That is a problem for the executive branch. It could have stopped that a year ago, before it got started, but it did not. It was so interested in turning over our markets to other countries that would lose their commonwealth preference if England were admitted to the Common Market, that it was trying to absorb those exports.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree that an increase in our imports is one factor that helps to determine the price of our own livestock prices, but it is only one. A basic factor is the price of feed grains that go to cattle and hogs. Cheap feed grains mean cheap cattle and hog prices a little later. I submit that is a basic cause of our problem.

Mr. AIKEN. The other day, I took occasion to compliment the Secretary of Agriculture on his handling of the feed grain situation. It has been costly. We cannot deny it. But the Secretary has held the price at a rather good level.

I wish the Senator from South Dakota to know why I spoke this morning as I did. The Senator may have noticed that I did not take a position on either part of the farm bill, but I do not wish the wheat growers of the Central Plains States, and other States, to get the idea that all is lost if they do not get the legislation out of this session of Congress. In fact, I believe the cotton part of the bill would get a lot more votes than the wheat part, anyway; but I do not wish wheat farmers to get discouraged. I believe there is a future in growing wheat. Regardless of whether we act on this bill or not, we are not going to produce enough this year to meet the probable demand. So there will be still further reduction in carry-over next year. My best guess now would be in the neighborhood of 200 million bushels or more; but what I was trying to point out was that there is a way in which wheat prices can be maintained. If I know the President of the United States—and all Senators worked with him in the Senate for many years—and I know the Secretary of Agriculture, they are not going to let wheat prices fall to a disastrous level, regardless of what Congress does.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator from Vermont fully recognizes that in terms of the 1964 crop, the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture are tied, that he has already prescribed marketing quotas. The referendum has rejected the quotas and I do not know how the price support can go over \$1.26; the law clearly says where quotas are rejected support shall be 50 percent of parity.

Mr. AIKEN. The hands of the Secretary of Agriculture are not tied. He will have control of practically all of the old

wheat, I believe it is 725 million bushels, on July 1, and if that is not put on the market at the minimum allowed by law, market prices will be good. It is evident that 1964 production will be considerably less—I estimate 20 percent less—than the requirements; and, under such conditions, we will have a seller's market. It is probably true that some wheat growers might get pinched for money and might sell for less than they should, but wheat growers are smart people and will not give away their wheat when they realize the demand is greater than the supply—assuming, of course, that the CCC will not dump its supplies on the market. That would depress prices, of course; but I do not believe they will use CCC wheat to depress the price to \$1.30 or \$1.40 a bushel; I do not believe that.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Vermont that the executive branch use whatever authority it has to protect prices of agricultural commodities, but I do not believe that relieves Congress from doing what it can to head off—

Mr. AIKEN. We have an obligation to the people who have been discriminated against. We also have an obligation to the civil rights advocates. I do not know which bill will take longer when it comes up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would hope, in view of the planting season that faces us just a couple of weeks down the road, that we could act quickly on this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the farmers of the country are not going to give up planting corn for \$1.25 or \$1.26 a bushel, or planting wheat at the same price. Neither are they going to give up planting soybeans at \$2.50 a bushel when planting wheat would bring half that price. I believe this is a practical situation, but what I wished to do is reassure wheat farmers that if Congress does not act, there is no necessity for and no probability of their getting disastrous prices next year.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree that we must give the farmers whatever assistance we can muster if the bill fails, but I am afraid that the rather optimistic conditions the Senator paints depend on an awful lot of "ifs." I believe there are at least 8 or 10 "if" conditions that would have to be met before what the Senator from Vermont contends would come true, so we really cannot promise the farmers of the country that they will get a good price for their 1964 wheat crop without any new wheat law at this time.

The supply of wheat will be near the level of our needs and prices will be above \$1.26 supports, but below the \$2 per bushel level in case all these "ifs" come true:

First. If winter wheat crop planting estimates prove correct.

Second. If farmers follow the plow-down pattern of recent years—years when marketing quota penalties were in effect—and

Third. If weather conditions are exceptionally unfavorable from the Dakotas to Texas the next 6 months; and

Fourth. If spring wheat producers do not overplant to any significant degree. In short, if all of these conditions did exist, production could be as low as 1,200 million bushels. This production, taken together with the 25 million bushels of "hot" wheat available on July 1, the 65 million bushels of barter and donation wheat which by law must come from CCC stocks, the normal 5-million-bushel imports, plus the 65 million bushels PIK certificate redemption wheat, would mean a free supply of 1,360 million bushels as a bare minimum; and

Fifth. If export demand holds at a high level which depends on worldwide weather conditions, production, quality, response to the 1963 situation, dollar demand, Public Law 480 demand, and shipments, and so forth; and

Sixth. If wheat prices stay in the range of \$1.25–\$1.35, we could estimate a significant increase in feed use—as much as 75 million bushels. If prices are above this level, feed utilization will drop sharply; only if there is stable domestic food use and some increase in feed use, could utilization in the range of 1,280 to 1,320 million bushels occur; and

Seventh. If all of these assumptions, or "ifs," were to turn out as facts; and

Eighth. If CCC abandons its long-time and well-accepted policy of payment-in-kind for export subsidies; and

Ninth. If CCC completely withdrew from the market and locked up its stocks; and

Tenth. If the policy of using wheat from CCC stocks for the short-term credit program was reversed; and

Eleventh. If wheat or flour for donation programs were, to the maximum extent possible, obtained from private stocks, then there would be upward pressure on wheat prices, at least after the normal harvest season glut, and season average prices could possibly be in the range of \$1.70–\$1.75 per bushel.

However, should all of the supply and utilization "ifs" not generally materialize, then even with all of the administrative actions permissible, it is hard to see how the season average prices could be much above \$1.40 per bushel.

If, on the other hand, weather was real good this spring, if plow down was less than normal, if spring wheat plantings were up, if world wheat supplies were good and total utilization equal to recent years prevailed, then prices could well average in the range of \$1.25–\$1.30 for the 1964 marketing year.

With only winter wheat seedings as a guide, I do not believe the incomes and destinies of some 1.25 million wheat farmers should be left to chance, or to the uncertainties of weather, plow down, world wheat production, and so forth. The risks, the "ifs," are just too great—too much of a gamble.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to make a few comments before I close. First of all, the Senator from Vermont had two sets of figures, one set relating to the esti-

mated production of acreage by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the other relating to exports more particularly to Communist countries.

It may be that the Senator from Minnesota believes that the second set of figures has been demolished; but I assure him that there has been no demolition of the first set of figures, upon which the Senator from South Dakota is premising the somewhat dismal picture.

I do not gainsay the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota. We come from the same general area of the country and we are all concerned about the prosperity of the farmer. But I do believe that we had better get our premises lined up. I have not seen anything yet to refute the figures of the Senator from Vermont with respect to the first total, and I would suggest that the Senator from South Dakota has been premising his viewpoint on obsolete figures and obsolete estimates by the Secretary of Agriculture which were made about the time of the wheat referendum nearly a year ago.

I do not wish to take a dog-in-a-manger attitude on this question, but I pointed out earlier in the day that I have not even had an opportunity to read the bill; but I must confess a little amazement at the great concern on the other side of the aisle to get something done on the wheat bill right now.

After the wheat referendum rejected the wheat program last spring, I was among the first in the Senate to ask for a new bill which would give the farmers a decent choice. Months have since gone by. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee was quoted as saying, I believe, that after the wheat referendum there would be no farm bill and that was all there was to it.

Other statements were made by other responsible Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle. I do not recall hearing the distinguished Senator from Minnesota say anything about it. He might have used a little more influence as the majority whip to get a bill before the Senate last year.

Months have gone by, and suddenly, Friday and today, a great sense of urgency is being displayed in the Senate.

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

Mr. MILLER. I am not blaming the Senator from South Dakota for this situation. He was one of those who was in favor of a bill. Unfortunately his views did not prevail. It is a little late now, it seems to me—

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

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota are in good standing on this subject. It is a little late, however, for our friends on the other side to say that the bottom will fall out of things if something is not done about the situation today or tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection

to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I enter my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I address a question to the acting majority leader?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As usual, two or three different things require my attention. I wish to be on the floor of the Senate as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if the bill is to come before the Senate today. Are we to understand that now it has been definitely decided that the bill will not come up on the floor for debate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Regrettably, that is the decision. There will be no agricultural bill on the floor of the Senate today. There may be some discussion of the bill, but no further action.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend.

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

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Chair, for the President pro tempore, announces the following appointments:

To the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Senator WALTERS.

To the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy: Senator BIBLE, Senator HOLLAND, and Senator KEATING.

To the Commission on Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial: Senator WALTERS.

To the Joint United States-Mexican Parliamentary Conference: Senators ELLENDER, JOHNSTON, GORE, GRUENING, KUCHEL, TOWER, MECHEM, and SIMPSON.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BONNER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. LEN-

NON, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. GLENN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2537. A bill 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; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 2538. A bill to amend section 47 of title 28, United States Code, to provide means for the disqualification of circuit judges for bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 2539. A bill for the relief of Koo-Sun Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2540. A bill for the relief of Emanuel E. Bloch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2541. A bill to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning February 10 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TO PRINT A SENATE DOCUMENT ON THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 300) to print a Senate document on the Federal prison system; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. LONG of Missouri, which appears under a separate heading.)

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 424)

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MUNDT submitted amendments, (No. 425), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage

increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CODIFIED IN TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 49

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, United States Code, section 39, and for other purposes.

This bill has been submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior, and its purpose is to repeal the provisions of law which prohibit the detail of Department of Interior field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia except under certain conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior explaining the purpose of this legislation be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2541) to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, United States Code, section 39, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1964.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, United States Code, section 39, and for other purposes.

We suggest that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill repeals the provisions of law that are codified in title 5, United States Code, section 39 (22 Stat. 255 and 34 Stat. 449), which prohibit the detail of field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia except for the performance of duties connected with their respective field offices. The language repealed provides as follows:

"It shall be unlawful to detail civil officers, clerks, or other subordinate employees who are authorized or employed under or paid from appropriations made for the military or naval establishments or any other branch of the public service outside of the District of Columbia, except those officers and employees whose details are specially provided by law, for duty in any bureau, office, or other division of any executive department in the District of Columbia, except temporary details for duty connected with their respective offices."

Repeal of these statutes would make meaningless the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 40, and title 19, United States Code, section 1525. These provisions are therefore also repealed.

Title 5, United States Code, section 40, provides:

"Nothing in section 39 of this title shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from detailing one officer from the Bureau of Customs for duty at the Treasury Department at Washington."

Title 19, United States Code, section 1525 provides:

"In connection with the enforcement of this chapter, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use in the District of Columbia not to exceed ten persons detailed from the field force of the Customs Service and paid from the appropriation for the expense of collecting the revenue from customs."

Prior to the 1951 fiscal year, appropriations made to the Department of the Interior contained limitations on amounts available for personal services in the District of Columbia. Such limitations were eliminated in the 1951 Appropriation Act for the Department, and they did not appear in the Department's 1952 budget. This has remained standard practice since that time. The language "personal services in the District of Columbia" was deleted from the Department's 1952 budget pursuant to section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 985, 986), which repealed the provision of the United States Code that required specific authorization in the appropriations for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The Department of the Interior has need, on occasion, to detail field employees into Washington, D.C., for experience in technical, executive, management and specialized work not necessarily related to their field tasks and to perform temporary duties in order to alleviate temporary workloads in the central offices. Several of the Department's bureaus have experienced increasing need for authorization to accomplish this. The Comptroller General has construed the present law as prohibiting such assignments unless directly related to the performance of field service.

The Department has no information as to the underlying reasons for this statutory restriction upon details of field employees in the District of Columbia. The statute was first enacted in 1882 (22 Stat. 255). The Department is of the opinion that it no longer serves any useful purpose and its repeal is recommended. If the statute were repealed and authorization granted to detail employees into Washington, D.C., there would be a small increase in costs involving payment of per diem and travel expenses. However, it is believed that the increased costs will be more than offset by the increased efficiency resulting in the utilization and performance of personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

TO PRINT A SENATE DOCUMENT ON THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on January 22, the Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries held a hearing on the status of our Federal prison system. While our Federal prison officials have their problems, the fact is clear that our Federal prison system is one of the most outstanding in the world. Over the years since the establishment of the Bureau of Prisons many fine articles and speeches have

been written concerning the work of the Bureau and penology in general. During the hearings the penitentiaries subcommittee agreed that the publication of a collection of these writings would contribute substantially to the efforts of our Nation to deal wisely with law violators. These writings have been collected, and I submit, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself, for appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing the printing of these writings as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a collection of writings about the Federal Prison system assembled by the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate; and that one thousand additional copies be printed for use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON BILLS TO BROADEN POWERS OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to give notice that the subcommittee plans to hold a public hearing in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 4, 1964, on several bills which would broaden the investment powers of credit unions, national banks, and Federal savings and loan associations. These bills are: S. 2161 and H.R. 8459, to broaden the investment powers of, and to provide increased administrative flexibility for, Federal credit unions; S. 2259 and H.R. 8230, broadening the power of national banks to lend on the security of forest tracts; and H.R. 9609, to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations and to authorize certain Federal funds to be placed in insured savings and loan associations.

Administration witnesses will be heard in support of these bills. Any members of the interested industries or the public who may wish to testify in connection with these bills are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, Chief of Staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, Room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone, Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

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

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Response by Walter N. Tobriner, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, in accepting national award at the annual Brotherhood Banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews on Feb-

ruary 17; and a list of former award recipients.

Discussion of advance showing of the film "One Man's Way," based on the life of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, and starring Don Murray.

TAX CUT MAY CONVERT BOOM TO INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the newly released gross national product figures for 1963 prove conclusively that a boom is underway, even before the effects of the tax cut are felt.

The fourth quarter of 1963 showed an increase of nearly \$11½ billion in the gross national product—the largest quarterly advance in over 2½ years. This indicates an increasingly vigorous economic expansion.

With the continuation of this expansion, we could balance our budget within a year or so. Because of the tax cut, however, we are indefinitely continuing budget deficits.

The argument has been made that this expansion is due to anticipation of the tax cut. The figures definitely disprove this argument. The items that increased the most are those least affected by the tax cut.

Look at the facts: A major increase was in automobiles, a durable purchase not affected by minor changes in after-tax income. Major increases occurred in exports, yet foreigners do not get a tax cut. State and local government purchases rose substantially, although these governments do not get tax reductions.

Thus, the danger flags are flying. Put the tax cut on top of these boom conditions and the results will be inflationary, unless there is extraordinary restraint by business, labor, and government.

WISCONSIN CONGRESSIONAL AP- PORTIONMENT BEST IN NATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Congressional Quarterly of February 21, 1964, has a report on congressional district disparities and variations apropos of the one-vote, one-person decision by the Supreme Court in the Georgia case.

I am proud and happy to point out that Wisconsin has the best record of any of the 50 States. The fact is that Wisconsin, under the new law that has recently been enacted reapportioning Wisconsin's congressional districts, has a maximum variation of 3.4 percent from the average. This means the smallest of Wisconsin's 10 congressional districts is only about 3½ percent less than ideal size, the largest only about 3 percent more than ideal size.

This is without question the best showing of any State. The only States that compare with Wisconsin, that is, with a variation less than 10 percent from ideal, are Rhode Island, which has only two districts, New Hampshire, which has only two districts, North Dakota with two districts, and Maine with two districts. Wisconsin has a more equal, one-vote-for-one-person representation than any

of the 50 States. This is a record in which I believe both Wisconsin political parties can take pride.

Wisconsin has a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature. Gov. John Reynolds has done an excellent job and deserves much credit for having piloted the congressional reapportionment bill through a Republican legislature. At the same time, it is obvious that the Republican majority in the legislature deserves credit for having supported a bill which provides such a close, almost precise representation of the populations

of the areas of our State. The maximum difference from the ideal-sized district in Wisconsin is only 13,000. When it is considered that Wisconsin has 10 congressional districts, this is a remarkable achievement for our Governor and our legislature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table published in the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Congressional district disparities and variations

[Based on 1960 census figures and 88th Cong. districts]

	Current number of Representatives	State population	Average district	Maximum variation from average (per cent)	Largest district	Smallest district	Disparity between largest and smallest	1964 House filing deadline
Alabama	8	3,266,740	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	Mar. 1
Alaska	1	266,167	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	May 1
Arizona	3	1,302,161	434,054	-54.3	663,510	198,236	465,274	July 10
Arkansas	4	1,786,272	446,568	+28.8	573,385	332,844	242,541	Apr. 29
California	38	15,717,204	413,611	+42.4	588,933	301,872	287,061	Mar. 20
Colorado	4	1,753,947	438,487	-55.4	653,954	195,551	458,403	July 24
Connecticut	6	2,535,234	422,539	-37.1	689,555	318,942	370,613	June or July 4
Delaware	1	446,292	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	Aug. 4
Florida	12	4,951,560	412,630	+60.3	660,345	237,235	423,110	Mar. 3
Georgia	10	3,943,116	394,312	+108.9	823,680	272,154	551,526	July 24
Hawaii	2	632,772	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	Sept. 3
Idaho	2	667,191	333,596	-22.9	409,949	257,242	152,707	May 7
Illinois	24	10,081,158	420,048	-33.6	552,582	278,703	273,879	Jan. 27
Indiana	11	4,662,498	423,863	-64.6	697,567	290,596	406,971	Mar. 26
Iowa	7	2,757,537	393,934	+12.3	442,406	353,156	89,250	Mar. 28
Kansas	5	2,178,611	435,722	+23.9	539,592	373,583	166,009	June 20
Kentucky	7	3,038,156	434,022	+40.8	610,947	350,839	260,108	Apr. 1
Louisiana	8	3,257,022	407,128	-35.2	536,029	263,850	272,179	May 29
Maine	2	969,265	484,633	4.3	505,465	463,800	41,665	Apr. 1
Maryland	8	3,100,689	442,566	+60.5	711,045	243,570	467,475	Mar. 9
Massachusetts	12	5,148,578	429,048	-12.3	478,962	376,336	102,626	July 28
Michigan (current)	19	7,823,194	411,747	+84.8	802,994	177,431	625,563	June 16
Michigan (1964 election)	19	7,823,194	411,747	-25.7	490,310	305,952	184,358	June 16
Minnesota	8	3,413,864	426,733	+13.2	482,872	375,475	107,397	July 14
Mississippi	5	2,178,141	435,628	+39.7	608,441	295,072	313,369	Apr. 3
Missouri	10	4,319,813	431,981	+17.3	506,854	378,499	128,355	Apr. 28
Montana	2	674,767	337,384	-18.7	400,573	274,194	126,379	Apr. 23
Nebraska	3	1,411,330	470,443	-14.0	530,507	404,695	125,812	Mar. 13
Nevada	1	285,278	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	July 15
New Hampshire	2	606,921	303,461	9.3	331,818	275,103	56,715	July 10
New Jersey	15	6,066,782	404,452	+44.8	585,586	255,165	330,421	Mar. 12
New Mexico	2	951,023	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	Mar. 17
New York	41	16,782,304	409,324	+15.1	471,001	350,186	120,815	Apr. 28
North Carolina	11	4,556,155	414,196	-32.9	491,461	277,861	213,600	Mar. 20
North Dakota	2	632,446	316,223	5.4	333,290	299,156	34,134	May 21
Ohio	24	9,706,397	404,417	+72.1	726,156	236,288	489,868	Feb. 5
Oklahoma	6	2,328,284	388,047	+42.5	552,863	227,692	325,171	Feb. 28
Oregon	4	1,768,687	442,172	-40.0	522,813	265,164	257,649	Mar. 6
Pennsylvania	27	11,319,366	419,236	+31.9	553,154	303,026	250,128	Feb. 18
Rhode Island	2	859,488	429,744	7.0	459,706	399,782	59,924	June 30
South Carolina	6	2,382,594	397,069	+33.9	531,555	272,220	259,335	(7)
South Dakota	2	680,514	340,257	46.3	497,669	182,845	314,824	Apr. 18
Tennessee	9	3,567,089	396,343	+58.2	627,019	223,387	403,632	June 8
Texas	23	9,579,727	416,527	+118.5	951,527	216,371	735,156	Feb. 3
Utah	2	680,627	340,314	28.6	472,654	317,973	154,681	Mar. 31
Vermont	1	339,881	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	July 29
Virginia	10	3,966,949	396,695	+36.0	539,618	312,890	226,728	Apr. 15
Washington	7	2,853,214	407,602	+25.2	510,512	342,540	167,972	July 17
West Virginia	5	1,860,421	372,084	-18.6	422,048	303,068	118,948	Feb. 1
Wisconsin (current)	10	3,951,777	395,178	-40.1	530,316	236,870	293,446	July 14
Wisconsin (1964 election)	10	3,951,777	395,178	+3.4	408,677	381,830	26,847	July 9
Wyoming	1	330,066	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	July 9

1 Currently elected at large.

2 Seat only.

3 At-large seat not included in computation of average.

4 Dates of State party conventions where nominations are made.

5 At-large districts.

6 Based on 1963 redistricting law.

7 Undetermined.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI TO COUNCIL OF SOUTHSIDE ADVANCEMENT ASSOCIATIONS, INC., MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on February 9, speaking before the Council of the Southside Advancement Associations, Inc., in Milwaukee, Postmaster

General John Gronouski delivered a speech that was excellent in many respects. One of the most impressive and appealing parts of this speech, in my judgment, was that the Postmaster General discussed the subject of prejudice and bigotry. In view of the pending civil rights controversy, I believe this discussion by the Postmaster General is most appropriate.

Mr. President, one of the great difficulties in the country today stems from the criticism of certain ethnic groups as being more biased than others. The Postmaster General addressed himself to that subject in speaking to the Council of South Side Advancement Associations, Inc., in Milwaukee. I quote from the speech:

I must admit to you, however, that I do get tired of the snide comments I hear and read about Americans of Polish descent. Those of us whose parents or grandparents were born in Poland are no strangers to discrimination. We have a proud history of fighting against discrimination and oppression wherever it exists.

Americans of Polish origin apologize to no one when it comes to believing in the basic freedoms of America. Our young men have fought and died to preserve those freedoms. Our people have contributed greatly to the free enterprise system and the American way of life which provides freedom of opportunity for all our people.

Certainly, there are bigoted people of Polish descent, just as there are bigoted people of German descent or Irish descent or any national origin.

But I know that I am reflecting the entire history of the Polish people—both in the old country, and here—and that I am speaking for the vast majority of Americans of any origin when I say that we believe in measuring each man as an individual, regardless of race, creed, or color.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire address by Mr. Gronouski be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET, COUNCIL OF SOUTH SIDE ADVANCEMENT ASSOCIATIONS, INC., MILWAUKEE, WIS., FEBRUARY 9, 1964

I am honored to be here tonight to speak at your annual banquet. Since I became Postmaster General last September, I have traveled to many places across the country and I have addressed many groups. But coming back to Wisconsin—and especially to this type of gathering of my friends in Milwaukee—is a special pleasure for me. I was delighted to be able to accept the invitation of your president, Adam Brzostowicz.

Soon after I accepted, a reporter wrote a story in which he attempted to ascribe all sorts of sinister motives to my visit to the south side of Milwaukee. He even went so far as to call me "a carpetbagger from Michigan," despite the fact that I was born and raised in Wisconsin and have spent most of my life in this State.

Needless to say, I have not come here tonight to do any carpetbagging, but to talk to you about some of the issues confronting our Nation and our State.

I have also come for another reason—to talk about a mutual friend of ours, your distinguished Congressman, CLEM ZABLOCKI. Before I left Wisconsin to go to Washington, I knew that Congressman ZABLOCKI was an important man in the Nation's Capital. In the last 4 months, however, I have learned just how influential he is.

CLEM is one of my closest friends and most trusted advisers in Washington. And in that respect, I am in good company. There is no need for me to tell you how close Congressman ZABLOCKI was to our late, beloved President Kennedy. And now he has become one of the top congressional advisers to President Johnson. The secret to Congressman ZABLOCKI's success is really a very simple one: While he votes his convictions and asserts

his influence and leadership on the great national and international issues confronting the Congress, he never forgets about the people who sent him to Congress. One week, he will be heading an important study mission to southeast Asia and the next week he will be fighting to make sure that Milwaukee gets the finest possible hospital to care for its veterans.

Recently, when CLEM was the host at a luncheon for me at the Capitol, I had some firsthand evidence of his prestige. Not only was he able to command bipartisan attendance from our Wisconsin congressional delegation, but the Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, and the House majority leader, CARL ALBERT, came to the luncheon out of respect for Congressman ZABLOCKI.

Although the plans are not yet definite, I have been invited by the Government of Poland to visit the homeland of my grandparents later this year. If time and circumstances permit me to make the trip, I hope I will be able to work in a visit to an outstanding example of the great accomplishments of your Congressman—the children's hospital at Cracow, which is being constructed with U.S. funds.

That children's hospital would not have come about without the great and guiding force of CLEM ZABLOCKI.

In the caliber of its representation in Congress, Wisconsin is one of the most fortunate States in the Nation. Our two U.S. Senators—BILL PROXMIER and GAYLORD NELSON—give us full-time, dynamic representation in the Senate.

Here in the State, I have been told there is a movement afoot to sell the idea that the people of the South Side of Milwaukee are not concerned about the schools their children attend, or the public institutions for the handicapped and mentally ill, or the roads our people drive on, or the industrial climate of Wisconsin.

I have been told that this movement which is afoot is trying to sell the idea that the South Side is a one-issue area.

Well, I consider that an insult to the people of South Side Milwaukee. I consider it a slander and I know it is not true.

I know you are deeply concerned about our schools—especially our colleges and universities—about the safety of our highways, the quality of our hospitals and mental institutions, the economic health of our State and the many other important issues facing the people of Wisconsin.

This is a nonpartisan gathering here tonight—and despite the rumors—I did not come here to give a campaign speech. But I would not be true to myself if I did not use this opportunity to say that just as the South Side is not a one-issue area, my friend John Reynolds is not a one-issue Governor.

I know and you know that Governor Reynolds has been waging a great battle in Madison against heavy odds in the legislature to take care of the State of Wisconsin and its people. You may not agree with him on every issue, but I know you respect him for fighting for you and your children and for a brighter future for Wisconsin.

In a more personal vein, I am proud to be able to speak at this banquet which is held each year close to the anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln. It is an ironic and tragic twist of history that two of our greatest Presidents—Lincoln and Kennedy—should be shot down by assassins' bullets.

There are many parallels in the lives of the two Presidents. Both were great because they led public opinion, because they were fearless and courageous. And they were great because they cared about people—the little people, the oppressed, and the afflicted.

A hundred years ago, Lincoln fought to free the slaves and preserve the Union. A hundred years later, Kennedy fought to as-

sure equal opportunities for every citizen of our land and to preserve peace in the world.

Both Presidents died when there still was so much they could have accomplished. But both will be remembered in history for how much they did accomplish.

I was only able to serve President Kennedy for a very short time before his death, but in that period I was able to glimpse the measure of the man and to be inspired by his tremendous capacities for leadership.

Now President Johnson is building on the accomplishments of John Kennedy. No Vice President in our history was better qualified to take over the Presidency than Lyndon Johnson. His many years in the Congress gave him a broad understanding and appreciation of every area of government.

Throughout the 3 years of President Kennedy's administration, President Johnson was at his side, contributing to each major decision. He knew every phase of U.S. policy and he was able to take over the reins of Government without a moment's hesitation.

The smoothness of the transition of administrations was enormously impressive and reassuring, not only to Americans, but to people all over the world. The orderly transfer of power, in a time of sudden crisis, was a dramatic demonstration of the stability of our Government. It made clear the maturity of American political society and the strength of our democracy.

The skill, vigor, and determination with which President Johnson has begun his Presidency have won him almost unprecedented public confidence.

The President has made it clear that the overriding business of this administration is to build on President Kennedy's brilliant and tireless work for world peace. In the last 3 years, we have witnessed a solid beginning on the difficult road to an honorable, just, and sound peace.

President Johnson is working for further steps toward the control and eventual abolition of arms. At the same time, he has made it abundantly clear we will at all times maintain our guard.

At home, the President has declared unconditional war on the remaining poverty in our Nation. And last week he named President Kennedy's brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, as his special assistant to direct that war. The President wants to wipe out the last vestiges of poverty in the richest nation in the world.

I am sure you can understand what a great thrill it is for me—a smalltown boy from Wisconsin—to sit in the Cabinet of the United States and to be the chief of the Nation's vast postal service. I have 595,000 (soon to be 590,000) employees working under me. Our work force is about as large as General Motors.

I know you can also understand how proud and humble I am to be the first American of Polish descent to be a member of any President's Cabinet. In all my actions, I will not tarnish that honor and I will try to live up to the high standards of my heritage.

I must admit to you, however, that I do get tired of the snide comments I hear and read about Americans of Polish descent. Those of us whose parents or grandparents were born in Poland are no strangers to discrimination. We have a proud history of fighting against discrimination and oppression wherever it exists.

Americans of Polish origin apologize to no one when it comes to believing in the basic freedoms of America. Our young men have fought and died to preserve those freedoms. Our people have contributed greatly to the free enterprise system and the American way of life which provides freedom of opportunity for all our people.

Certainly, there are bigoted people of Polish descent, just as there are bigoted people of German descent or Irish descent or of any national origin.

But I know that I am reflecting the entire history of the Polish people—both in the old country, and here—and that I am speaking for the vast majority of Americans of any origin when I say that we believe in measuring each man as an individual, regardless of race, creed, or color.

And I am proud to be working for a man in the White House who shares my deep conviction in this matter.

It is the American system of freedom of opportunity that allows me—an American of Polish descent—to sit in the Cabinet of President Johnson today.

Those of us who are not members of the Daughters of the American Revolution know from personal experience what it is like to be discriminated against. Even now, I get letters from certain regions of the country from mothers who are upset because their children's Polish names are ridiculed by classmates in school. And I get letters from postal workers who believe they have been discriminated against because they are Polish.

The point I am making is obvious: Anyone can be discriminated against for any reason. And I know from my own heritage that the Polish people have long battled against injustice and prejudice.

We pay homage tonight to Abraham Lincoln who fought the battle a hundred years ago, but Americans of Polish descent can also be proud of a great Polish leader, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Kosciuszko came to Philadelphia in 1776. As a colonel of engineers, he organized the defenses at Ticonderoga and West Point, contributed to Burgoyne's defeat at Bemis Heights, and strengthened the Saratoga fortifications. A grateful Congress gave him American citizenship, a pension with landed estates in Ohio, and the rank of brigadier general.

Kosciuszko was more than a professional soldier and engineer. He was an outstanding humanitarian. Before he returned to Europe in 1798, he drew up a will placing him in the forefront of the movement to abolish slavery.

It read: "I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize by friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other and giving them liberty in my name."

Thank you.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on February 24, 1918, the Estonian people, represented in their National Council, cast off the last vestiges of Russian imperialism, and declared themselves independent. This took great courage, for the Russian army was doing everything in its power to maintain control of Estonia. But the Estonian people knew their rightful heritage. They were a distinct and advanced people, deserving national self-determination.

That day 46 years ago was the most important in Estonian history. It started a remarkable improvement economically, in agriculture and industry, and it also started an improvement in Estonia that was really astounding, in education and in many other ways, as this new, small democracy developed.

Independence started Estonia on 22 years of amazing progress under democracy. Agricultural production expanded tremendously as agrarian reform gave land to the peasants for the first time

in centuries. Estonia soon was self-sufficient in food, and even more, exported great amounts of butter, potatoes, and grain. The 52,000 farms of 1919, owned by the German, state, and church monopolies, became 140,000 small family farms. As always, private farm ownership led to the greatest production of food in the nation's history. No one went hungry in Estonia before the war.

Industry grew markedly during those years of independence. Oil deposits were discovered and developed. Peat, phosphates, lumber, woodpulp and paper, building materials, and many other products were produced by Estonians for their comfort and happiness.

The economic boom was supplemented by a major explosion of cultural progress. Education was developed to the fullest. Illiteracy was reduced to about 3 percent, including many illiterate Russian refugees. Schools were constructed at an impressive rate, and nearly every school-age child in Estonia had access to education. The University of Tartu was a center of learning, with almost 3,000 students, a library of 660,000 books, and a large faculty of noted educators. Music, art, and cultural pursuits of all kinds flourished. This was quite an achievement for a small nation of little more than a million people. In short, it was quite obvious that the Estonian people were devoted to freedom. By their hard work and talents they created a new Estonia, progressive and independent, with every chance of greater improvement in the future.

But we know that this chance was destroyed by the Communists in 1940. The greed of the Soviet Union in its restless search for new peoples to conquer brought untold misery to the 6 million people in the Baltic nations. In an age when every self-respecting nation should have been trying to set an example in opposition to Nazi degeneracy, the Soviet Union chose instead to join in the merciless partition and subjection of peaceful peoples. The world has seldom seen such cynicism and hypocrisy from one nation as that evidenced by the Soviet Union in 1939 and 1940.

The Communists now think the world has forgotten Estonia. But we owe it to our fellow citizens from Estonia and to free people everywhere not to ever forget what happened to Estonia. Every year on Estonian Independence Day, whether it be the 46th or the 100th, the people of the United States will send best wishes and hopes for freedom and happiness to the Estonian people. Let us hope especially that in the near future Estonia will receive these greetings as a free nation, able to accept them as a part of its own joyous celebration.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a Presi-

dent and the inauguration of a new President. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of February 25, 1964, p. 3539, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. JACKSON. The bill would provide for an authorization to assist in meeting the costs of the incoming President-elect and Vice President-elect, and also of the outgoing President and Vice President for a period of 6 months after the latter leave office.

The bill as it passed the House provided for an authorization of \$1,300,000. When it came to the Senate, we reduced the authorization to \$500,000. In the conference, after considerable discussion, we, in effect, split the difference between the House figure of \$1,300,000 and the Senate figure of \$500,000, and agreed upon an authorization of \$900,000.

In addition, we reduced the amount that could be approved on voucher from 20 percent to 10 percent of the total amount to be authorized. This would relate to those matters which the President-elect decided involved costs related to what we termed classified and essential to the national security. Originally, the bill provided that the President-elect and the Vice President-elect merely needed to certify the costs as confidential. The conference language holds that they must be classified and essential to the national security. Those are the two principal amendments that were agreed upon in the conference to resolve the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I shall vote against the conference report. I hope I am not penurious in my approach to any program to provide for the President and Vice President of the United States. It seems to me it is utterly unrealistic and excessive to allow \$900,000 to be expended between the election of the President and Vice President in November and their taking office in January.

We hear much talk these days about economy. Yet a program of this kind is presented to us, which provides a sum, beyond the salaries of the President and Vice President, for the support of those offices for a period of 6 or 8 weeks between the November election and the assumption of power about January 20.

Mr. President, when compared with the total budget, this is not a large sum of money. However, we should bear in mind that the budget is made up of thousands of items of this size or smaller items, and the sum total of them is what leads to such enormous spending.

More than that, Mr. President, proposals of this kind are somewhat of symbols as to the attitudes of Congress and

the executive branch of the Government toward spending.

There are already a number of services which are available—particularly to the outgoing President. He is allowed a staff and a certain sum of money; and the incoming President receives a large number of services which are not reflected in or affected by this item—for example, Secret Service protection. He needs that, but that item appears elsewhere in the budget. There are a number of other perquisites which flow immediately to one who is elected President.

So it seems to me wholly unnecessary to provide almost \$1 million to take care of these activities from November until January.

I am aware of the fact that the national committees of the two parties are pressing very vigorously for the enactment of this proposed legislation. Heretofore, such sums as have been expended have generally been contributed by the Democratic National Committee or by the Republican National Committee, and I do not think it is improper to have some allowance made for these expenditures. For that reason, when the bill was before the Democratic Policy Committee, I suggested that the amount be reduced from \$1,300,000 to \$500,000; and that course was followed on the floor of the Senate, and the bill as passed by the Senate called for \$500,000. I think that sum would be ample to provide for these expenses over this period of time, for it amounts to more than \$125,000 a month. Although the demands are great, they do not even approach those which are made upon the time and the resources and the staff of one who actually has assumed the Presidency.

I think it becomes rather ridiculous when the newspapers herald the fact that the President is going around the White House, turning out the lights, and that the post offices are being darkened at night, to save money, and that we are going to return to the homespun quality of thrift, which we knew in our boyhood days, but then to have Congress provide \$900,000 of entirely new money, really for the relief of the treasury of the Republican National Committee in, perhaps, the year 1980 or the year 1985, or somewhere about then, and now for the relief of the Democratic National Committee and the other campaign committees. To me, that approaches irresponsibility; and I merely wish to have the RECORD show that I voted against it.

Mr. President, I do not seek to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on this question, because in my efforts to obtain some reason and some sanity in Government spending, I have found that about the best way to get run over hard is to advocate a reduction in expenses when one is serving in a Senate in which Members speak continually about economy. If a Senator really wants to get trampled under foot, let him just make a motion that expenditures of this sort be cut—such a motion in a Senate in which individual Senators rise each day and swear their allegiance to economy.

This provides too much money, and I regret it. I know the Senate conferees must have made an effort to defend the

position taken by the Senate; but in my opinion the American taxpayers should not be taxed more than \$500,000 to take care of the expenses of the President-elect from the time of the election until the time when he assumes that office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, let me assure the Senator from Georgia that I was highly in favor of a \$500,000 limitation. However, the Senator from Georgia knows that the House was in favor of a much larger amount; and in such a case, normally an attempt is made to strike a balance between the position taken by the House and the position taken by the Senate; and the balance was struck exactly between the amounts voted by the two Houses.

However, the Senator from Washington pointed out, in the conference, that this amount is a ceiling; it is not necessarily the amount of money that will be appropriated. This is an authorization bill; and the Appropriation Committees may not approve amounts up to the ceiling thus set. The expenditures may not come anywhere near that amount. So perhaps the Senator from Georgia and I will, later, have an opportunity together to do something about getting this amount back to the amount which we think it really should be.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished and able Senator from Iowa that after a bill which relates to what are in the category of housekeeping items is passed by Congress, thereafter a Member of Congress is considered guilty of lese majesty, if not a number of other things, if he attempts to interfere with expenditures in the White House—as would also be the case if a Member of the Senate attempted to interfere with expenses in the other body of Congress.

If I had been aware that splitting the difference would be the rule which would be followed on all occasions, I would have endeavored to have the Senate vote for \$100,000; and in that case, we would have been much better off, following the conference.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say there is in the bill an item which was of even greater concern to me, and apparently it was also of great concern to other Senators, because the House version provided that up to 20 percent of this money could be spent for confidential items. The Senate rejected that provision, and deleted that portion of the bill, and did not feel that any of this money should be spent in a confidential way—with the result that the taxpayers would not know what was going on.

This question was raised in the conference. At my suggestion, we struck out the word "confidential," and inserted in lieu thereof the phrase "classified and are essential to the national security."

It seems to me that a newly elected President of the United States can be trusted, so that if he certifies that any of these expenditures are classified and are essential to the national security, we should be willing to recognize that per-

haps there are some items which are indeed essential to the national security and should not be revealed. We already do that in the case of the President of the United States; and in the case of the President-elect, the feeling of the conferees was that this would be a desirable thing, and that an appropriate safeguard was placed on it.

The House version provided for up to 20 percent of these items. It was agreed that that percentage would be cut to 10 percent; and it was our feeling that with that 10 percent reduction, plus the limitation I have mentioned, the interests of the Senate would be amply served.

As I have said, I have reservations regarding the amount. I would have preferred \$500,000. However, I think we still will have an opportunity, at the time when the Appropriations Committee makes its report on this item, to reduce it; and if there are good reasons for reducing it, I am sure we shall do so. And if there are not good reasons for requesting the Appropriations Committee to vote in favor of an appropriation of \$900,000, I am sure that committee will not recommend \$900,000, either.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his able assistance in connection with the conference.

I desire to point out that we feel that this is definitely a ceiling; and in my judgment—speaking only for myself, although I am sure I also speak for the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—they can get along with well under the \$900,000 figure.

The House took an adamant position on the \$1,300,000; and the result—\$900,000—was a pure compromise, nothing else.

I also wish to point out that this authorization includes the costs of the outgoing President and Vice President for a period of 6 months from January 20 of the year in which they leave office. I think it is a rather improper business for the national committees of both national parties to pay the costs of an incoming President and an incoming Vice President in connection with matters that relate directly to their responsibilities and duties as President and Vice-President-elect. I do not believe the political parties should be involved in that sort of thing.

Obviously, this program must be kept within bounds. I wish to make the record clear that we in the Congress should scrutinize very carefully the requests for funds in this regard, because there is no reason in the world why the entire job, affecting the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, and the outgoing President and Vice President, cannot be done for a sum much less than the \$900,000 figure. Therefore, I would like the record to show that it was with great reluctance that the \$900,000 figure was agreed upon.

It was only in the interest of getting the proposed legislation passed that that figure turned out to be \$900,000. We would expect that years hence—of course, many years—when funds are made available, they would be scrutinized

very carefully; and that this job could be done for a sum very substantially less than the amount authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I call attention to the strong possibility that the conference report on the tax bill may well be considered tomorrow afternoon.

I have discussed the question of the four treaties on the Executive Calendar with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and there is a strong possibility that they will come up and perhaps be voted on shortly after 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, Calendar No. 851, may be brought up tomorrow provided it is cleared all around and that not too much in the way of debate will be required in view of the other possibilities inherent in the session on Tuesday.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Can the Senator outline for us the likelihood of the civil rights bill coming before the Senate? Will it be brought before the Senate following consideration of the bill relating to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938? When I was out of the Chamber, I understand that objection was made to the consideration of the cotton and wheat bill. I wondered what the plan of the leadership was and how that plan would impinge on the civil rights bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the distinguished Senator from New York consider the possibility of postponing the taking up of the civil rights bill until next Monday or Tuesday so that it might be possible to get the farm bill before the Senate tomorrow or the next day?

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from New York has relatively little to do about it, as the Senator from Montana knows.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I raise the question only because if that procedure were given serious consideration, it would have to be by unanimous consent. The Senator is asking me a question. I am trying to give him the benefit of my thoughts as to what moves can possibly be made.

Mr. KEATING. As the Senator knows, I have not been one of the objectors to taking up the farm bill—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. KEATING. However, I am not in accord with that particular strategy, because I envision a long debate on the farm bill. I do not believe that it would be enacted in 2 or 3 days. It will require long debate. I would not like to see the proposed civil rights legislation deferred to that extent. Since I do not know what the present plans are in relation to the cotton and wheat bill, I wondered if the Senator felt like stating what they were and when we could expect the proposed civil rights legislation to be brought before the Senate. If he can do so, I would appreciate it, although I understand perfectly that he may not at the moment be able to respond to that inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, I tried to obtain unanimous consent to take up the cotton and wheat bill tomorrow, but there was objection to my request. If the climate is right, it is possible that another attempt may be made tomorrow. I am a little disturbed that a bill of that nature, which means so much to the wheat ranchers in my part of the country and the West in general, as well as the Middle West, has encountered such difficulty up to now.

The Senator knows that time is becoming of the essence insofar as concerns taking up the civil rights bill, although once the Senate takes up that bill, I am sure there will be plenty of time to discuss it. So I am merely trying to think of various ways and means, in the shape of possibilities, as to what might possibly be done and still obtain consideration of the wheat and cotton bill. So far, I must admit in all candor that I am stymied.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Perhaps I misunderstood the inquiry which the distinguished majority leader addressed to me. I would not wish to have him labor under any false impressions regarding my intentions. Did I correctly understand him to make the inquiry as to whether the Senator from New York would object, in a new legislative day, the Senate having adjourned, to a unanimous consent request to defer the second reading of the civil rights bill? I would have to object to that. I did not understand that that was the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason I asked the question of the Senator was that I know of his unfailing desire to bring the civil rights bill before the Senate as quickly as possible and make it the pending business. One of the possibilities being considered was perhaps postponing the civil rights bill for another 3, 4, or 5 days. For that reason I raised the question at that time. The reason behind the question is that there would be an attempt to get the wheat and cotton bill out of the way. It would be made the pending business and disposed of.

Mr. KEATING. I would certainly be disposed to object to deferral of the second reading of the bill if the Senate were in a new legislative day and the bill were properly before it. But that is not our present problem, of course. That may arise tomorrow or—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator object to postponing the second reading to a date certain?

Mr. KEATING. I would be disposed to object to anything which would defer the already deferred proposed civil rights legislation any further for the purpose of letting it be supplanted by a farm bill or some other proposed legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I hope I have explained the situation to him as best I can.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that. I regret that I did not get the full purport of the question earlier, or I would have been more forthright before. I did not realize what the Senator had in mind.

RACIAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from time to time on the floor of the Senate, I have pointed out the very glaring difference in the treatment by the news media of similar events arising in different sections of the country. I have done that with particular reference to the misnamed civil rights legislation and the wave after wave of propaganda that has been disseminated throughout the country by the great metropolitan press and by the television networks which were calculated to inflame the people of this country, who may have little knowledge of the facts, against the white people who happen to reside in the Southern States.

Time and again I have seen instances in which an incident occurring in one of the Southern States has been blown up by the press and television networks in this country and carried by the information services overseas, when similar incidents in other States outside the South have been found way back on page 11 and disposed of in very short articles, with small headlines.

There appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday an article, over on part B, under a small one-column headline, "Five Arrested in Maryland Race Affray."

This article had to do with some of the so-called nonviolent demonstrations, which have resulted in great violence. This particular incident occurred in Princess Anne, Md.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FIVE ARRESTED IN MARYLAND RACE AFFRAY

PRINCESS ANNE, MD., February 22.—Four Negroes and a white man were arrested and a State police captain was injured slightly today when a racial demonstration broke out briefly into fist-swinging violence.

About 200 Negroes, most of them students from nearby Maryland State College, huddled at the entrance to a segregated restaurant and refused to budge in defiance of police orders.

Then a white man pushed his way out of the entrance of the restaurant and a fight broke out, according to the Associated Press. He was identified by State police as Kenneth W. Ainsworth, of Bloxom, Va., and charged with disorderly conduct.

Capt. Paul Randall, commander of State police on the Eastern Shore attempted to break up the scuffle and was struck in the face.

On his orders about 15 State police, several of them with K-9 dogs, moved in and dispersed the crowd.

Police arrested three students and a 24-year-old Cambridge, Md., man. The latter was charged with resisting arrest, failure to obey an officer and assault.

The students were charged with disorderly conduct and failure to obey an officer.

Clarence Cromwell, of Cambridge; Douglas Hutchins, 21, of Donald, Md.; Edward A. Davis, 20, of Snow Hill, and Thomas Dopson, 20, of Baltimore, were those arrested.

One of those arrested was bitten by one of the dogs.

The Maryland Chapter of the NAACP promptly wired Gov. J. Millard Tawes protesting police brutality, according to the Associated Press.

Police also had to use dogs to disperse other demonstrators who had swarmed over the police car in which the suspects were placed.

The demonstrations in this lower Eastern Shore town started this afternoon when more than 100 students gathered on the main street in front of Tull's Restaurant, where a Negro student had been beaten yesterday when he and about 20 others attempted to gain admission.

The demonstrations were directed for a while by Gloria H. Richardson, a key figure in the civil rights movement in Cambridge.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this article refers to an incident involving the action of about 200 Negro students from Maryland State College in barring the entrance to a segregated restaurant whose owner was endeavoring to do business with those he desired to do business with. The article says the Negro students refused to budge, in violation of police orders, from the restaurant entrance. When a white man undertook to get out of the restaurant, a fight broke out, and the white man was arrested. I suppose he was arrested for trying to cross a picket line, but I do not know the charge against him. In any event, the article says he was arrested. Capt. Paul Randall of the State police, tried to break up the fight and was struck in the face. The article states that on his orders, about 15 State police, several of them with K-9 dogs, moved in and dispersed the crowd. Several persons were arrested. Way down near the bottom of the article we are told that one of those arrested was bitten by one of the dogs.

One other paragraph says that the police "had to use dogs to disperse other demonstrators who had swarmed over the police car in which the suspects had been placed."

Mr. President, if this incident had happened in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, or South Carolina, all the network television crews would have been there, with all of their paraphernalia, taking pictures, grinding away, showing the dogs. There would have been pictures showing the dog biting the student who was blockading the door, and those pictures would have been sent to the four corners of the earth—at the expense of the American taxpayer. It has been done before when incidents of this type have happened in the South. Pictures have been shown, not only throughout this country, but throughout the four corners

of the earth, in an attempt to show that the white people and the policemen of the Southern States are different from those of other areas.

If an incident of the type reported in the article had happened in the area that I described, it would not have appeared in part B of the Washington Post. It would have appeared on the front page under very large headlines charging unusual brutality, and that dogs had been used against the demonstrators; and on the editorial page there would have been the most gruesome cartoon drawn by the pen of Herblock, showing the alleged brutality wherein the dog had been released and had bitten the poor, unfending student.

But here, in the circulation area of the Washington Post, in a State where I assume the votes of all Members of the Congress are dedicated and pledged to voting for any legislation anyone may introduce that might be called a civil rights bill and are nailed down; there is not a picture of the dog biting a demonstrator. Rather, the article states that one of those arrested was bitten and that police "had to use dogs" to drive the demonstrators away from the police car. This is another illustration of what I have inveighed against for several years. This is deliberate distortion of the news, by blowing up incidents in Southern States and by playing down those that happened elsewhere. Mr. President, that is reprehensible. It is an abuse of the freedom of the media of communication guaranteed by the Constitution.

This is only an illustration. I could stay from here until midnight to show others. When I have all my data at hand, I may do just that. I am merely showing that there has been a deliberate design to limit and play down all racial incidents outside the South. Television has been playing it down, as has the press. When an incident occurs in the South, the TV networks have all their people on the scene, taking pictures and describing incidents that are said to be brutal. But when a similar thing happens in other areas the article mildly states, "The police also had to use dogs." That is the news story. In other words, no incident could possibly arise in the South in which the police "had to use dogs," but when they arise outside the South the articles say that they "had to use dogs."

That is the fine, sweet spirit of fairness that has served as propaganda for this misnamed, misbegotten civil rights legislation that will be brought up on the floor of the Senate in the next few days.

Any well informed person would know that the news has been deliberately distorted. Incidents have been magnified and misrepresented when they occurred in the South. When such incidents have occurred outside the South, they have been minimized. That is one of the handicaps that those of us seeking to preserve constitutional government must face. It is one of the difficulties that we face in trying to preserve the rights of the legislative branch and keep it from abdication its functions and delegating

all its powers to the Attorney General of the United States.

The brainwashing of the American people has been very effective.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today is Estonian Independence Day. On February 24, 1918, the brave people of Estonia took advantage of the disintegration of the Russian empire to revolt and declare their independence. For 22 years thereafter they lived in the golden age of Estonian history. They observed representative government, freedom of the press, religion, and assembly. They made enormous progress in economic and cultural development. In 1939, they were surely more different from their Russian neighbors than even in 1918.

When Nazi Germany met with the Soviet Union in 1939, they signed a secret protocol never equaled in history for perfidious hypocrisy. According to this protocol, Estonia was to become the private domain of the Communists, to do with as they would. Thus the Soviet Union, freed of fear about its most obvious enemy, proceeded to conquer Estonia, all the while assuring the world that it was only protecting Estonia from Germany. The left hand of the world knew not what the right hand was doing.

Estonia was conquered by the now familiar combination of internal sabotage aided by crushing exterior force. But the fate of conquered Estonia is even more horrible than the conquering itself. Immediately after the Red Army assured Estonian Communists and their Soviet advisers of preponderant power, they began to destroy every freedom that Estonians had known. The right to assemble was denied. People were arrested and sentenced without trial. Hundreds of thousands were wrenched from their homes and sent to Siberia, the familiar Communist form of genocide. If thousands of people died in the process, so much the better. That would aid the resettlement of Russian colonials in the seaboard and richest agricultural areas. Every form of political organization except the Communist Party was destroyed. No freedom of the press was allowed. All publications, all entertainment as well as all government became the vehicle of the Communist state.

All of this rained down on the head of helpless Estonia, which had never threatened anyone. By 1941 every sun arose on a gray, desolate scene of homes destroyed, of families divided, of hundreds of graves and abandoned houses. The Communist mind had seen no opposition to its designs, and had finally exerted its greatest evil.

We serve our principles well by pausing to commemorate the anniversary of a nation now desolate and sad under Communist tyranny. We are in effect honoring the convictions of our own forefathers who labored under tyranny, and arose to throw it off, bringing to the world the highest form of freedom ever devised. That is the future for Estonia which we desire—freedom, independence, and a return to the bountiful rewards of representative government.

ITALY'S CONTINUING PROBLEM: THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a time when the NATO alliance is troubled by so many internal problems, it was a special pleasure to welcome a recent visitor to the United States, the President of Italy. Antonio Segni's tour last month underscored the close bonds of blood and thought which unite our two countries and reminded us that Italy remains one of our strongest allies in the free world.

This Nation owes much to the sons and daughters of Italy who chose to emigrate to this land. They have enriched every field of American endeavor and have proved time and time again their patriotic dedication to this country.

Because we are such good friends of Italy, we tend to overlook the serious internal problems which beset that nation, and particularly the serious threat posed by communism. It behooves each of us who is dedicated to a free and stable Italy, working for a better life for all her people, to keep informed about what is going on there.

That is why I read with particular interest a perceptive article written by my longtime associate, Stephen May, who is now practicing law in Rochester, N.Y. Drawing on his extensive travels in Italy and his continuing study of Italian affairs, Mr. May wrote an enlightening analysis of Italy's internal stresses and strains which was published in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle.

Inasmuch as this is a subject which should be of concern to all of us, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW ITALY FIGHTS TO CONTAIN THE REDS

(By Stephen May)

The recent visit of President Antonio Segni reminds us again of our Nation's close ties to Italy—and of the perplexing problems our NATO ally faces at home. It is no overstatement to say that Italy's whole future may depend on the success of the bold experiment in coalition government on which it recently embarked.

This experiment involves collaboration of the Christian Democrats, the Roman Catholic Party which has dominated postwar Italian politics, with the leftwing Socialists and two moderate leftwing parties. The significance of this "opening to the left"—or *apertura a sinistra*—is that it may provide a stable government equal to the defense requirements of the nation and the social needs of the people.

The center-left condition was originally conceived as a means to stem the Communist tide and to modernize Italy socially, economically, fiscally, and educationally, in order to meet the demands of a spectacularly expanding economy. Both are substantial undertakings, the magnitude of which is little understood in this country.

The Communist Party in Italy—called the PCI for short—numbers 1,600,000 members and is the largest in the free world. In the national elections of April 1963 it polled nearly 8 million votes—over one-quarter of those cast—and is thus the second largest political party in the country.

The success of the PCI appears to run contrary to all the rules of international

politics: Over 99 percent of the Italian people belong to the Catholic Church, the traditional bulwark against the Reds, the country is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, and the government is firmly committed to the cause of the free world.

Why, then, has atheistic communism, which supposedly thrives on poverty and opposition to NATO, been so successful in Italy? The answer lies in a combination of astute leadership, sound organization, opportunism, poverty, ignorance, and protest.

Strong man of the party is its canny general secretary, Moscow-trained Palmiro Togliatti. Tough and firm in intraparty squabbles, he can wave the clenched fist with the best of them at workers' rallies, or can appear the epitome of reasonable mildness for TV's mass audience.

Togliatti has worked hard to keep the Communists in the mainstream of Italian politics. Portraying themselves as moderates who reject Red China's belligerent tactics in favor of winning power through the orderly procedures of parliamentary elections, they have gained a large measure of domestic respectability.

Well organized at the local level, the PCI works at its job all year round, in contrast to its opponents, and has substantial funds at its disposal. Time and time again, clever Communist maneuvers to exploit local discontent have paid off handsomely at the polls.

Industrial workers, for example, have been assiduously wooed by the Reds, who play up to their dissatisfaction with their share of Italy's booming economy and who identify themselves with labor's protests over wages and working conditions. The Communists have also scored heavily with the underemployed workers of the south, such as the impoverished farm laborers of Sicily.

The unfortunate fact is that Italy's economic prosperity has spread only partially to the lower economic classes, which are naturally resentful of the new wealth acquired by so many others. There is often a vote of desperation—*il voto della disperazione*—a rebellion against years of grinding poverty, which is easily attracted by Communist promises of the moon.

The main Red theme seems to be: "Sure, things are better, but you aren't getting your fair share. Stick with us; we'll prod the government and management and get you more."

Not surprisingly in a country with such strong religious traditions, there is little effort to instill Marxian ideology in the minds of the masses—and little indication that most party members really understand what communism stands for. To them, the PCI is a respectable political party which promises something better—and that's obviously what a lot of people want to hear.

Thus, in spite of the vigorous opposition of the church and the satisfactions which come with continuing prosperity, the Communists continue to get one vote out of four and exert great influence on all phases of Italian life. Their great fear is that they will be isolated from the main body of Italian politics, for they recognize that times are too good to seize power by force and that they must continue to rely on gaining ground at the polls.

In the immediate years after the war, the leftwing Socialists, led by Pietro Nenni, were allied with the Communists in opposition to the Christian Democrats and as champions of labor. But repelled by revelations of Stalin's crimes and the brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution by the Soviets, Nenni has since the mid-1950's led his party on an independent leftwing course which challenged the Communists for the allegiance of the Italian workingman.

Although 40 percent of its membership must still be considered pro-Communist, the leftwing Socialists recently found sufficient common ground to enter into the alliance with the Christian Democrats under Premier Aldo Moro. This potent coalition could split the Italian workers' movement, thus cutting the heart out of the Communist power base and isolating the comrades.

Inevitably, the *seconda apertura* will be sorely tried by Communist strikes and harassments and by dissident elements within the Socialist and Christian Democratic ranks pulling to the left and right, respectively. But, if it survives and thrives, it could mark a significant turning point for Italian democracy.

For the ambitious center-left program of social and economic reform and government planning could win substantial working class support and eliminate the need for the protest vote of the past which has gone to the Communists. And although the Nenni Socialists continue to adhere to neutralism, there is no indication Italy will renege on its commitments to NATO.

The *apertura a sinistra* may thus make possible a secure and effective coalition which will provide an attractive alternative for that discontented one-fourth of Italy's voters who now cast their lot with the Communists. In the long run, a better life for more of our Italian friends could result.

As President Segni observed in Washington, "Many ties of history, civilization and blood" unite America and Italy. An informed, patient and sympathetic American public, alert to developments in Italy, can help keep those bonds strong and enduring.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have in this country many groups with the avowed goal of wiping out all Communists. Unfortunately, many of these dedicated persons operate at a distinct disadvantage—they have never seen a Communist.

And, perhaps because of this lack of firsthand information, they seem to discover them in the most unlikely places—such as the White House and the Supreme Court.

Today, as I rise to comment on the 46th anniversary of the Independence of Estonia, I would like to reverse custom. Instead of once again pledging our aid and moral support to the Estonians, I would like to beg their help.

Certainly if there is a people in the world qualified to testify to the facts of life under the heel of the Red boot, it is the Estonians.

For 200 years, the country was dominated by the czar. Finally, in 1918, the Estonians managed to rid themselves of the Russians only to have them return 22 years later, bringing with them the "people's government."

The "people's government" was not accepted gratefully by the Estonians. The story of the "persuasion" used by the Communists to force this government on a people who rejected it is a story of horror—of mass murders, deportation, torture, mock elections, the whole wretched list.

Rather than go into the details, I suggest a reading of Special Report No. 3 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress. Minds and memories will quickly be refreshed.

Estonia today, on the 46th anniversary of its independence, is living under a totalitarian tyranny.

But—many Estonians have escaped their chains and are living in the United States and other free countries.

It is to them I turn today—realizing their sorrow on what should be a joyful day—I ask them to help the world that is still free.

As witnesses to what has happened when communism captured a country, I call on the Estonians enjoying the benefits of the free world to dedicate themselves anew to helping countries still free to remain free.

I ask them to be even more forceful in telling their stories. And, I caution the world's free people to listen to those truly experienced in dealing with communism.

Their story is one we cannot afford to ignore.

FOREIGN POLICY AND MILITARY POLICY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 12, retired Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau delivered a speech which I believe all Members of the Congress should read. General Trudeau minces no words in pointing out what he and many of us feel are the wrong steps being taken in our foreign policy and our military policy, and he speaks on this subject with a knowledge gained through many years of service to the Army and his country.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ROAD AHEAD

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, U.S. Army, retired, president Gulf Research & Development Co., API Lubrication Committee, Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., February 12, 1964)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the American Petroleum Institute and the automotive industry, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Americans it is always a pleasure to return to Detroit to meet and greet old friends and to make new ones. I have a deep appreciation for those of you associated with the automotive industry who during my military career met the challenge and provided the military during every emergency and over the years with the necessary track and wheeled vehicles.

As a member of the API central committee on research of the division of science and technology, I am proud to serve with all of you, and, in particular, with those of you who are members of the lubrication committee and are here today to help smooth (or oil) the way for the automotive industry.

No doubt you did not solve all your problems today, but I can think of no better vehicle to provide a common ground for the exchange of information and discussion of problems of mutual interest between the engineering, service, and design executives of the automobile manufacturers and the oil marketers and technologists concerned with the maintenance and lubrication of automotive equipment. However, I will not attempt to compete with the many experts in this field who are here tonight.

Your many problems are of direct concern to me as president of Gulf Research & Development Co. and as a student of world affairs. In spite of the fact that I spent 38 years in

the Army, I am no stranger to the oil industry and the role that science and technology plays in this industry. I can't overaccent the future role of petroleum. The whole economy of the West can turn on what happens to the control and use of petroleum in the free world as the principal source of energy today. This has been noted for a number of years by people concerned about world strategy. We see great advances being made by Russian oil in penetrating world markets. Many of you are familiar with what is happening in Europe with the advent of pipelines and the growing tanker fleet for Russian oil to flood the free world. This is a most disruptive influence and may become even more critical before long. Matter of fact, I think from here on that the economic struggle may be far more intensive than the military struggle, assuming we maintain adequate deterrent power.

Tonight, I want to touch on some of our problems as I see them down the road ahead. I know you share the concern of many of us for our receding stature in this distraught and chaotic world. Too often I hear that time will solve our problems, but time is not on our side, unless we use it more wisely and courageously. Too often I hear that "He who fights and runs away, lives to fight another day," but this is a sad philosophy and gets more difficult and less applicable as days go on. There most certainly comes a day when that statement can no longer be true. As someone said, "When spirits are low and principles ignored, people don't give a damn if their own ox is gored."

Winston Churchill said, "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival."

"There may be even a worse case—you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

I am sure you and I believe in what that great man said, but there are many on the world scene today who apparently would rather live as slaves than stand up for what they must know to be right.

Tonight, I want to speak to you also as the president of the American Ordnance Association, and as an American citizen. America still marches in the forefront of history, though precariously at times. We stand at the opening of a new and promising era—the most powerful Nation in all the world; a nation recognized as blessed beyond measure, with the most enlightened form of government in the world. Yet, at the same time, and this has been historically true of other mighty states which have preceded us, we find ourselves challenged to defend—or better to assert—our rights at a score of vital points along a widespread defensive periphery (even in our back—and front—yard), and hesitant to stand fast for principle and right. We seem to still wallow in the doldrums of the decade following the Korean war when victory meant compromise and compromise meant appeasement or accommodation or convergence as they call it now. Despite bold words in high places, this remains the temper of our policy actions today.

Let's quit coddling the Communists. In the last 2 months they have shot down and killed three of our airmen over Germany, insulted our flag in Panama, driven our Ambassador out of Zanzibar, and bombed our Embassy in Cyprus. Despite this, we have the incongruous situation of a leading administration Senator tell us not to be overly disturbed about such explosive developments. He further asserted that American

foreign policy is "on the right course," and we should press on for disarmament.

On the other side of the fence, we find the longshoremen and sailors in New York refusing to load wheat on foreign ships, especially those that have been supplying Castro and are now supposed to haul American wheat to Russia.

Which side is right? Let us examine the events of the past few years. If the Senator is right, then communism is receding and freedom should be advancing. There should be peace and stability in the free world and turmoil and trouble in Communist lands, but the very reverse of this is true. Triggered by the sale of American wheat to Russia, many of the nations of the free world are now rushing not only to recognize our self-designated opponents, but are trying to trade with them on credit.

There is a lot of talk about poverty in our land, and we all know there is some. I think we are told in the New Testament that, "The poor you have always with you." While I, too, could rejoice if the poverty of worthy people could be alleviated, I think the first kind of poverty we have to defeat is the poverty of the spirit that has turned us into a timorous and trembling nation and wounded our prestige all over the world.

When our house is under heavy siege, we had better repulse the assailants instead of taking time off to buy candy so the kids will stop crying.

Talk of liberty, and freedom, and progress, is common throughout this Republic, yet today there are many indications that too many of us fail to realize fully the tremendous threats that face us from within and abroad and how much is really at stake if we lose the present struggle and suffer the loss of our blessings that are still the best hope of freemen everywhere. My claims of danger from within have been openly stressed many times by many patriots including Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, one of our greatest Americans, but I know Mr. Hoover has left much unsaid. Read his new article in the current issue of the Harvard Review entitled "The U.S. Businessman Faces the Soviet Spy." I wish there were more public knowledge of the threat to our institutions and our youth from non-card-carrying Communists and the libertine and Fabian Socialist left.

As General MacArthur said, "There is no substitute for victory." The law of life is one of struggle. All the world knows this, but in this favored segment of the world we, as a people, seem to be forgetful. With 3 billion people unlike even in their fingerprints, the dawn of the utopia full of milk and honey is still only a dream. Struggle is a cross mankind is destined to bear as long as the world exists. It will never be made of foam rubber, nor will the psychiatrist's couch ever replace it. We don't need any more tranquilizers to help us ignore our problems, but we do need a moral adrenalin to stimulate us to solve them courageously. The erosion of the moral integrity of Western man is too prevalent to ignore. I can't get much comfort out of the ironical statement of "Don't worry about Cuba—they are still 90 miles away." Or, "We've contained them, at least." Or, "Let's accept disarmament on the best terms we can get." Can you? Of course, we haven't contained them. We've hardly restrained them. I'd say, at Guantanamo, they are containing us.

After 15 years of such containment, there is hardly a section of the free world's frontier that is not overtly or covertly being eroded or penetrated today. Only the torch left in Castro's hands could have lighted the fires in Panama and Guantanamo. Unchallengeable power and determination to stop further erosion and preserve ourselves and Western civilization is the priceless ingredi-

ent to any successful solution. Any weakening of our present relative nuclear deterrent or conventional military power in the face of this challenge could be devastating. Neither magic "black boxes" nor the Ouija board of disarmament can give the solution to this struggle. Our obvious abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine has made us the laughing stock of even African tribesmen from Cairo to Capetown and Tangiers to Zanzibar and the price of our folly remains yet to be paid.

We must be most watchful of pronouncements coming from even prominent Americans that the growth of communism is not as important as the expansion of "non-Communist revolutionary" forces in Latin America as these latter are only the Trojan horse hiding another form of Marxist socialism. Our adult population are so brainwashed we won't even stop the erosion affecting our own children in our schools and on our campuses. Now we're to be sold on "converging coexistence." Need I tell you where the point of convergence will be?

Today, change is more rapid and meaningful than in any period during the past 500 years at least. This situation is typified by not only the dramatic fading of the boundaries of empires, but by the ever-increasing rate of obsolescence of both commercial products and military weapons—and even by ventures beyond the long-standing frontier of the atmosphere.

I note, with satisfaction, that our Defense Department acknowledges now that space does have important defense implications. We should no longer delude ourselves as to the critical aspects of the space race if we are to survive. The orderly progression from our proven capabilities for manned atmospheric flight to manned space flight deserves our most careful consideration.

Technological developments and advances in the state of the art of weaponry, together with judgments based on projections of future developments in technology, have established certain discernible trends and changes in the nature of our defense posture. While opinions differ as to the wisdom of following or implementing such change in the composition of our strategic forces, the trends themselves are established and undeniable, in my opinion.

The atomic test ban treaty has encouraged a dangerous complacency and satisfaction on the part of many of our people. This tricky treaty is rife with danger for our future security. The apologies and pressures that both preceded and followed its adoption indicate that even its proponents recognized its questionable value. Halloween is with us only 1 day each year and we must beware of any trick-or-treat arrangements every day during the rest of this and every year.

It is realized that certain values have been placed on both our national and international interests in reaching the important decision to accept a restriction of high altitude nuclear testing. However, those of us who are somewhat knowledgeable cannot help but express our concern as to the impact such a decision may have upon the future security of our Nation and our ability to react in the event of a nuclear attack. We must not consider the test ban treaty as a recognition of a stalemate in the further development or production of nuclear devices for defense.

The explosion of science and technology has opened doors never dreamed of a few years ago. In the nuclear field all of us, both friend and foe, are still infants. For one thing, we have no way of determining how much we don't know. More important to our security, we don't know how much our potential enemies do know, or how long

it will be before—or even if—they know more than we know today. A blind ban on high altitude nuclear testing and on the development of nuclear devices in space for deterrence and defense can be as disastrous to our Nation's security as the failure to guard our freedoms with continuing vigilance and courage along our farflung earthbound defense perimeter.

I can't accept a pseudo-scientific conclusion promulgated by some that since no defense can be completely adequate we must accept the best disarmament terms we can negotiate. Computer logic must be tempered by human judgment and experience and the premium to be put on courage, commonsense and adherence to principle was never higher than it is today.

People talk—but only talk—about our nuclear defenses against enemy missiles. What nuclear defenses? We have none. The Nike-Zeus system—imperfect though it may be—is our best hope today but it is not in production. Had the same criteria of perfection before production been applied to our other major weapons systems or space ventures over the last decade we would have nothing today—not even early warning. The growth potential of this basic system to defeat missiles and even satellites is our best hope for a nuclear defense tomorrow. Today we are the world's greatest nuclear nudist colony.

The added complacency (maybe it's only euphoria) being generated by the test ban treaty and the seeming disregard for the military importance of space or the urgency for antimissile and satellite defense seems to present the Soviet a real opportunity to achieve a transcendent advantage in these fields. Bluff and blackmail are bad enough, but this could be "the real McCoy." This may explain their asserted decrease in interest in exploring the moon as their resources are not inexhaustible. Of course, by our easing their agricultural problems they can transfer needed men to industry or armaments and we certainly opened up a Pandora's box for which we will pay p'enty. Now some people want to sell them chemical plants on long-term credit so they can outpace us sooner.

A recent article ignores antisatellite defense and mentions the apparent ease with which the aggressor can always multiply the number of his missiles and decoys. The author may have knowledge I don't possess, but this is far from easy and fantastically expensive. We should know from our own experience. Of course, Russia doesn't need to do this for as long as we lack any defense, their relatively unsophisticated missiles in moderate numbers may fill their strategic requirement. We are thus graciously letting the Soviet "off the hook" in this regard by remaining naked but their tortured economy would be hard pressed to multiply and sophisticate their weapons in the manner indicated except at the expense of their own industrial base, their commercial competition with the free world or further restriction on consumer goods which would not enhance the contentment of their own people. The added deterrent against attack becomes obvious and important if our defensive capability against missiles and satellites could be moderately good, even if never absolute. Thus we may be awarding them not only a probable military advantage, but also political and economic advantages in this struggle to retain a free world.

Recently, the Soviet displayed some new antimissile missiles. If any shift from their space effort is for the purpose of concentrating their current resources on the production of such a system plus the placing of their supermegaton warheads in near-earth orbit-

ing maneuverable satellites, we are really facing the greatest threat that has evolved to date.

All Communists have long practiced absolute deceit and treachery in their relationships with other groups or nations as we know. They even advocate it. Under the Marxist-Leninist writings, a lie is totally condoned, even praised, if it serves communism. In dealing with such people, there can be no real trust since there is no real integrity on the part of the other signatory group. Without trust a treaty becomes of questionable value. We must leave no stone unturned to maintain an adequate deterrent and build a defensive capability of suitable magnitude.

Defense needs and economic pressures are pushing industry toward the automated factory or, where this is not practicable, toward the adoption of numerically controlled machines and production lines. This is certainly one of our efforts with respect to refineries. I do not join with those who see automation as a permanent threat to jobs, unions, and prosperity, although adjustments to provide for our growing labor force must certainly be made. Rather, to me, the strict quality control and improved production which automation makes possible is the harbinger of a future more prosperous and productive than any period yet experienced in our remarkable history. If kitchen appliances were still made by hand, very few of us could afford them. I will venture the opinion, without much fear of contradiction, that electronic data computing and automation today are employing twice as many persons at four times the payroll of those who have become unemployed because of them. Our unemployed rolls could be reduced substantially today if men had to work for their compensation. Many would rather accept tax-free unemployment compensation than be listed for social security by a private employer at even larger wages.

The talents of man are best developed and employed where the dependence on his physical ability is least. This doesn't mean a world of loafers, however. From another viewpoint, the comforts and condition of any society seem to be generally in direct proportion to its utilization of all available energy sources and in inverse proportion to its dependence on human physical energy. Automation and numerical control will contribute greatly toward giving many routine tasks to machines. Even more advanced is symbolic control made possible through completely automatically programmed tools. One significant step which should accompany the trend toward automation calls for the early standardization of machine tapes. It is time to act now, before the problem is made more difficult and much progress is being made.

The degree to which our industry meets the basic requirements of modernization is the yardstick that will measure the degree of effectiveness of our national program, but industry cannot do it alone. Were it not for the critical situation our Nation faces—as well as the rest of the free world—production deficiencies could be calculated simply in terms of added costs and time delays to national progress. But with the Communist threat, severe international competition, which we ourselves nourished, and the demands from underdeveloped nations that set the scene for this decade and beyond, it is our business, and our mutual concern to see that the play ends in victory and not in tragedy for ourselves and free peoples worldwide. In this respect, we all have a definite need to improve our management and administrative procedures.

Rapid expansion and cost-plus contracts have permitted the growth of waste and loose control to an unsavory degree in places. I am glad to see a tightening up on contract

procedures. Furthermore, the state of the art has progressed beyond the capability of some executives to keep abreast of their own operations.

Today is a time when our country faces the gravest crisis in its history. It seems to me that unless our leaders, like you, in industry, in business, in government, in all walks of life—with the utmost seriousness and dedication—engage more positively in solving the challenging problems facing us, America and the whole free world can suffer the most dire consequence. Communism, socialism and the proponents of health, wealth, and happiness for all, fear a fully awakened America and their No. 1 effort is to lull us to sleep. Brainwashing is not confined to enemy prison camps. When the distinction between patriots and traitors grows dim in the public mind, as it seems to do today, the doctrines of Marx and the techniques of Pavlov have made their imprint. Maybe Johnny can't read but I am sure you can, and the handwriting is on the wall and in the papers. I can think of no better example of adding insult to injury than to follow the refusal to recognize God in our schools by denying American children the sight of their flag flying in front of their school. What's next? The Communist goal has been spelled out by every Red from Lenin to Khrushchev—world domination, a Red world. We are still challenged on every front.

The keys to our survival are still faith, not fear; firmness, not fuzziness; courage, not complacency; patriotism, not patronage; and sacrifice, not selfishness. The clarion call to be bold, decisive, creative, and morally strong is as clear as it was to our forefathers through the long painful decades when they stood alone and fought for liberty and progress. We, in our time, will be stronger and better when we weave back more brilliantly into our own fabric of thought and heart the epic days and deeds of our forebears and of our immortal great. As someone said 100 years ago when we pushed the frontiers of freedom to the Pacific and built this great country, "The cowards never started and the weak never arrived." I hope history will write a favorable verdict of us, but what we need are strong men throughout this Nation if we are going to arrive at the dawn of the coming century intact.

Remember, at the age of only 188 years, our country is the oldest and proudest symbol of liberty in the world. Forty years after our Revolution we had ejected the British a second time. Then President Monroe told everybody else, including the Russians, to keep out of the Western Hemisphere. They did.

Another 40 years, and our own sad conflict ended we had to tell the French to get out of Mexico. They did.

Another 40 years and we ejected the Spaniards from Cuba, and told the Germans in no uncertain terms to stay out of Venezuela. They did.

Then on 20-year cycles, we fought two world wars to insure our freedom and hemispheric solidarity. We did.

Now, after another 20 years, our Cuban front yard is a playground for the "dead-end kids" and termites are in the woodwork from Passamaquoddy to Panama and Patagonia. I, for one, bow my head in sorrow at this low state of American affairs.

Let us remember, among the interesting words of Rudyard Kipling, the following, perhaps prophetic verse:

"Fenced by your careful fathers, ringed by your leaden seas,
Long did ye wake in quiet and long lie down at ease;
Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie,

Ye saw that the land lay fenceless, and yet
let the months go by . . .
But ye say, 'It will mar our comfort'
Ye say, 'Twill 'minish our trade.'
Do ye wait for the spattered shrapnel ere ye
learn how a gun is laid . . .
For the low, red glare to southward when
the railed cost-towns burn?
(Light ye shall have on that lesson, but lit-
tle time to learn.)"

I am sure that you as members of the American Petroleum Institute and good American citizens share my concern as to the future progress and advancement of our country and its great principles for the benefit of ourselves and freemen everywhere.

It is fitting that as we celebrate the anniversary of the birth of one of our very greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln, we appraise again our humble beginnings and our nobility of purpose if we are to gage successfully the rough course down the road ahead.

With due regard and regret for either our failures or our yet incomplete victories, we need apologize to no one for the causes we have advanced for the benefit of mankind. We are losing our pride in accomplishment and our loyalty to the ideals that made us great. The protection, the prosperity, and the progress of our country demand our fullest dedication, struggle, and efforts if we are to achieve these goals. It is our paramount problem today. This struggle will yet be won by the superior spirit, determination, and tenacity of the victor. I hope it will be our side. If not, God knows we will deserve our fate. Greater devotion to the true spirit of America and continued expansion of the phenomenal moral and industrial power of the United States of America would be among the most reassuring signs that this country and the free world, under God, will not fail. On this night, when Lincoln's memory burns bright again, let us rededicate ourselves to the United States of America, which will only remain the land of the free as long as it continues to be the home of the brave—and that means you and me.

Thank you very much.

APPRAISAL OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GOIDWATER. Mr. President, one of the most popular indoor sports engaged in in recent months by our radical left columnists and commentators has been the downgrading of the Congress. These people whose writings and remarks are triggered either through ignorance, or, God forbid, some sinister purpose, would have the American public believe that this Congress has been a bad Congress because it has not passed every crackpot suggestion that has reached it or reached its committees.

A better judgment of Congress accomplishments would be quality rather than quantity, but obviously these centralists want nothing to stand in the way of any leftwing idea that comes along. It is time that this Congress and the whole congressional concept be defended, and I was particularly happy to notice the remarks made by the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, before the 57th annual banquet of the Alexandria, Va., Chamber of Commerce on February 1 on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

OPEN SEASON ON CONGRESS

(Excerpts of address of Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, before 57th annual banquet of Alexandria, Va., Chamber of Commerce, at Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel)

Congress is being abused and vilified as never before in our history. It is "open season" on Congress. There is a sinister campaign now underway to discredit and destroy Congress as a coequal branch of the Federal Government and as a great traditional American institution. Many, oblivious to the grand design, are unwitting peddlers of distortion and half-truths about the Congress and its individual Members.

Benito Mussolini, the Fascist dictator, is reported as having referred to the American Congress as "parliamentary charlatans." Echoing Mussolini's contempt for representative government, like a Hitlerian voice from the grave, the current propagandists are blasting Congress, thus the people's ability to select their representatives. One famous journalist said the prestige of Congress "has sunk lower than a snake's belly."

This campaign is not only an attack upon Congress, but an attack on individual liberty, the private enterprise system and our representative form of government—it is a vote of no confidence in the people. It is an attack upon the Constitution of the United States and the role of the Congress under that Constitution.

Before the Constitution was even considered there was a Congress. The Continental Congress, acting for the people, created the United States as a free nation. The first article in the Constitution itself and the first words following the preamble deal with the creation of the Congress with a House and a Senate.

The Congress is today simply guilty of representing the American people as provided in the Constitution. Congress is only performing its duty, under a solemn oath taken to uphold and preserve the Constitution. The Constitution has endowed Congress with the authority to make the Nation's laws.

Congress has been criticized for staying in session too long. It is being lambasted for its seniority system. Every activity of Congress has been "raked over the coals." Both barrels have been leveled at the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The 1st session of the 88th Congress, ending during the Christmas holidays, was a great and fruitful session of the Congress. It represented the wishes of a majority of the American people. The American people were willing and are today anxious for the Congress to remain in session as long as necessary, not only to consider good legislation but, what is more important, to prevent the passage of bad legislation. The American people want this Congress to preserve their Constitution.

The last session of this Congress exhibited a courage and stamina beyond the call of duty. It withstood all pressure, ridicule and abuse to remain in session and preserve the integrity of the Congress as a co-equal branch of the Government and to directly represent the American people.

Through calm, cool, exhaustive study and discussion by this Congress, the American people will get a vastly improved tax bill—a bill which affects every man, woman, and child in this Republic. After days and even months of deliberations and thorough consideration, I believe the Nation will get a better civil rights bill which will affect the very foundation stones of the Nation for the

next 100 years. By prolonged study, the entire free world will have an improved foreign aid bill. Congress has gone over the \$50 billion military expenditure with a fine-toothed comb. The very security of this country and freedom everywhere, throughout the globe, depend upon this appropriation and careful scrutiny by the Congress. Congress ushered in the age of atomic power, astronautics and space. The stock market and current economic trends emphasize the wisdom of Congress in staying in session and doing its duty. Prosperity indexes continue to spiral almost daily.

The United States has reached its exalted position as the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of the free world under our representative form of government. We have the highest standard of living in all the history of the world. The American people enjoy more luxury, the highest wages, the best roads, the finest working conditions, equal rights for man and women largely as a result of wise legislation by the Congress over the years. We manufacture over half of the world's automobiles, television, and radio sets and, yes, a great percentage of the world's instrumentalities of science and culture. We have a great portion of the world's libraries, public schools, hospitals, colleges, churches, daily newspapers, and periodicals. The Congress played no small role in these fantastic accomplishments not only for the American people but we have shared them with the world. Congress helped create this palladium of religious freedom and material and cultural plenty by rejecting unwise legislation as well as enacting good laws.

The American people should look into their associations and the background of those who constantly attack their Congress. What is the purpose of this chorus of detractors? Whose bread do they eat? Why? What is the source of their retainers? How much and from whom?

We should resist these calculated efforts to stampede Congress into ill-conceived and hasty reforms. There are those who want to reform Congress out of existence. There are those who are trying to nibble it to death.

Lately the Members of Congress have been flooded with questionnaires from students, study groups, professors, and foundations. Polls, inquiries, and fantastic suggestions are pouring in—all implying the need of reform and suggesting that our representative government is outmoded.

Many of the more vicious attacks on Congress result from the repudiation by the Congress of selfish interests legislation and pet schemes of certain cliques and groups. Had their personal projects and programs been passed, in rubberstamp fashion, they would be praising the Congress as Hitler praised the Reichstag and Tojo the Japanese Diet. Had their idealistic brainstorms been railroaded through by the Congress, then their chorus of abuse would have been changed to a song of praise.

The Congress must not be intimidated and pressured by selfish interests. The Congress must legislate for all of the American people. We must continue to be the citizen's contact with his Federal Government. Our door must always be open to him. Public office is a trust bestowed by the people and I believe this Congress has kept that trust. We have kept a firm and critical reign over the people's bank account—the Public Treasury. We are the avenue—and sometimes the only avenue—through which the people can reach the executive agencies and departments of the Government, supported by their own tax money. As servants of the people, the Congress is the guardian of their liberty and the trustees of their Treasury.

I do not believe the American people have ever elected a more conscientious Congress

than the 88th. I have been associated, over the years, with many organizations and legislative bodies, but I have never been affiliated with a more dedicated, determined, courageous and patriotic group of men and women. I have confidence in its leadership, its committee chairmen and its individual Members; and I can assure you that they will keep their sacred covenant with the American people and uphold their oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

THE RIGHT TO PRAY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, many Members of the Congress have been deeply disturbed ever since the decision of the Supreme Court in the New York prayer case over the ultimate effect of that decision upon the morals, as well as the ethics, of future generations. While the Supreme Court has not yet gone as far as Mr. Justice Douglas indicated it would have to go to be consistent; namely, to outlaw the employment of chaplains at our military academies and for our military forces; the employment of chaplains for both branches of the Congress, the inscription of "In God We Trust" on our currency, and so forth, the Court has gone far enough in the subsequent Pennsylvania and Maryland cases to create grave doubt as to whether or not there can be voluntary prayers in the public schools or the study of any part of the Bible under the designation of comparative literature.

Several months ago, members of the Senate breakfast group requested our distinguished colleague from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, to make a study of the various proposals for a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayers in public schools and the continued official recognition of the overwhelming public viewpoint that we are a Christian nation, and at a meeting of the prayer group next Wednesday, Senator SIMPSON will report on his study of that vital problem.

In the meantime, a member of our breakfast group, Hon. David Lawrence, has published in today's issue of his splendid U.S. News & World Report an editorial entitled "The Right To Pray." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE RIGHT TO PRAY (By David Lawrence)

Plainly, a constitutional amendment has become absolutely necessary to clear up the confusion that has arisen as a result of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States banning prayer in the public schools.

For the American people do not know now whether their children can lawfully be given in the classroom the very instruction in morality and righteous living which is so essential to the proper upbringing of American youth.

We may today be equivocating if we try to apply the High Court's ambiguous words in its decisions on prayer in the schools. Some interpretations would appear to permit the reading of parts of the Bible as a historical or literary study. Public school principals,

in various States, have already indicated a desire to experiment with such devices. But how can we be sure whether the historical or literary does not invade the areas of religious teaching?

It is much more sensible to rely on a clearly written constitutional amendment which emphasizes the difference between voluntary and compulsory prayer in the schools or in ceremonies conducted under government auspices. The provision in the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," should be continued, but there should be a clear definition affirmatively stating the basic principles safeguarding the free exercise of religion.

Prayers are offered at the opening of sessions of the Senate and the House and of the Supreme Court itself. These are an official part of the proceedings. Under the Court's decisions, is it at present constitutional for any form of religious exercise to be conducted in buildings financed with Government funds?

Each individual has a right to pray. This right does not vanish when the individual participates in a governmentally supported proceeding.

The argument that has influenced the Supreme Court is that any practice of theism—to utter prayers expressing a belief in God—is in itself equivalent to "an establishment of religion," and that to let schoolchildren express a belief in God as they pray at the beginning of a schoolday is to make it a government-directed or government-sponsored undertaking which is allegedly prohibited by the Constitution.

But there is a distinct difference between volition and compulsion. The atheist has a right to abstain from participation in any prayer, whether or not God is mentioned. He has no right, however, to interpose his beliefs in a manner that forbids others to worship God as they please—"the free exercise" of their religion.

It is no answer to the problem to say that the right to pray can be adequately exercised in the home or at church services. For the value of prayer once a week in a church, where the attendance covers all ages and large numbers, is not as great as the everyday impact of prayer on the minds of children of the same age in a small classroom. Here the teacher can promptly supplement the prayer with lessons explaining morality and integrity, thus inculcating in the minds of boys and girls at an impressionable period in their lives a respect for fellow human beings, a respect for honesty as opposed to cheating, a respect for the rights of others as opposed to intolerance and selfishness.

Indeed, how can our youth be trained in those ways of living which will help to prevent juvenile delinquency and crime unless in some way reverence for the Supreme Being is instilled?

The importance of prayer in the schoolroom is primarily that it is strengthened by group psychology and that it is an everyday, rather than a once-a-week, stimulus to better living.

It is being asked: Is there a right to pray during proceedings held in any Government building? If it is constitutional for certain individuals within the Government itself to organize collectively in trade unions—for private purposes—while others refrain from joining, how can it be persuasively argued that there should be no right of individuals to choose to pray collectively in a school provided by local government? Certainly an individual may pray in silence, but the benefit of articulation by the group is then lost.

Let the new constitutional amendment make it clear that prayers can be conducted

in the classroom on a voluntary basis and that those who do not wish to attend may be excused or temporarily released.

The problem has too long been neglected. Early action is as vital as the war on poverty or the war on crime. For the right of young and old to pray together voluntarily in any building or facility provided by government—Federal, State, or local—is essential to the fulfillment of the objectives stated in the preamble of the Constitution: to "promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on February 22 many Americans will recall to the day, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy 3 months before on November 22. News editors in the State of Nevada have paid tribute to his memory. I ask unanimous consent that several of their representative expressions be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Las Vegas (Nev.) Sun]

WHERE I STAND

Forty-eight hours in history.

Three men met violent death—a President, a policeman, and an alleged assassin.

The world mourns for the President. A family and a few friends mourn for the policeman, for things happened too fast to dwell for long upon his death. The assassin's death leaves too many unanswered questions. If, in fact, he were the one who pulled the trigger, a grief-stricken world is asking why.

The brutal senselessness of it all is what is so disturbing. There seems to be a contagion to violence that peacefulness cannot match. Violence begets violence and often spreads to the meekest of men but somehow meekness and peacefulness do not have a soothing effect on the violent element of our society.

The Nation had misgivings when it was announced that the President would visit Texas, and Dallas in particular. Adlai Stevenson actually called the White House to dissuade him from the trip. The Nation was uneasy when the President visited the South recently.

It gets kind of scary when the President of the United States cannot go out among the people who elected him and feel secure with them.

President Kennedy walked to the wall in East Berlin. He mingled with immense crowds in West Berlin. He traveled in France, Ireland, and England where people take their politics seriously and was loved and unharmed but in his own beloved country, to which he contributed so much, he was shot down like an animal.

What kind of nuts are on the loose? What sort of beasts are we to tolerate and encourage in our midst?

There seems to be no unlocking of minds that are prone to the least little suggestion of violence. We may never learn what prompted the action of Lee Oswald but we do know that Jack Ruby's act was triggered by Oswald's violence after a suggestion by his sister that "someone is going to kill that man."

Of course, the sister of Ruby didn't dream that her words could possibly be the inspiration for such stupidity and wantonness

on the part of her brother, but evidently it set him to brooding. But why do supposedly good, peace-loving people have such thoughts?

It's the haters who we permit in print and on the air who inspire such thoughts and deeds. It's the Dan Smoots and Westbrook Peglers and Robert Welchs who instigate the hate that leads the misfits and malcontents into acts of violence.

From the State of Texas alone more millions go out to further the poisonous doctrines of the Gerald L. K. Smiths, the Winrods, the Smoots, and all the other hate-mongers than from all the other States combined. And we wonder why a man of peace, understanding, and good, a man esteemed and loved by free people throughout the world, is shot down in Texas.

A supposed minister with one of the largest churches in Los Angeles, a man who has amassed millions through hate sermons, is sponsored on the air to further inflame the gullible and weakminded by one of the largest manufacturers of dogfood—which incidentally is a tax deduction for one and tax freedom for the other.

And we shake our heads in wonderment why a man whose courage, intellectualism, and dedication would have set him down in history as one of our great Presidents is cut down without a chance to further his great contributions to the Nation and mankind.

Preaching hatred of Presidents, religion, color, and nationality should not be tax exempt. It may be protected under the free-speech clause of the Constitution, but it should carry no bonus clause from the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Take the profit out of hate and soon there will be no acts of violence by the weak-minded and impressionable.

If such can be accomplished, perhaps a nation's grief and a family's desolation can find some consolation.

[From Henderson (Nev.) Home News]

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY

TO MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY:

For more than 80 long, terrible hours, you were the United States of America—not President Johnson nor anyone else. Upon your slim shoulders rested the responsibility of bringing a semblance of reason and order to this Nation. You did it well—everything you did was right. Your husband would have been very proud of you, as we all were.

You brought back to the American language words which had become almost obsolete. Words like gallant, pride, dignity, fortitude, composure, courage, good breeding, and good manners.

For a while the headlong trend toward casualness (and there is a very thin line between it and carelessness) was halted and we were given an example of what disciplining of one's emotions meant.

You showed us that there are still beautifully trained, well controlled, considerate and compassionate people left in the Nation.

Perhaps equally impressive were the actions of your children. They were delightful and lovable throughout this trying period. They, too, were perfect and brought us both joy and sorrow.

During those long hours you represented not only your country at its best, but all of the millions of widows of this Nation. Only they can really know and understand your deep sorrow and grief. You represented them well. You can carry your head high, knowing that you did all that your husband expected of you.

We sincerely hope that you will find it in your heart to continue your efforts to develop a cultural center in our Nation's Capital. You are needed. Please do not let this seed you have planted die out. We hope you will

accept our heartfelt thanks for the restoration work you did at the White House.

We know you have the courage to go on with your life. You have our deepest sympathy.

Mrs. GRACE W. BYRNE.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. February 24 marks the day on which Estonians 46 years ago ended the rule of czarist Russian oppression and reestablished their freedom and independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion toward the West.

But the new rulers of Russia—the Communists—launched a violent military attack on the newly established republic, trying to subjugate its people under Moscow's yoke again.

In the ensuing war of independence, 1918 to 1920, Estonians gallantly repulsed the overwhelming Soviet forces and the war ended with a peace treaty in which the Soviet Union solemnly recognized Estonian independence.

During the following 20 years of independent life, industrious and able Estonians achieved miraculous results in economic as well as cultural fields.

It is noteworthy that the Estonian Republic was the first and at that time the only country in the world which granted full cultural autonomy to its ethnic minorities—Russians, Jews, Germans, and Swedes.

Estonia's independence was recognized by all countries of the world, and it was a full member of the then League of Nations.

Independent Estonia, as well as Finland—the people of which country are ethnically and linguistically the nearest kins to Estonians—and the two other Baltic Republics—Latvia and Lithuania—checked conclusively the Russian Communist expansion to the West. They constituted the northern flank of the prewar "cordon sanitaire."

It is highly significant to note that imperial Russia by the beginning of the 19th century had only three universities: two in the so-called Baltic provinces—Tartu University, 1632, in Estonia, and Vilnius University, 1578, in Lithuania; the third and the only Russian university had been founded in Moscow in 1755; that is, 123 years later than Tartu University in Estonia.

Quite naturally, the Estonians, being proud of and highly cherishing their cultural, economic, and political achievements, of a considerably higher standard than that possessed by the peoples of Russia proper, could not consent to being pressed into Russian provincial status, neither during the czarist regime, nor under the present Communist rule.

At the outbreak of World War II, the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union saw the chance of recapturing the pearls in the imperialist "czarist crown"—the Baltic provinces—and at once entered into a criminal conspiracy with Hitler. That conspiracy provided for annihilation of independent Baltic

republics in ascribing them to the Soviet sphere of influence. Under the pretext of protecting them from Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union forced a treaty of military assistance upon Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and shortly after that occupied them militarily.

Since then, Soviet occupants have committed terrible war crimes in Estonia, for which up to the present time no Communist war criminals have been brought to trial.

The constitutionally elected President of Estonia, Konstantin Pats, was arrested and deported to Russia, and up to now Soviet administration has not given any information as to his later fate.

By wholesale arrests, outright killings, and mass deportations to Siberian slave labor camps, almost 10 percent of the entire Estonian population has been eliminated.

Religious freedom has been de facto abolished: Churches are subject to flagrant destruction, and pastors and churchgoers to extreme persecution.

Russification of Estonian population, deportation of able-bodied Estonian workers to faraway Russian areas and personal terror against opponents of the Communist regime, amounts to genocide; all this together with plunder of Estonian economic resources is a form of neocolonialism of the worst kind.

It is hard to understand that while pressure is being exercised on certain Western countries for abolishment of colonialism in different parts of the world, no word is being heard in favor of applying pressure upon Soviet Union for termination of its most cruel type of colonialism in the Baltic countries.

This 46th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Estonian Republic should serve to remind freemen all over the world that millions of their fellow men are still living under a tyrannical regime.

The people of Estonia must not be forgotten in their fight for freedom and self-determination.

The United States are being regarded by the whole free world as their dynamic leader and a steadfast champion of liberty and justice. Therefore the United States has the moral obligation to work for the restoration of freedom and self-determination for Estonia and other captive nations.

Abandonment by the United States of the cause of Estonia and the other captive and satellite nations of Europe would be in conflict with our solemn commitment to these people and also against the security of our country.

FOREIGN STUDENT EULOGIZES PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, although it is over 3 months since the tragic events of November 22, we continue to find repeated examples of the high esteem in which President Kennedy was held by residents of foreign countries, as well as our fellow Americans. One such feeling of regard and affection was recently expressed by Wolfgang

Thuer of Salzburg, Austria, in a letter of condolences to the Lewiston, Maine, high school students and teachers.

Mr. Thuer was a foreign exchange student at the high school from September 1962 until his graduation in June 1963. During that time he served as an excellent junior ambassador of good will, setting a fine example by participating in many scholastic and athletic organizations. He was graduated with honors and awarded membership in the National Honor Society.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Thuer's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

To Mr. Shapiro, the Teachers, and All My Friends at L.H.S.:

The tragic event just a few days ago struck us Europeans as much as it did you. Our reaction to that cruel crime against democracy and humanity was horror and consternation. What we felt for the victim, your great President, was sorrow and true affection, but also appreciation for the tremendous contribution he had made on our common way toward peace. Mr. Kennedy's merits and achievements have certainly been appreciated by all people throughout the world who have the same goal and the same optimistic attitude as he had, and even his enemies will admit his greatness.

At the end of the year I spent in your country I was fortunate to see him personally, to hear his warm and optimistic appeal to us, and to join in the enthusiastic cheers of 2,500 youths from all parts of our world who expressed their friendship toward the American people and its President that way. I will never forget the impression of a sincere and devoted statesman Mr. Kennedy made on me.

As I write these words, however, the world seems to keep on going the same every day the way it always does. People must live and work and sometimes forget the dead. Even the Americans will put Mr. Kennedy's name among many others on the innumerable pages history has written. But his attitudes, his goals deserve more than the cold silence and criticism of history books. As long as we live and as long as we remember John F. Kennedy we will make his goals ours—liberty, peace, honesty, humanity, friendship, and mutual support for all men and all time.

With all those ideals in mind we may try to make our world a better place to live in, we may remember the dead, but also celebrate our feasts. Mourning and celebrating are reconcilable if we understand the reasons for both.

When I am writing this you are celebrating Thanksgiving which recalls the first time your pioneers looked back on the work they had done, the achievements they had reached in the new and unknown country. Meanwhile, this country has become the most determined supporter and the strongest defender of liberty. Let us say thanks for this also. And for all your future plans and deeds. I wish you and your people the most of success and the traditional good will, especially for this coming year which may be a hard and decisive one.

Sincerely yours,

WOLFGANG THUER.

STATEMENT ON THE NEED FOR GREATER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors, I wish to reiterate my

strong support for S. 1666, which would amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 in order to provide more freedom of information on administrative agency matters.

The purpose of this bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, is to reduce the amount of secrecy in Government agencies and to permit easier access to information by all interested citizens. Except for certain kinds of matters which, because of proper reasons, may be specifically exempted, all administrative agencies would be required first, to publish in the Register substantive rules and descriptions of organization and functional methods; and second, to make available for public inspection and use its opinions, orders, rules, and records. If information or records should be improperly withheld, any complainant could bring action in the proper district court to force their production, with costs and attorney fees assessed to the agency.

S. 1663, sponsored by Senators DIRKSEN and LONG, also provides for the same amendment to section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act. In addition, it proposes other amendments aimed at the same end of gaining greater freedom of information in administrative agencies. Particularly pertinent is section 6(f) which, with certain specified exceptions, permits depositions and discovery before administrative agencies to the same extent and in the same manner as in civil proceedings in the Federal district courts.

The changes proposed in the Administrative Procedure Act would be fully in accord with recommendations made by the Administrative Conference of the United States in its final report, dated December 15, 1962. The Administrative Conference was established by Executive order of the President for the purpose of suggesting improvements in existing administrative procedures. Six Members of Congress—Senators DIRKSEN, HART, and MUSKIE, and Representatives BENNETT, HARRIS, and ROGERS—were included in the membership of the Conference. A committee of the Conference, chaired by Rosel H. Hyde of the Federal Communications Commission, presented a proposal that would have required agencies which conduct adjudicatory proceedings to provide rules permitting parties before them, except as provided otherwise by law, "to secure fact revelation prior to hearing through discovery techniques." The final recommendation adopted by the Conference used the following terminology:

The Conference approves the principle of discovery in adjudicatory hearings and recommends that each agency adopt rules providing for discovery to the extent and in the manner appropriate to its proceedings.

In addition to the Conference on Administrative Procedure, such other organizations as the Hoover Commission and the American Bar Association, as well as many competent lawyers and scholars, have favored legislation of this type. There appears to be widespread agreement that the rights of participants

in administrative proceedings, as well as those of the general public, to have free access to agency opinions, orders, rules, records or other documents should be unhampered except for limitations to protect national security and personal privacy.

Mr. President, last October numerous highly qualified witnesses testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure on these bills. The evidence presented there has convinced me of the need for increased freedom of information on agency matters. The subcommittee chairman, Senator LONG, has stated that the hearings demonstrated "beyond a shadow of a doubt the absolute necessity for a new public information statute." I would like to support fully this conclusion of my colleague from Missouri, and to emphasize the values that would accrue from congressional action in this field by referring to recent situations which have arisen in my State of Indiana.

In April 1963, the Federal Power Commission initiated an adversary proceeding against the Indiana & Michigan Electric Co. through which it alleged in essence that the company's sales at wholesale for resale of electric energy to more than 20 purchasers—municipal and rural electric—would subject such company to the rate-fixing authority of the Commission. At the same time the company was directed to show cause why it should not file with the Commission its rate schedule for such customers.

Although the company was ordered to produce extensive and voluminous documentation and was subjected to substantial prehearing discovery of its records by FPC staff members, the company's request for similar right of prehearing discovery of material in possession of the FPC vital to its case was denied by the Federal Power Commission.

The company then filed suit against the FPC in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, asking the court to grant the discovery previously denied by the Federal Power Commission in its proceeding.

In November 1963, Judge Jesse Ecshbach of the above-mentioned district court ruled that under Federal law he had no power to grant the company the requested discovery. However, the judge in the course of the hearing stated:

I might say that I am shocked by the arbitrary denial of the very orderly procedure which I consider necessary to due process of law by this Commission.

In his opinion, he pointed to the "iniquities presented by the Commission's rulings on matters of discovery," and stated that the examiner's ruling "has resulted in a complete and effective denial of any prehearing discovery for the plaintiff in the Commission proceedings." Furthermore, in dismissing the complaint, the judge made the following significant statement which relates so clearly to the purpose of these bills that I wish to quote four or five pertinent sentences:

In so holding, this court is not unmindful of the fact that the record in the instant case constitutes an alarming example of how

a private litigant before an administrative agency may be denied the opportunity to pursue the orderly procedures so vital to our traditional notions of fairplay. Contentions advanced by counsel for the Commission through the hearings in this cause afford this court no nourishment to hold as we must. Counsel for the Commission contended that the plaintiff did not specifically designate the various documents sought. It would be strange, indeed, if the plaintiff could designate the dates and authors of the various engineering reports which it has never been given an opportunity to examine. Likewise, the possibility of permitting restricted discovery on the day of trial affords the experienced trial practitioner no effective remedy at all. This is especially true where much of the data sought consists of long and detailed engineering and rate studies.

In December, less than a month after the district court decision, the Public Service Commission of Indiana served formal notice of its withdrawal from the Federal Power Commission proceedings. The three members of this State commission unanimously approved dropping out of the case because they believed that the State had not been allowed adequate opportunity to prepare a defense against the projected assumption of jurisdiction by the Federal agency. As early as May 3, 1963, the Indiana commission had requested the holding of a concurrent hearing, but this was denied by the FPC. The Indiana commission also charged that the schedule fixed for the hearings did not permit its staff sufficient time for investigation, that its requests for extension of time were denied, and especially that the less than 1 month allowed to read, analyze, and prepare a defense against the very extensive evidence presented by the FPC on November 4 was totally insufficient. Then, on December 20, 1963, the Indiana Public Service Commission, after public hearing, entered its order asserting its jurisdiction over the matter in dispute. The Indiana commission then forthwith withdrew from the Federal Power Commission proceeding. It is also significant that the public service commissions of Maryland and Wyoming withdrew from such Federal Power Commission proceedings for the same reasons.

The Honorable Edwin K. Steers, attorney general of the State of Indiana, has advised me by his letter, dated February 17, 1964, that in his opinion "these bills would greatly improve the procedures before Federal administrative agencies and achieve a closer balance between the discretionary powers of such agencies on the one hand and the rights of the parties appearing before them on the other." The Indiana attorney general cited another case in Indiana to which I direct your attention. He stated as follows:

A more recent example of the breakdown in the administrative process appears in the case of the *Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. v. Federal Power Commission et al.*, now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana in docket No. IH 64-C-10. In that case the Federal Power Commission admitted that a letter, requiring the utility to file certain rates and contracts, may have been issued to the utility without the knowledge or con-

sent of the Federal Power Commission. Such a letter, indicating at least an indicia of authority if, in fact, unauthorized, demonstrates the extent to which the abuse of administrative process has gone.

Attorney General Steers concluded his statement with the following comment on these bills:

I am confident that you and the Congress of the United States are most desirous of affording fair and impartial hearings before Federal administrative bodies and of protecting the constitutional rights of all parties to such proceedings. Upon this premise, and in light of the situations directed to your attention by this letter, I urge serious consideration of this matter and the passage of Senate bills No. 1663 and No. 1666.

I think the Indiana situations described above, without regard to the merits of the issues over which discovery of information was sought, clearly demonstrates that a new approach to the problem of freedom of information is essential. S. 1663 and S. 1666 would do much to provide this new approach. For this reason, they have my full support and I hope that we can enact them into law in the very near future.

SENATOR SCOTT CRITICIZES HANDLING OF 10-SENATOR LETTER ON GENOCIDE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 17 nine Senators joined me in a letter to President Johnson urging his support to our effort to have the United States ratify the Genocide Convention. We pointed out that although 66 other nations have ratified this important international document, the United States has failed to take such action in the 15 years since the convention was signed.

Following is the reply I received. It came from the Department of State:

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: I have been asked to reply to your letter of January 17 to the President.

This administration shares fully the convictions which led President Truman to submit the Genocide Convention to the Senate in 1949 with the request for advice and consent to its ratification. There can be no question of this Government's dedication to the convention's purpose of outlawing the international crime of genocide.

It is the intention of the administration to ratify the Genocide Convention upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate, and we hope that the situation in the Senate will develop to a point where this can be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I am very distressed at this buck passing. The Genocide Convention has languished for years in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for lack of leadership to ratify it. Now it seems destined forever to remain in a pigeonhole.

I do not believe President Johnson ever saw our letter. If he had, I feel certain he would have provided the leadership we requested. More than likely, some White House staff assistant gave it a routine assignment to whatever Government agency was involved. It was probably given the same treatment as

letters requesting the President to accept a can of salad oil or to crown a beauty queen.

But this letter, signed by 10 Senators, deals with the survival of civilization itself. It asks the President to help us put the United States on record against race murder. The beasts of this world must know that if they try another "final solution" they must face the kind of reckoning being dealt to former Nazi executioners even today.

I know that ratification of an international document is the responsibility of the Senate. But the Senate is a busy legislative body. It must give priorities to the great mass of legislation before it. Our request was that the President help give ratification of the Genocide Convention first priority. It needs the push that only he can provide to get the action that is so necessary.

I do not know what next we must do in this matter. Perhaps my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who signed this letter, and the many other Senators who stand ready to ratify the Genocide Convention, will have a suggestion on what our next move must be.

The original letter was signed also by Senators J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota; EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York; MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon; KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York; DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland; and DANIEL K. INOUE, Democrat, of Hawaii.

STEEL INDUSTRY'S POSITION ON FORTHCOMING TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the steel industry recently has been presenting to the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee its views with respect to the position to be taken by the U.S. Government in the forthcoming "Kennedy round" trade discussions. Representative of the industry's viewpoint are statements by John P. Roche, president of American Iron and Steel Institute; Leslie B. Worthington, president of United States Steel Corp.; and Henry J. Wallace, administrative vice president, commercial, of United States Steel Corp.; as well as an article appearing in the February 15 issue of *Business Week* magazine. I ask unanimous consent that these statements and article be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF JOHN P. ROCHE, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE, TO U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 1964

My name is John P. Roche, and I am president of American Iron & Steel Institute. The institute is a nonprofit trade association consisting of 87 member companies. The steel industry is truly one of America's basic

industries. It employs more than 500,000 persons in about 275 companies in 300 communities in 37 States. Eighty-five of those companies make raw steel required to manufacture their finished products; the remainder are engaged in the further processing of semifinished steel produced by others. The industry spends more than \$6 billion annually for the many hundreds of materials, services, and supplies it consumes. It currently generates revenues of about \$15 billion a year. It is the basic material used in manufacturing industries accounting for about one-third of total manufacturing employment in the United States.

Both the labor and capital facilities used in the steel industry are highly specific to steel production; that is, neither resource can be easily or quickly absorbed in other sectors of the economy if it happens to be displaced by imported steel. More importantly perhaps, steel or steel products constitute the economic mainstay of a substantial number of local communities.

In 1963, the industry produced 109.3 million tons of ingots and steel for castings. While that was an improvement over the less than 100-million-ton annual figures of the previous 5 years, it was well below the 117-million-ton record of 1955 and was also below the levels reached in 1953, 1956, and 1957.

Steel is a vibrant and energetic industry steadily increasing its efficiency in order to improve its competitive position at home and abroad. It has its problems and is making significant headway in solving many of them. Of these, none is more important or more pressing than the decline of our share in world steel trade through the reduction of exports and the fast rise in the tonnage of foreign steel moving into this country.

This adverse development in international trade was a matter of grave concern to the steel industry in 1962 when the American Iron & Steel Institute adopted a resolution on the subject of free trade which says in part: "We believe in and subscribe to the objective of a free and growing two-way international trade for this country. No industrial nation like the United States can have any other objective in its own best economic and political interest."

The United States is no longer a net steel exporter. It was a substantial steel exporter through 1957 but in the period of 1958-62, U.S. exports of steel mill products were reduced to little more than half the volume of the 1953-57 period—or to only 6 percent of world trade compared to about 15 percent in the earlier period. Meanwhile, imports of steel products into the United States nearly tripled. They rose to 9 percent of world imports, against 4 percent in the 1953-57 period. And the U.S. foreign trade balance in steel shifted from an annual export surplus of 3 million to 4 million tons to an import surplus of equal amount in 1963.

World trade in steel mill products has been increasing and reached 44 million to 45 million tons in recent years, nearly triple the 1950 volume. But U.S. exports have stagnated at about 2 million tons, while U.S. imports have risen rapidly to a level of about 5½ million tons in 1963. The 5.5 million tons displaced 40,000 steelworkers and a payroll of more than \$300 million. But this is history.

The American steel industry is determined to recapture the markets which it has lost in this country and to become a significant factor once again in the export market. But we cannot accomplish either objective without some consideration from the Government. There may have been a time when we could have won this battle without regard to the hurdles established by other governments—but not any more. Here are a few of the reasons why:

1. The increasing trend toward self-sufficiency in steel on the part of countries

that formerly imported their requirements. Steel mills appear to be regarded by many as a symbol of national prestige. Even when installation of a steel mill is clearly uneconomic in the short run and quite possibly uneconomic in the long run, political considerations have often led to a decision to use scarce resources to build steel mills rather than alternative kinds of facilities. Thus, countries such as Venezuela, Peru, Argentina, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the Republic of the Congo, which formerly constituted markets for exports, are now supplying much of their own steel needs, and in some cases are even exporting small surpluses.

2. Except for the United States, major steel exporting countries have traditionally maintained a two-price system in which home market customers are forced to subsidize export sales at dumping prices. This situation has, of course, been aggravated in recent years by the existence of substantial excess capacity in the major steel producing countries, which tends to increase the pressure for expansion of export markets.

3. The rapid trend toward parity of technology and facilities among major world steel producers, hence a narrowing in the historic American advantage in product quality and productive efficiency. Much of this has been a direct result of U.S. foreign economic and technical assistance.

4. The low absolute and relative level of U.S. tariff rates on steel products and the absence of nontariff trade barriers in the United States in contrast to their continued existence abroad.

This perhaps is an opportune time to mention briefly antidumping and national preference legislation.

Antidumping legislation: Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade condemns dumping. I believe that the negotiators should urge that all countries should provide effective means of preventing this unfair and disruptive trade practice and that no concessions should be made which would weaken this principle.

National preference legislation: The Federal Buy American Act of March 2, 1933, is a statutory enactment in full force and effect under GATT as "existing legislation." The negotiators from foreign countries may contend that the United States should agree to relax the terms of the American act. Our negotiators should realize that other countries have national preference policies, formal or informal, and therefore, should make no concessions. This subject is covered fully in exhibit D of our brief.

U.S. rates of duty on steel mill products are among the lowest of all U.S. rates on industrial goods. For example, a comparison of 1961 U.S. tariff rates on industrial goods shows that steel products carry ad valorem duty rates averaging about 6 percent. That is lower than any other major product group except inorganic chemicals, agricultural machinery, and fertilizers. Steel tariff rates are from one-half to one-third of those of other industrial imports.

Moreover, in steel trade, our tariff rates are clearly lower than those of our major competitors. They rank with the lowest averages of duties on steel products among the nations of the world.

At the same time, it is to be borne in mind that there is a significant difference in the base on which duties are assessed abroad as compared with the United States. The ad valorem duties of the principal foreign countries are imposed on a cost, insurance, and freight value, whereas in the case of the United States the duties are based on the f.o.b. value at the foreign point of shipment. A recent study by the Committee for Economic Development shows that this difference in procedure means that countries which levy on a c.i.f. basis obtain an average of 10-percent increase in their effective tariff protection compared to the United States.

On top of all this, the inherent disadvantage of the United States vis-a-vis the ECSC is being further compounded by the recent move of the high authority authorizing an increase in steel tariff rates which became effective on February 15. France has already raised its duties and the other countries are expected to follow suit in line with their traditional policy of protecting the producers of their basic commodities.

With respect to nontariff barriers, there are a number of practices in various countries which tend either to limit their imports or to expand their exports to the detriment of the U.S. competitive position in world markets. These include transactions taxes and import equalization taxes, surcharges in addition to tariff rates, import licensing, and quotas, foreign exchange controls, customs formalities and exclusive supplier agreements, and the fact that some market practices prohibited by law in the United States are often condoned in some foreign countries.

While the incidence of these barriers varies widely from country to country, the industrialized nations generally are freer of such barriers than are the developing countries. But many industrialized countries do have effective devices for limiting imports. Japan from time to time has invoked standby import licenses and foreign exchange controls to curb imports. Transactions, or equalization, taxes are widely used in Western Europe. This drastically affects the competitive position of countries like the United States which depend less on such indirect taxes on sales and more on direct taxes on personal and corporate net income. Present European practice is to levy such taxes on imports, and rebate them on exports.

U.S. producers are affected significantly in three ways, by the impact of such taxes: (1) In U.S. sales to these countries; (2) in competition with their products in "third country" markets; and (3) in competition with imports from those countries in the U.S. domestic market.

In my view, rates of duty cannot be separated meaningfully from the additional barriers to trade, such as the transactions, turnover, and equalization taxes of our main European competitors. Commercially, these barriers together constitute a governmentally determined "cost of entry" which is weighted against the American steel producer.

So long as foreign producers of steel stand securely behind a barrier comprised of tariffs plus intangible—but nonetheless very real—obstacles to entry, e.g., protracted delays in processing clearances, import quotas, exchange control, etc., they have the economic wherewithal for continuing to dump in the virtually unsheltered U.S. markets. There is no question but that such protection provides a particularly powerful subsidy for dumping raids on the U.S. market.

I respectfully submit, it is readily apparent that further reductions of U.S. rates of duty on any steel products could only result in the encouragement of further expansion of foreign capacity and in more damage to the welfare of American steel producers and their employees, and to heavy longrun penalties to the American economy as a whole.

We know that the U.S. Government is principally concerned with the impact of international trade on our balance-of-payments position and unemployment in the United States. The American steel industry is equally concerned. We submit that both these factors are present equally, no matter the size of company or the current status of the profit-and-loss statements of the member companies of the industry, large and small.

The United States had an unfavorable balance of trade in steel mill products amounting to \$170 million in 1963. Five years earlier we had a favorable balance of \$355

million, a difference in our payments position of over half a billion dollars.

Concerning employment, steelworkers comprise an important part of the total labor force in cities like Pittsburgh, Pa., Youngstown, Ohio, and Gary, Ind., and represent the bulk of workers in such steel towns as Bethlehem, Pa., Middletown, Ohio, Fontana, Calif., and many others.

In summary, I would like to make four points:

1. The major objective of the negotiations should be to seek a large expansion of trade while avoiding undue hardships to particular industries and workers.

2. American steel producers find themselves at a great and increasing disadvantage in meeting foreign competition at home and in world markets.

3. Because of the continuing growth in the excess of steel supply over demand abroad, there is no basis for expecting early improvement in this position of U.S. producers.

4. And, finally, American producers should be given the opportunity to compete on a basis of equality. This calls for the adjustment of foreign tariffs, the removal or lowering of nontariff trade barriers, and the elimination of destructive and unfair competitive practices. If these reasonable objectives are not attainable by our negotiators, the United States should not offer steel products for tariff reductions at the GATT negotiations. This would still leave substantial inequities for which correction should continue to be sought.

We realize that the upcoming Kennedy round of negotiations will be one link in a long chain of conferences which over the years we hope, as you do, will develop what our American Iron & Steel Institute resolution previously quoted calls "a free and growing two-way international trade for this country." We are determined that steel will be a strong and substantial contributor to the growth of U.S. exports.

We pledge our assistance in developing the Government's policy on international trade. To this end, we respectfully suggest that you accept our proposal to provide a permanent corps of industry advisers to you and to any other agency of our Government, not only for these negotiations, but for the future as well.

TESTIMONY OF LESLIE B. WORTHINGTON, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP., PITTSBURGH, PA., BEFORE THE TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 19, 1964

My name is Leslie B. Worthington and I am president of United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa. I welcome this chance to discuss with you the opportunities and obstacles which I believe confront our Government and the steel industry in achieving further freedom of world trade.

In our company, we believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. We recognize, however, that unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized.

Given a competitive climate that is fair to all, we believe we can successfully meet the serious competitive problems that now face us in markets abroad and at home; but such a climate in steel mill products simply does not exist in the world today.

To keep our products competitive is our responsibility as a steel producer. But to keep a competitive climate that is fair is something that only Government can do.

Thus, the representatives of our Government at the trade negotiations should seek voluntary agreement that will eliminate unfair methods which restrict and impede competition and will, at the same time, encourage constructive practices that will promote world trade.

Only our Government is in a position to eliminate destructive trade practices in steel products; and we would think that Government would undertake to do this, not alone because in this country we believe in fair competition, but also because of the importance of the domestic industry to the economic well-being of the United States.

The importance of a vital steel industry to our Nation in wartime has been very well demonstrated on three occasions during my lifetime. The importance of the industry to our national economy in peacetime can, I believe, be demonstrated by reference to a very few representative data.

There are more than 500,000 employees of the American steel industry engaged in the production and distribution of steel mill products. Many thousands more are employed in the mining, processing, and transportation of raw materials, in the fabrication of the mill products and in related industries.

The payrolls of the American steel producers in 1963 exceeded \$4 billion.

There are steel plants in some 300 different communities in this country and each of them contributes to the economic welfare of the community in which it is located.

Taxes paid by the steel companies in 1962 to local, State, and Federal governments exceeded the sum of their net profits and amounted to more than \$743 million.

During the post-World War II period the American steel industry has averaged nearly \$1 billion a year in capital expenditures. Such expenditures in 1964 are expected to reach \$1½ billion.

Steel mill products are the raw material for a host of manufacturing industries in the United States. It has been estimated that nearly one-third of total man-hours in manufacturing are devoted to the further fabricating of steel mill products into end-use articles.

That a healthy and progressive steel industry is essential to the economy and defense of this country cannot, I believe, be seriously questioned.

No doubt our Government has a considerable stake in the well-being of the steel industry and, because that well-being is now under serious challenge—and under circumstances with which only our Government can cope—I believe the problem should be made clear at this time.

These circumstances actually arise out of the tremendous postwar, worldwide growth in steel production. Table 30 of the brief we have filed with the Committee shows that in 1930, 25 nations produced steel and, of the total production of 100 million ingot tons, the United States produced about 44 percent.

Following the end of World War II—in 1946—30 nations were producing steel and the United States produced about 54 percent of it. However, 16 years later—in 1962—55 nations were producing steel and, out of nearly 395 million tons of steel ingots poured in that year, the United States produced just under 25 percent.

It is estimated that by 1965, 71 nations will be producing steel and many of the newcomers can be expected to add to the chaos that exists in the export markets of the world.

Since the close of World War II, our Government has provided the money to build, modernize, or expand 179 different foreign steel plants. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1963, this money has reached the astonishing total of \$1,735

million. By way of contrast, the American steel producer has been able to expand and improve his own steel mill facilities through his ability to pay his own way—and without direct help of any kind from his Government.

The view is sometimes expressed that at least some of the nations which have built or are planning steel plants could better invest in agriculture or other development that would contribute more significantly to the improvement of the living standards of their people. However this may be, the fact remains that many nations continue to be successful in raising the large sums necessary for the installation or expansion of steel plants—notwithstanding that the plants now in operation around the world, to say nothing of plants now building or in the planning stage, have the capacity to produce steel far in excess of the world's present requirements.

It is this foreign steel excess capacity and its utilization to flood world markets with dumped steel that has created the problem which I believe must be the concern of our Government.

It seems to be true that, in every foreign country which has a steel industry, the government assists in building an export trade. Such assistance would account for the practice that appears generally to be followed in foreign nations of operating steel mills so as to earn foreign exchange, to bring the export-import trade into balance and to serve other political considerations.

In the major foreign steel-producing nations, the requirements of the domestic market are generally supplied at prices which the steel producers jointly seek to stabilize—usually with the aid of their government. Since there is an excess of steel-producing capacity in these nations, the remaining production, not absorbed in the domestic market, is then dumped in the export market at whatever prices it will bring. To the extent that the foreign steel producer is able to cover his fixed charges out of his domestic sales, he is then in a position to price his export sales on his incremental costs. By marketing his excess production in this way, he is able to utilize a labor force which either the law or local practice causes him to maintain, regardless of the need for their services; and he is also able to earn foreign exchange for his government, and to serve his own financial interests in the bargain.

In many of the smaller countries, heavy capital investment in modern steelmaking equipment, lack of domestic or other economical sources of raw materials, inefficient labor and other costly operations would indicate that serious losses must be incurred on sales in export but, nevertheless, political considerations seem to dictate that this policy be followed.

These attitudes, policies, and practices on the part of foreign steelmakers and their governments, including the willingness of governments to subsidize exports, are reflected in the steel export markets of today. As the volume of export offerings has continued to increase, competition for available business has become more and more intense. Under these circumstances, prices on steel products exported to the United States and to non-steel-producing nations have been driven to levels that reflect the predatory and destructive competitive practices that are prevalent among exporters.

We in United States Steel believe that it is good business to treat all of our customers alike, both large and small. For this reason, we publish prices f.o.b. mill on our steel mill products and quote these prices to each of our customers. We reduce our prices both at the mill and at delivery points to meet lower prices quoted by our domestic competitors in competitive areas when we believe this is the sound thing to do and when such action

is consistent with our practice of treating all of our customers in an even-handed fashion.

My company has on a few occasions attempted to meet the indiscriminate prices quoted in the United States by the importers of foreign steel. We found—as we lowered our price—that the price on the foreign steel was reduced correspondingly. Of course, this is the characteristic of the dumping price—that it will be lowered in whatever amount is necessary to take the business away from the domestic supplier.

Any overall effort to meet dumping prices could foreseeably end in disaster for any private company that is operating in a free competitive economy. And we have not yet found it advisable to attempt to meet on a customer-by-customer basis the dumping prices which are being quoted on imported steel in the United States. We are fully aware that the latter practice would work to the disadvantage of those of our customers who prefer to buy domestic products—even though the price is higher than the prices quoted on foreign steel—as well as those of our customers who are not in a position to buy all or even a substantial part of their requirements from importers.

My company tries to sell regularly in the home markets of other steel-producing nations where prices are stable and are not much different from our own domestic prices. However, in the non-steel-producing foreign nations of the world, it would be necessary that we meet dumping prices if we were to be successful in selling our products. To undertake to do so would, we think, favor consumers abroad to the marked disadvantage of our domestic customers.

We hope to be able to continue this even-handed basis of selling our products because we believe it is important that we contribute as much as possible to the ability of each of our customers to maintain a healthy competitive position in the markets in which he sells his products. A good many of them compete successfully in the sale abroad of their products made of steel, as well as competing with each other in their own markets in this country. The United States has a favorable export balance of trade in capital equipment and consumer durable goods manufactured from steel. One of the factors making this possible is that the manufacturers of these products in the United States are able to buy their steel from domestic steel producers at prices which compare favorably with the prices paid by their foreign competitors in other major steel producing countries.

With many nations now striving for the creation or further expansion of steelmaking facilities, our problem is becoming more and more aggravated with the flooding of export markets. This is particularly true of our own coastal markets. In these markets, steel products have been sold at constantly declining prices as cutthroat competition from an ever increasing number of steel producing nations has forced them down.

As to Russia and the other Red bloc countries, it is very likely true that they have it in their power to enter any foreign market, including the United States, on a basis that would threaten the collapse of the domestic industry.

The chaotic price competition in the world export steel trade, as reflected in the pricing of exports of steel mill products to the United States, has created a problem which can only be described as critical. We believe in free trade under equally fair competitive conditions. Such fair competitive conditions simply do not exist in the steel export markets of the world today.

History bears out the view that the suppression of unfair competitive practices in

no way hinders or stifles the flow of free trade in any market—domestic or foreign—quite the contrary. If standards of fair competition could be established in world trade in steel products, they would, I believe, prove a far greater stimulus to such trade than any adjustments that are possible in the existing tariffs of the steel producing nations.

It is our recommendation, as stated in our brief that rates of duty and nontariff trade barriers should be considered jointly in relation to their overall impact on international trade in steel mill products. In this connection, both duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by other nations on imports from the United States should be compared with the duties and nontariff trade barriers imposed by the United States on steel imports from such other nations. Adjustments should then be negotiated which will provide the opportunity to the American steel producer and to the steel producers of other nations to compete in world markets on a fair basis of equality. Furthermore, unfair and destructive trade practices, such as dumping, must be eliminated before free trade between the United States and foreign nations in steel products can be realized. If these objectives cannot be accomplished, then steel mill products should be placed on the U.S. reserve list. In addition, if other nations should increase their rates of duty or increase or impose other levies or barriers on steel imports from the United States, then the U.S. rates of duty should be increased correspondingly. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY J. WALLACE, ADMINISTRATIVE VICE PRESIDENT, COMMERCIAL, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP., PITTSBURGH, PA., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1964

My name is Henry J. Wallace and I am administrative vice president, commercial, of United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Until January 1 of this year, I was president of National Tube Division of United States Steel. Upon the consolidation of that division with the other steel producing divisions of my company, I transferred to my present position.

During my years of service with National Tube Division, first in the sales department where on August 1, 1950, I became vice president in charge of sales, and then, starting February 1, 1960, as president of the division, I either sold or was responsible for the sale of our pipe and other tubular products in competition with foreign products. Because of my firsthand experience, I was selected by my company to appear today before your Commission.

Prior to the hearing, I handed to your secretary, Mr. Bent, several copies of my testimony to which there is attached a list of steel mill products. This list shows the TSUS numbers, the U.S. rates of duty, and the volume of imports during 1962, and the first 6 months of 1963, for each TSUS item. I understand that a copy of my testimony with the appended list of steel mill products has been placed before each of you.

If you care to refer to the list of products, you will note that the rates of duty vary considerably from product to product, between different sizes of the same product, and for carbon and alloy products. The percentage rates apply to ad valorem values, which are f.o.b. foreign port and in all cases lower than the delivered price in the United States. The volume of imports also varies greatly from product to product, and within the general product category.

You will see that the four steel mill products that have been imported in greatest

volume carry very different rates of duty. They are concrete reinforcing bars, which carry an import duty of 8.5 percent ad valorem; wire rods with import duties on the two largest volume items of one-tenth of a cent and one-quarter of a cent per pound, respectively, which are the equivalent of 2.9 and 5.1 percent ad valorem; welded standard pipe, which carries a duty of three-tenths of a cent per pound, equivalent to 4.5 ad valorem; and structural shapes three inches and over with a duty to only one-tenth of a cent per pound. Total imports of these four products during 1963 are estimated at 544,000 tons of reinforcing bars, or about 17 percent of the total U.S. market; 801,000 tons of wire rods, equal to almost 40 percent of the total market; 670,000 tons of welded standard pipe, over 27 percent of the total U.S. market; and 544,000 tons of structural shapes, or about 10 percent of the total U.S. market.

Then there are the very important flat rolled products. Carbon plate imports rose from 37,000 tons in 1961 to an estimated 275,000 tons in 1963, and the majority of the items in this category carry a duty of 8 percent ad valorem. The bulk of hot rolled sheet imports also have an 8-percent rate of duty and imports rose from 53,000 tons in 1961 to an estimated 360,000 tons in 1963; most cold rolled sheet imports have an ad valorem rate of 8 percent, plus one-tenth of a cent per pound, and 1963 imports are estimated at 170,000 tons—up from 5,000 tons in 1961; galvanized sheets have a rate of one-tenth of a cent per pound, plus 8 percent ad valorem, and 1963 imports are estimated at 209,000 tons, compared with 54,000 tons in 1961. Tinplate imports have a rate of duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound, and imports grew from 15,000 tons in 1961 to 83,000 tons in 1963. The sharp rise in imports of each of these flat rolled products, which have moderate rates of duty, are a cause of real anxiety among domestic steel producers.

By way of contrast, there are some products with low rates of duty which have not yet been exported by foreign steel producers to the United States in significant volume. Examples are sheet piling, dutiable at one-tenth of a cent per pound, with imports for 1963 estimated at 14,500 tons; railroad rails and track accessories, which carry a duty of one-twentieth of a cent and one-eighth cent per pound, respectively, with 1963 imports estimated at 10,750 tons; and railroad wheels and axles, dutiable at four-tenths and three-tenths of a cent per pound, respectively, with 1963 imports estimated at 900 tons.

The list of steel mill products also shows a number of products having moderate import duties that have not yet entered the United States in any significant quantity. And then there are some high-duty items that show inconsequential imports. Clad plates carry the highest duty rate of any of the steel mill products—24 percent ad valorem—and imports for the last 2 years were less than 500 tons. Coated strip has a 19 percent ad valorem equivalent rate and few imports.

At the other extreme, is a free list item—barbed wire—which has been imported in this country in heavy volume for a good many years. During the past few years, imports have supplied in the neighborhood of 50 percent of the total American market.

I would like to be able to measure for the Commission the probable economic effects of the modification of any of these rates of duty on the American producers of the various products. This would require more information than we are in a position to obtain about the domestic companies that manufacture and distribute the various steel mill products. However, several sound con-

clusions can be drawn from what we do know of the steel import situation.

First, I would like to describe briefly the trend of steel imports into this country.

As competition has increased between foreign exporters in the common garden variety of products—such as welded standard pipe, reinforcing bars, and wire rods—the foreign steel producers have moved into markets for the higher quality and more sophisticated products. This is evidenced by the extremely sharp upturn during the past 2 years in the imports of carbon steel plates, sheet and strip products, and tin mill products, and some stainless steel products, particularly from Japan. Obviously, foreign producers are not abandoning their markets for any steel product in the United States. Rather, they appear to be seeking to expand their markets in this country to include the whole range of steel mill products.

Accordingly, the question as to whether any U.S. rate of duty applicable to a steel mill product should be reduced may properly be examined in the light of the ability on the part of foreign steel producers to continue to penetrate more and more of our markets in an ever-increasing volume.

We are regarded here in the United States by other steel-producing countries as the world's major steel export market. This is so because we are consuming approximately 35 percent of all the steel that is produced outside Russia and the satellite countries and an exporter can now command whatever volume of business he wants if he is willing to sell in the United States at whatever price he is able to get. As our foreign competitors see it—whether they are in Europe, Japan, Canada, Mexico, Australia, South Africa or elsewhere—the U.S. market should absorb an increasing proportion each year of the world export market. Now, the proportion of our market which imports can be expected to preempt—unless our Government acts to establish fair competitive market conditions—can be forecast on the basis of the present trend of imports—from 3,163,000 tons in 1961 to 5.5 million tons in 1963. The potential increase in imports can also be viewed from the standpoint of the vast expansion that has, and is taking place in the world's steelmaking capacity.

In 1930 only 25 nations produced steel and output was about 100 million tons. By 1946, 30 nations were producing steel and output had increased to 124 million tons. The end of World War II signaled a vast steel expansion program throughout the world and much of this expansion was financed directly with funds furnished by the U.S. Government. The U.S. steel producers also expanded their plants at an unprecedented rate, but with their own resources and without direct governmental help. By 1962, 55 nations were producing steel and world steel production had reached 395 million ingot tons. However, the U.S. share of world production had slipped from 44 percent in 1930 to an estimated 26 percent in 1963.

It is expected that by 1965 there will be 71 different nations producing steel.

As each new nation builds steel capacity, its internal market is usually closed to further imports of such steel mill products as it produces. The purpose of building a steel mill is to supply the domestic markets and, in order to supply it at a profit, that market must be isolated from world export prices. Since the domestic market seldom can consume the total output of the new mill, the surplus production is added to the volume formerly imported in seeking new export markets. This means principally the United States. Our market is not only the largest and richest of all, but it is also without trade barriers except the import duties that have, since the Tariff Act of 1930, been greatly re-

duced in successive negotiations of reciprocal trade treaties and, during recent years, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Most foreign steel producing nations are still expanding their steelmaking facilities and most of them are already equipped to make steel in quantities far beyond their domestic requirements. A considerable part of this expansion is reported to be for planned exportation to the United States. Thus, we should expect that foreign exporters will make every effort further to increase their already huge markets in this country. As a part of this effort, their representatives at Geneva are said to be prepared to seek further concessions in rates of duty and modification or repeal of our Antidumping and Buy-American Acts.

Next, with respect to some of the conditions, causes and effects of competition between the foreign and domestic steel industries which are brought into question under section 221(c) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962:

I should first say that the general level of domestic market prices on steel mill products is about the same in each of the major steel producing nations. The prices which our domestic customers pay for most products do not differ significantly from the prices paid by domestic consumers in Europe and Japan. Carbon steel plates are a standard commodity in most steel producing countries. Our published price at the mill on a common grade and size of plate is \$6.02 per hundredweight after cash discount. The equivalent figure for England is \$5.625 and for Japan \$5.80. For the other principal countries, the figure includes the national excise tax and for Germany it is \$6.208; for France it is \$6.988 and for Canada it is \$5.99.

The foreign steel producers who enter the U.S. market offer nothing that is not available in quantity from domestic steel producers. They offer no superior physical properties, no closer tolerances, no special features, no increased usefulness, and make no claims for their product except that it is manufactured to meet American specifications. Their present method of marketing steel products inside the United States is by underpricing the domestic producer in whatever amount is necessary to take the customer's order.

Such foreign steel producers do not pretend to offer to their own domestic customers prices which would reflect the same net return as they receive from sales in the United States. This is true for two reasons. First, it is unlikely that they could survive by selling their products at home at the same net return they receive from their sales in the United States. Second, their traditional method of marketing steel mill products is to maintain stable prices in their domestic markets, where almost all of them sell the bulk of their production, and then sell their surplus output, based on their incremental costs, at whatever prices they can obtain.

In considering the consequences of further reductions in steel duties, the Commission should, I believe, accept the fact that reductions in rates have in the past brought about an increased inflow of imported steel and should be expected to do so to an even greater degree in the future. In my view, steel imports are now excessive and have already caused serious damage to our economy in those respects that are prescribed in the Trade Expansion Act.

An estimate of the damaging effects on the American economy of the importation in 1963 of 5.5 million tons of steel products may be drawn from the benefits that would have derived from the production of this quantity of steel in the United States. This tonnage would have generated between three-

quarters to \$1 billion in steel company revenues. In addition the production of this tonnage would have provided employment equivalent to some 48,000 additional workers to produce and sell the steel. The added payrolls and benefits to these workers alone would have amounted to as much as \$400 million. The added payrolls would have been spent by employees in the steel producing communities throughout the Nation and this would have a multiplying effect on the economy.

Of course, this is not the whole employment story since the steel companies would have purchased hundreds of millions of dollars in additional goods and services from their suppliers who in turn would have provided a substantial number of jobs and payrolls which would have benefited both national and local economies.

The beneficial effect on employment and the consequent benefits to local and national business would have also generated additional revenues to local, State, and Federal taxing authorities. Employees would have paid additional sales, excise, payroll and income taxes to local, State, and Federal Governments and the steel companies and their suppliers would also have paid out millions of dollars in various taxes, such as State and Federal unemployment, sales and income taxes.

The total investment in plants and equipment according to the American Iron & Steel Institute was \$19.5 billion as of December 31, 1962. Additional investment in 1964 is estimated at \$1½ billion. To the extent that such facilities cannot be used in steel production at the normal rate for which they were designed and built, capital investment then becomes idle and cannot otherwise be employed.

Thus, every additional ton of imported steel that is admitted into our markets through further reduction of duties means additional unemployment, further loss of productivity and availability of skilled workers, further loss to Government of tax revenues and further sterilization of capital investment in domestic steel mills.

Before closing, I want to make the final point which I believe to be of transcending importance. The foreign steel that is being sold in the United States today is without any significant exception being dumped in our markets by any reasonable definition of dumping, including that set forth in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On the west coast, we find that prices on imported 2-inch galvanized pipe are being quoted as low as \$60 under our price. On the gulf coast, imports of this product are being sold at prices as low as \$58 under our price. As a result, foreign-made welded standard pipe now supplies about 70 percent of both the Texas and west coast markets, where the saturation is greatest. We are now selling this product f.o.b. mill to pipe jobbers at a price of \$198 per ton and are quoting delivered prices at Houston of \$211 per ton, and at Los Angeles at \$206 per ton.

The prices quoted by foreign steelmakers in the United States are made after they have paid U.S. import duties, commissions to importers in the United States, and transportation costs from mill to seaboard and then across the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean. It seems obvious that the foreign steel producers' ability to stabilize their own domestic market prices makes it possible for them to follow such pricing practices within the United States. As I view it, this is the practice of predatory pricing, a practice, I am told, that our laws are intended to suppress.

I believe there should be no reduction in U.S. rates of duty until, by governmental action, fair competitive conditions for the

sale of steel products are restored not only in the United States but also in foreign markets.

I would like to offer for the record a copy of the testimony given by the president of my company before the Trade Information Committee yesterday explaining why we do not generally meet the prices of imported steel mill products in the United States.

If there are any questions, I would be glad to undertake to answer them.

LIST OF STEEL MILL PRODUCTS, RATES OF DUTY, IMPORTS 1962 AND FIRST HALF 1963

Shown below are the TSUS item numbers for steel mill products and the rates of duty applicable thereto. Set opposite each item

number is the volume of imports of that product during the year 1962 and 6 months 1963, and, in the fourth column, the common name of the product as it is known to American industry and as it is described by the American Iron & Steel Institute and other specification writing and statistical groups, including agencies of the U.S. Government.

Common product name	TSUS Item No.	Rate of duty	Imports (thousand net tons)	
			1962	6 months of 1963
Semifinished (ingots, blooms, billets, slabs and sheet bars):				
Carbon.....	608.15.00	8.5 percent ad valorem.....	159	57
Do.....	608.16.00	10.5 percent ad valorem.....	2	3
Stainless.....	608.18.20	14.5 percent ad valorem ¹	0	(?)
Other alloy.....	608.18.40	14.5 percent ad valorem ¹	9	9
Concrete reinforcing bars:				
Carbon.....	608.40.00	8.5 percent ad valorem.....	607	269
Do.....	608.41.00	12.5 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	(?)
Alloy.....	608.42.00	16.5 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Other bars (bars carbon, alloy and cold finished):				
Carbon.....	608.45.00	7 percent ad valorem.....	107	63
Do.....	608.46.00	10.5 percent ad valorem.....	6	5
Do.....	608.48.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 10.5 percent ad valorem.....	2	(?)
Do.....	608.50.00	0.625 cent per pound plus 10.5 percent ad valorem.....	2	2
Stainless.....	608.52.10 and 50	14.5 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Other alloy.....	608.52.40 and 80	do ¹	6	2
Hollow drill steel:				
Carbon.....	608.60.00	0.375 cent per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	(?)
Do.....	608.61.00	10.7 percent ad valorem.....	1	1
Alloy.....	608.62.00	14.7 percent ad valorem ¹	1	1
Wire rods:				
Carbon.....	608.70.00	0.1 cent per pound.....	254	117
Do.....	608.71.00	0.25 cent per pound.....	353	234
Do.....	608.73.00	0.2 cent per pound.....	1	0
Do.....	608.75.00	0.375 cent per pound.....	12	5
Stainless.....	608.76.20	0.25 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	8	6
Other alloy.....	608.76.80	do.....		
Stainless.....	608.78.20	0.375 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹		
Other alloy.....	608.78.80	do.....		
Plates:				
Carbon.....	608.84.20	8 percent ad valorem.....	145	104
Stainless.....	608.85.10	12 percent ad valorem ¹	9	5
Other alloy.....	608.85.30	do ¹	1	0
Carbon.....	608.87.20	0.1 cent per pound plus 8 percent ad valorem.....	0	0
Stainless.....	608.88.10	0.1 cent per pound plus 12 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Other alloy.....	608.88.30	do ¹	0	0
Clad.....	608.90.00	24 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	0
Coated carbon.....	608.95.20	0.1 cent per pound plus 8 percent ad valorem.....	0	0
Coated alloy.....	608.96.20	0.1 cent per pound plus 12 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Tinplate.....	608.92.00	0.8 cent per pound.....	52	60
Terneplate.....	608.93.00	1 cent per pound.....	(?)	0
Black plate.....	608.81.00	10 percent ad valorem.....	4	(?)
Do.....	608.82.00	8 percent ad valorem.....	47	49
Sheets, not pickled and not cold rolled:				
Carbon.....	608.84.40	do.....	110	110
Stainless.....	608.85.40	12 percent ad valorem ¹	2	4
Other alloy.....	608.85.60	do ¹	2	1
Sheets pickled or cold rolled:				
Carbon.....	608.87.40	0.1 cent per pound plus 8 percent ad valorem.....	48	52
Stainless.....	608.88.40	0.1 cent per pound plus 12 percent ad valorem ¹	8	6
Other alloy.....	608.88.60	do.....	(?)	(?)
Sheets, galvanized.....	608.95.40	0.1 cent per pound plus 8 percent ad valorem.....	110	8
Sheets, other coated or plated:				
Carbon.....	608.95.60	do.....	(?)	(?)
Alloy.....	608.96.40	0.1 cent per pound plus 12 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	(?)
Strip, hot rolled:				
Carbon.....	609.02.20	6 percent ad valorem.....	4	2
Do.....	609.03.20	8.5 percent ad valorem.....	5	2
Do.....	609.04.20	9.5 percent ad valorem.....	74	39
Strip cold rolled:				
Carbon.....	609.02.40	6 percent ad valorem.....	1	(?)
Do.....	609.03.40	8.5 percent ad valorem.....	3	1
Do.....	609.04.40	9.5 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	(?)
Strip alloy, hot or cold rolled:				
Stainless.....	609.06.20	10 percent ad valorem ¹	101	0
Alloy.....	609.06.40	do ¹	38	0
Stainless.....	609.07.20	12.5 percent ad valorem ¹	108	0
Alloy.....	609.07.40	do ¹	70	0
Stainless.....	609.08.20	13.5 percent ad valorem.....	116	79
Alloy.....	609.08.40	do ¹	81	0
Strip, coated.....	609.17.00	19 percent ad valorem.....	0	0
Flat wire:				
Carbon not coated.....	609.20.00	6 percent ad valorem.....	4	2
Do.....	609.21.00	8.5 percent ad valorem.....	15	8
Do.....	609.22.00	10 percent ad valorem.....	67	34
Carbon, coated.....	609.25.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 6 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	0
Do.....	609.26.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 8.5 percent ad valorem.....	2	2
Do.....	609.27.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem.....	(?)	0
Stainless, not coated.....	609.30.20	10 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	0
Do.....	609.31.20	12.5 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	0
Do.....	609.32.20	14 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	(?)
Alloy, not coated.....	609.30.40	10 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	(?)
Do.....	609.31.40	12.5 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	(?)
Do.....	609.32.40	14 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	(?)
Alloy, coated.....	609.35.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Do.....	609.36.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 12.5 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Do.....	609.37.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 14 percent ad valorem ¹	(?)	0

See footnotes at end of table.

Common product name	TSUS item No.	Rate of duty	Imports (thousand net tons)	
			1962	6 months of 1963
Round and shaped steel wire:				
Carbon	609.40.10	8.5 percent ad valorem	2	1
Do	609.40.20	do	(2)	(2)
Do	609.40.30	do	87	38
Do	609.40.40	do		
Do	609.40.50	do	63	34
Do	609.40.60	do		
Do	609.42.10	0.3 cent per pound	9	0
Do	609.42.20	do	6	3
Do	609.42.30	do	46	24
Do	609.42.40	do	7	5
Do	609.42.50	do	10	5
Do	609.42.60	do	51	17
Do	609.70.00	12.5 percent ad valorem	(7)	(7)
Do	609.72.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 12.5 percent ad valorem	(5)	(7)
Do	642.96.00	0.25 cent per pound		
Do	642.97.00	15 percent ad valorem	42	25
Stainless	609.45.10	12.5 percent ad valorem ¹	2	0
Stainless or alloy	609.45.30	do	1	1
Do	609.45.40	do	1	(2)
Alloy	609.45.60	do	(2)	(7)
Stainless, alloy, etc.	609.75.20	16.5 percent ad valorem ¹	0	(7)
Do	609.75.40	do	67	44
Alloy, coated	609.76.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 16.5 percent ad valorem ¹	42	25
Barbed wire	642.02.00	Free	1	(2)
Galvanized wire fencing	642.35.00	0.25 cent per pound	1	0
Bale ties	642.90.00	Free	1	1
Do	642.91.00	19 percent ad valorem	270	154
Wire nails	646.25.00	0.5 cent per pound		
Do	646.26.00	0.2 cent per pound		
Structural shapes, plain, 3 inches and over:				
Carbon	609.80.20	0.1 cent per pound	363	224
Alloy	609.82.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	1	1
Bars, shapes under 3 inches, carbon	609.80.40	0.1 cent per pound	259	139
Sheet piling:				
Carbon	609.96.00	do	8	5
Alloy	609.98.00	0.1 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Rail and track accessories:				
Rails, carbon	610.20.00	0.05 cent per pound	10	4
Joint bars and tie plates, carbon	610.25.00	0.125 cent per pound	(7)	(7)
Rails, alloy	610.21.00	0.05 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	(7)	(2)
Joint bars and tie plates, alloy	610.26.00	0.125 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Wheels and axles:				
Axles	690.25.00	0.3 cent per pound	(2)	0
Wheels	690.30.00	0.4 cent per pound	1	1
Welding pipe and tubing:				
Carbon	610.30.00	0.875 cent per pound	(2)	(2)
Do	610.31.00	0.625 cent per pound	2	1
Do	610.32.20	do		
Do	610.32.40	0.3 cent per pound	585	300
Do	610.32.60	do		
Alloy	610.35.00	0.875 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Do	610.36.00	0.625 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	0	0
Do	610.37.20	do		
Do	610.37.40	0.3 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	2	(2)
Do	610.37.60	do		
Other pipe and tubing and oil country goods:				
Carbon	610.39.20	0.1 cent per pound	56	46
Do	610.39.40	do		
Do	610.42.20	7.5 percent ad valorem	21	23
Do	610.42.40	do		
Do	610.45.00	12 percent ad valorem	1	(2)
Do	610.48.00	11 percent ad valorem	(7)	(7)
Do	610.49.00	10.5 percent ad valorem	29	18
Alloy	610.40.20	0.1 cent per pound plus 4 percent ad valorem ¹	(7)	(7)
Do	610.40.40	do		
Do	610.43.20	11.5 percent ad valorem ¹	2	4
Do	610.43.40	do		
Do	610.46.00	16 percent ad valorem ¹	1	(2)
Do	610.51.20	do		
Do	610.51.40	15.5 percent ad valorem ¹	(7)	(7)
Do	610.51.60	do		
Do	610.52.20	do		
Do	610.52.40	14.5 percent ad valorem ¹	2	0
Do	610.52.60	do		

¹ Plus additional duties depending upon alloy content.² Less than 500 tons.³ Included in "sheets, galvanized," above.⁴ Included in 609.30.20 above.⁵ Included in 609.31.20 above.⁶ Included in 609.32.20 above.⁷ Not available.

Sources: TSUS (1963, annotated). U.S. Department of Commerce, FT-110 report.

Steel's case against imports

Year	Imports		Exports		1957-63 imports as percent of U.S. apparent consumption	Year	Imports		Exports		1957-63 imports as percent of U.S. apparent consumption
	Tons	Dollars	Tons	Dollars			Tons	Dollars	Tons	Dollars	
1957	1,155	(1)	5,348	(1)	1.5	1961	3,163	380,447	1,990	423,087	4.7
1958	1,707	(1)	2,823	(1)	2.9	1962	4,100	484,382	2,013	424,048	5.6
1959	4,396	516,568	1,677	363,043	6.1	1963 (11 months)	5,054	584,891	1,950	420,658	6.9
1960	3,359	448,781	2,977	600,845	4.7						

¹ Not available.² Estimate by Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Source: American Iron & Steel Institute.

WHEN STEEL SEEKS HELP FROM UNCLE SAM—ALARM OVER INROADS OF IMPORTS WILL BRING THE INDUSTRY'S VARSITY TEAM TO TELL TARIFF COMMISSION OF ITS TROUBLES AND HOPED-FOR REMEDIES

Steel's first team goes to Washington next week for its most important confrontation with Government since the price-increase fiasco of April 1962. For 3 days, presidents of a dozen steel companies will tell the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee about the industry's alarm over its worsening world trade position and the remedies it suggests.

Steel will have its say as part of the U.S. preparation for the Kennedy round of trade negotiations due to start May 4 in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Last fall, Christian Herter, chief U.S. negotiator, invited steel—and many other industries—to provide "marketplace knowledge" to guide U.S. negotiators at the GATT bargaining sessions. The hearings before the Tariff Commission and TIC are part of the procedure used in establishing what the United States will offer—and ask for—in Geneva.

Industry shift: A month or so ago, the steel industry didn't seem to feel there was much point in taking the hearings seriously. Some felt that Herter's invitation should be ignored. Then sentiment shifted to a perfunctory filing of briefs, and next to the idea that commercial research directors or sales VIP's should testify at the hearings.

But as the industry studied its position, its reaction grew more urgent. That's why presidents or chairmen of six of the eight largest producers—plus those of at least half a dozen others—will testify for the 15 minutes each company gets. They'll make these points:

Full employment is just as much U.S. public policy as is freer trade, and right now, the two clearly conflict in the case of steel.

Foreign steel producers are violating the GATT agreement in various ways to the disadvantage of the U.S. steel industry.

Through its postwar aid programs, Washington has helped build so much new steel capacity abroad that the U.S. steel industry has lost its dominance in the world market.

Disturbing figures: To emphasize its plight, the industry can point to the way imports are steadily outpacing exports. Figures for the first 11 months of 1963 show the worst deficit, in tons, since 1959—when we first imported more steel than we exported.

In dollars, the latest statistics are even more disturbing. Imports for the 11 months were \$100 million above total 1962 steel imports. And steel's 11-month dollar deficit was \$104 million greater than in all 1962—\$164 million against \$60 million.

Strong language: In their briefs, steel companies warned bluntly that 1964's steel import deficit will worsen. From an all-time high of 6.9 percent of apparent U.S. consumption in 1963, prophesied President William J. Stephens of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., imports could double within 18 months. Japan, he said, will have enough galvanized sheet capacity within 2 years "to eliminate the United States from world markets." Britain and Japan, he went on, are adding capacity that will render "world trade conditions in tinsplate chaotic."

United States Steel Corp. was milder in its brief. But its president, L. B. Worthington, pointed to "virtually insuperable barriers we now face" in competing not only here but in the markets of competitors and in third-country markets.

Loss in jobs: Briefs dealt bluntly with unemployment and the way imports are reducing employment levels here.

The American Iron & Steel Institute brief took the point even further: "It is estimated that the domestic steel industry would have provided \$375-million in wages and salaries

for an additional 50,000 workers in 1962 if it could have maintained its 1953-57 average participation in world steel trade and had experienced no further erosion of domestic markets by imports."

Looking just at exports, President Alfred S. Glossbrenner of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. said that between 1957 and 1962 "the loss in seamless pipe exports alone can be measured as an equivalent loss of 3,000 to 4,000 jobs in U.S. seamless pipe mills."

All the 15 U.S. seamless mills and 37 of the 38 U.S. rod mills are located in "c" or "d" labor markets—those of moderate or relatively substantial unemployment, the Youngstown and Pittsburgh briefs note.

Cost-of-entry issue: What should our trade negotiators do about this in the "Kennedy round"?

All agree that U.S. tariffs on steel mill products should not be cut. They average 5.9 percent and are the world's lowest. But some want them put on the reserve (non-negotiable) list from the start, while others suggest this be done only if nontariff concessions can't be had.

The difference is really just in bargaining technique. The steel industry is unanimous in wanting our GATT negotiators to equalize the "cost of entry" of steel products into all steel importing nations. That involves considering all charges in imports, not merely duties. The U.S. charges duty only. Other nations impose transmission, import, turnover, sales, and stamp taxes. Moreover, they grant export subsidies of several kinds. Steelmakers feel these disparities shut them out of export markets while propping open the door for imports.

"A 100-foot quantity of standard 2-inch pipe shipped from the United States to France," says AISI President John P. Roche, "accumulates French duties, stamp taxes, and transaction taxes to the amount of \$18.71. A similar shipment from France to the United States is assessed only the \$1.10 duty."

Dumping problem: Steelmen are equally angry about dumping, and will say so in Washington next week. In seven steel cases last year, the Treasury Department ruled that dumping took place in five. But the Tariff Commission denied injury in any.

Steelmen note that the European Coal & Steel Community last month raised its external tariff to counter what it called dumping by the United Kingdom, Japan, and various Soviet bloc nations. They argue that the GATT agreement explicitly forbids dumping—in language close to the U.S. Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. J. & L.'s stand is this: Strengthen GATT's antidumping provision, including a rolled-steel products section in it, and impose steel import quotas until effective antidumping programs are in operation.

In a letter to Herter this week, President David McDonald of the United Steel Workers also complained about the tariff hike put through by the Coal and Steel Community. But McDonald suggested a milder way of meeting the problem. He said the United States should insist on bargaining from the old levels, refuse any concessions on steel products if the Europeans refuse to do this.

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week it was my honor to appear on the same platform with the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] at the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of

my remarks printed in the RECORD at this point:

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

I have been asked tonight to talk about the issues facing Congress in 1964.

This is easy enough to do in an age when America is bursting with problems and issues. But I wonder if the concentration on the year 1964 is not a mistake.

I know there are great issues facing us today—none any greater than civil rights, for example—but I think we should be looking to the future in the fast-moving world.

Therefore, I say to you that a real issue facing the American people this election year is: which political party has the vision to look ahead to the year 1974, or indeed, the year 2000, and make plans to meet the challenges this country will face then.

One of the main reasons we have so many problems today is that this country did not do enough planning in 1954. We just sort of let everything gather under the rug.

But do not misunderstand me. I am not here to criticize and harangue. I do not want to waste my time denouncing the sins of the past. I am a positive liberal. The liberalism of complaint and denunciation does not satisfy my sense of public duty nor my progressive spirit. I believe in the liberalism of advocacy and action.

We have problems, yes, but I say these problems also can mean opportunity—the opportunity to give a better life to all our people.

These are just some of the more immediate tasks we face:

We must secure civil rights for all our citizens. We must correct what has become a citizenship gap in this country—the gap between the promise and the fulfillment of our Constitution and the Emancipation Proclamation.

We must destroy poverty. President Johnson has declared an all-out war on poverty in this country and we can win it. As he said in his state of the Union address, the richest nation on earth can afford to win this war. "We cannot afford to lose it."

Our economy must grow in all parts of the country. It must develop not only on the already overcrowded shores of our seacoasts and Great Lakes, but also in the great heartland between the Appalachians and the Rockies.

Automation and technology must create new jobs, not more jobless. It can be made a blessing and not a curse.

Old age must be welcomed with serenity and lived in dignity. It's disgraceful that the richest nation on earth should provide the least security for its elderly.

We must rebuild our cities, revitalize our rural areas and broaden the base of our economy.

We must provide for wholesome leisure-time activity and recreation and make it available to all.

We must conserve our natural resources. The press of population and industrialization places a new, even more urgent emphasis on conservation.

In all these challenges—in all these problems—you will notice there is one common denominator—education. We must make education, which has become a necessity for all, a reality for all. And we must make sure that education is not just an interlude of leisure for youth but is a challenge that prepares them for life during an age of scientific revolution.

Let's look at some of the biggest problems facing this country and see how education plays not only a vital role—but the key role.

Take poverty and unemployment—and here I want to recite some facts to you. Two

out of three of the unemployed today do not have a high school education. Or let me put it another way. One out of 10 workers who did not finish grade school are unemployed. But only 1 out of 50 who finished college are unemployed.

All these are obvious facts. We know we must keep our young people in school longer. But let's not blame the young people for dropping out of school. Let's look a little deeper at the question and ask: Are they dropping out because what they're learning can't be related to the world they know outside the classroom.

Also, on the question of school dropouts are we recognizing the problem before the child actually leaves school? We do know that one out of three students now in the fifth grade will drop out before graduation from high school. Doesn't this tell us that the problem of the dropout begins long before the child becomes a teenager?

The question of civil rights is also closely linked to education. And I'm not just talking about the immediate problems of school desegregation or integration. We have a long way to go in this country to overcome the tragic results of segregated education and the lack of opportunity for higher education we have given the Negro.

This Congress will pass a civil rights bill, I can promise you that, and we can guarantee the constitutional rights of every American, but it will be a hollow victory unless we add to it a successful effort to provide an education to all Americans that will let them participate fully and creatively in American life.

This means an education that will reach out to the dropouts, the illiterates, the unskilled, the slum child and the bewildered child brought from a sharecropper's farm to the pressure-cooker atmosphere of the big city. To do this we must explore new ideas and new proposals in education so we can reach these children.

I'm afraid that too many educators have been content with the methods used back in Dickens' day. We must begin thinking about education as a process that lasts throughout a person's life—not just his first 18 or 20 or 22 years.

We must begin thinking about education as a process that demands greater flexibility in training opportunities—the kind of flexibility that relates education to the needs of a rapidly changing society.

I think we have to do more research in the fundamentals of education. How many different ways do children learn? How do we relate teaching techniques to these different ways? Have we done enough with the new techniques available to us in the new audio and visual aids?

I believe the Federal Government can do much to help in this field by making a bigger investment in education. The Government can underwrite some of the research and it can step up its activities as a clearinghouse for this research.

The Federal Government also can do more to provide greater opportunities in higher education. The education bills we enacted last year broke new ground for aid to colleges and the college student. But we must do more.

Last spring 400,000 high school seniors graduated in the upper half of their classes and failed to go on to college. More than half of them were in the upper 30 percent of their class. Lack of money was the major reason. There also was inadequate guidance and lack of incentive.

But in any case, I say, what a tragic waste. What an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

I believe the Federal Government can do more to help students go to college. I think we can do this through expanded scholarship aid and through Government-guaranteed

loans that will be made available to college students through their local banks just as home mortgage loans are backed now by the Federal Housing Administration.

We must not limit college education to just the children of the well-to-do and the children of the college-educated. This Nation needs all the talent it can get. But I also say something more than just a national talent pool is at stake. Democracy itself is at stake.

The development of brainpower must be the chief national product of America and from here on out education must become America's chief national industry.

ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER SPEECH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to address the national Roosevelt Day dinner in New York City. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LIBERALS AND THE CHALLENGE OF TOMORROW

I don't have to tell this distinguished audience that 1964 is an election year.

And I guess that means I don't have to repeat the familiar refrain that 1964 is a crucial year. To politicians, all election years are crucial. It's like that old remark that all women are beautiful. Only, as you know, some elections are more crucial than others.

I don't think it's an exaggeration, though, to say that 1964 will mark a major turning point in the history of this great Nation—a year when the great fundamental issues that have been troubling us for decades will be decided.

As a liberal—and as a Democrat—I can tell you here and now that the administration of President Johnson and the Congress will meet these issues—the issues of civil rights and the war on poverty—and carry on the work started by our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

But as a liberal I want to point out that 1964 is also the year when we must take stock of our talents and our resources and face up to the reality of another generation of even more staggering problems at a time when we're still struggling with our old ones.

It's easy enough to point out some of the more immediate problems:

Should the richest nation in the world have one of the highest rates of unemployment?

Should the richest nation in the world have the least security for its elderly?

Should the richest nation in the world be content with some of the dirtiest cities, the most crowded streets, and the most shameful slums?

Should the richest nation in the world be satisfied with overcrowded schools?

And should the Nation that is the leader of a world that is half colored continue to deny or ignore the God-given rights of its own colored citizens?

The easy answer to all these questions is a simple "No." The richest Nation in the world should be a proud example.

But as the old saying goes—things are easier said than done.

The liberals of this country will have to face up to the fact that it's not good enough to point out what's wrong with the richest Nation in the world. And it's even worse to wring our hands and cry over and over again about mistakes of the past and denounce the same old villains.

I, for one, don't want to waste my time denouncing the sins of the past—even if

they are Republican sins. I want to point the way to a better life in the future.

I am a positive liberal. The liberalism of complaint and denunciation does not satisfy my sense of public duty nor my progressive spirit. I believe in the liberalism of advocacy and action.

We need criticism—good constructive criticism. This is the oil that makes our democratic machinery function. But instead of the lopsided emphasis that's being placed now on what's wrong with our society and our institutions, I want a little more positive criticism that points toward solutions.

We need the harmony of advocacy and the joy of affirmation.

The time is at hand for this country to face the harsh facts of an age where several revolutions are going on at the same time.

This country now has a full warehouse of problem conditions that can present us with either great opportunity or profound crisis. This country is bursting with population growth. It is exploding with knowledge. It is growing in wealth and stands at the pinnacle of world power. And the movement of our people and the fast pace of social change is almost beyond belief.

All of these conditions give us an awesome responsibility. But they also give us an unmatched opportunity.

Just think of the things we must do to carry out a program that will help the people, give progress to the Nation and insure peace in the world:

We must secure civil rights for all our citizens. One hundred years ago the Negro was freed from slavery. Today he must be guaranteed the freedom of full citizenship. We must correct what has become a "citizenship gap" in this country—the gap between the promise and the fulfillment of our Constitution and the Emancipation Proclamation; the gap between the promise and the fulfillment of our great free enterprise system.

We must destroy poverty. There may always be a lower third or a lower fifth on the vertical scale of some impersonal computer—but one-third or one-fifth of our people should never live below the level of decency. People are not statistics. They are human beings.

Our economy must grow in all parts of the country. It must develop in the great heartland between the Alleghenies and the Rockies as well as on the crowded shores of our seacoasts and the Great Lakes.

Automation and technology must create new jobs, not more joblessness. It must make boomtowns, not ghost towns; build new factories, not retire idle plants.

Old age should be welcomed with serenity and lived in dignity. The ills and infirmities of old age are not a fault, not a shame. But the shame and the fault will be ours if we leave the elderly in neglect—unwanted and uncared for, living from day to day, hand to mouth, in some lonely roominghouse, dreading the day when illness will rob them of both their money and their dignity.

We must make education, which has become a necessity for all, a reality for all. And we must make sure that education is not just an interlude of leisure for youth but is a challenge that prepares them for the joy and experience of living.

We must rebuild our cities, revitalize our rural areas and broaden the base of our economy.

We must provide for wholesome leisure-time activity and recreation and make it available to all.

And now more than ever we must conserve our natural resources. The press of population and industrialization places a new, even more urgent emphasis on conservation.

We must explore the unknowns of outer space with a massive effort on our own part and in a cooperative effort with other nations.

Above all, we must preserve the peace of this world. The days when peace can be used as just another propaganda word are gone. The harsh conditions of a new age demand constructive action, not mere lip service.

We liberals have faced awesome problems before. The man whose birthday we honor tonight—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—brought this Nation out from the depths of a great depression and really saved our free enterprise and democratic system. He then turned his great talents to saving the world from the power-mad lust of Adolf Hitler and the militaristic ambitions of the Japanese warlords. He envisioned a world of freedom. He envisioned a world of law and order—a society of United Nations.

Harry S. Truman carried on the great tradition of Franklin Roosevelt and led the fight to save the free world from Communist domination.

And most recently this Nation was rescued from 8 years of inbred apathy and indifference by John F. Kennedy, a vigorous young President who revived the idealistic faith of our people, got this country moving again, and gave to humanity the hope of peace.

John F. Kennedy not only gave us the inspiration to move this country forward, he also gave us the tools, the sinew, and the strength so that now the President of the United States can talk about peace. He can negotiate for peace, and not negotiate from fear. He can negotiate from strength, not from weakness. And now we can command respect from the Soviet Union to a point where they are willing, at long last, to talk more reasonably and sensibly about the problems that exist in the world.

All these contributions from the great leaders of the past now must be consolidated and advanced by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I can assure you here tonight that President Johnson is pledged to the programs and the principles of John F. Kennedy.

I want all of you to remember those great words in President Johnson's address to Congress shortly after the funeral of President Kennedy—"let us continue." For those three words sum up the central theme of the Johnson administration.

I can tell you that the Kennedy program will be carried out by the new administration because President Johnson was an inspirational member of the team that set forth that program. He was a part of it. He was a most important member. I know. I sat there with those men. I worked with them. And I know we will continue the Kennedy-Johnson program.

I realize that many of my liberal friends—especially in the North—have in the past expressed their doubts about President Johnson's commitment to the cause of civil rights.

I want to set those doubts to rest right now. President Johnson is in this fight to the finish. His commitment to civil rights comes from a long family background of deep respect for the dignity of the individual. It also stems from his close association with Franklin D. Roosevelt and his early familiarity with the ugly pattern of discrimination against Mexican-Americans he observed when he was a young school-teacher in south Texas.

We have today in the White House, as if it was almost an act of—well, indeed, it was an act of fate—a man from the South who will lead this Nation into a united program of equal rights for all. What a great opportunity this is for America.

Civil rights is the great unfinished business of our time. But it is not the only critical problem we face. Equally important—indeed, it is intimately connected with the issue of civil rights—is poverty.

Twenty million Americans live in such abject poverty that they must do without the barest essentials. Another 26 million live at the ragged edge of just minimum standards. These two figures add up to one out of every four Americans.

This is a disgrace in the richest nation on the face of the earth. And I want to say now that I totally reject the logic and the moral implications of any candidate for public office who says the poor deserve their condition because they either want to be poor or are too lazy to do anything about it.

What sort of logic is this? How callous and indifferent can you get? The men, women and children living in poverty today are those who have been left in the backwash of our economic life—shunted aside, forgotten. They're the first fired and the last hired. When the economy dips their plight gets worse, and even when the economy rises they can hope for very little.

This is a condition that will grow in America unless we take positive steps now. And I warn that unless we do take steps to get at the roots of poverty in this country, we will be in for serious trouble in the years ahead. John L. Lewis was speaking the truth when he said that history warns us that "all forms of government fall when it comes up to the question of bread—bread for the family, something to eat. Bread to a man with a hungry family comes first—before his union, before his citizenship, before his church affiliation. Bread."

But we don't have to wring our hands and fear future disorders. We can win this war on poverty. A start has already been made in the President's messages to the Congress, for they have startled the comfortable in our society to an awareness that there is too much poverty in our age of plenty.

To take advantage of this start we must embark on new and expanded educational, housing and public works programs. We must have a medicare program, a Youth Conservation Corps to take our jobless boys off the streets, and a domestic Peace Corps to work in our hospitals, our mental institutions and with the children in our slums and on our Indian reservations.

Let me say a special word here about medicare, which is a soundly financed program of medical care for the aged under social security.

We are a growing nation at both ends of our age scale—more babies at the bottom and people living longer at the top. In both cases this is due to the finest medical service in the world. But this is a service that costs money and we must find a way to spread the load to help those who are no longer working.

The dignity of old age must be respected. Illness is not a crime that must be paid for by financial poverty or the shame that comes to many when they are forced to accept charity. The young have a duty to help the elderly for the young that do not respect age must soon come to hate their own destiny.

I spoke earlier about how this country is expanding with population growth and exploding with knowledge. When I was elected to the Senate in 1948 the population of the United States was 150 million. Since that time this country has added more people than the total population of Great Britain. By 1975 this country will have 225 million people.

Just think of what this will mean in terms of new problems. Economists speak about the multiplier effect when they talk about business conditions—that \$10 spent tends to turn over and cause \$30 or \$40 in additional

purchasing power. Well, let me tell you the multiplier effect in social and economic problems brought by this population growth is infinitely greater than any 4-to-1 ratio.

In addition to this population growth we've had a tremendous shift in population in this country and it shows little sign of slowing down. The big city areas are getting bigger. The smaller towns are getting smaller. The rural areas are drying up. And the heartland of America is being drained by the migration to the seacoasts.

And if you think all this is bringing staggering problems, throw in another even more complex factor—the incredible pace of automatic and technological advance that is re-making our entire industrial economy. And then add to that the multiplier effect the new tax cut will have on further industrial research and development. This surely will mean more automation, more fantastic machines, more people thrown out of work.

What are we going to do with these people? How are we going to keep an economy going where much of the production is done by machine? Machines don't buy products, you know.

One answer is that the Federal Government—working closely with the best minds in the universities, in private industry and the labor unions and in State and local governments—must channel all the energy it can into coordinated research and planning to insure that this Nation has a balanced economy.

Franklin Roosevelt was bold enough to make a reality of the dream of a Tennessee Valley Authority and he brought new hope, new life, new industries and new jobs to an entire region.

Today, we must be bold enough to deal with even greater challenges. We must find the imagination to do extensive regional planning that will broaden the economic base of all sections of the country. This is the type of grand architecture we need to give scope and purpose to the miracles of automation and technology so we can turn these wonders into a "boon and not a bane to humanity," as President Johnson said.

I think one of the first steps we must take is to create a Commission on Automation, Technology, and Employment so we can get ready for the comprehensive planning that is essential. I have introduced such legislation to carry out one of the proposals in President Johnson's state of the Union message.

We also must take bold steps to meet the challenges of the future by improving education at all levels—from the day care center for preschoolchildren to the postdoctoral studies in the great universities.

The new industries of tomorrow will require technical and scientific skills that millions of Americans do not have today. We have just made a start in Congress by providing for greater efforts in vocational education. We must go further, though, and learn more about the needs of tomorrow so we won't be teaching people skills that are obsolete.

We have made a start on manpower retraining. But here, too, we have much to learn. We also must continue the effort to keep our young people in school—to emphasize to them again and again that the real new wealth in this country is the wealth of knowledge and skill.

I'm optimistic enough to believe that we can meet these challenges here at home. But I'm also realistic enough to know that it would all be meaningless if we couldn't find a way to live without war.

Since that day in August in 1945 when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Japan the whole concept of total war has changed. Since that time we and the Russians have learned that there are no winners in an atomic war—and very few survivors.

But we in this country have also learned that we cannot withdraw from the atomic arms race with Russia or anyone else unless we have sound safeguards against any cheating.

We realize that the road to peace could well be a thousand miles long, but we are prepared to follow the advice of the old proverb and take the first step. We did that under President Kennedy and now President Johnson is taking up the task anew with his recent proposals to Chairman Khrushchev and the disarmament conference in Geneva.

Since 1961 we have made great strides toward achieving a permanent peace—thanks largely to the efforts of four great people who are no longer with us:

Dag Hammarskjöld, who gave his life for the United Nations, fighting to prevent a civil war in the Congo.

Eleanor Roosevelt, whose very personality and spirit was an embodiment of the noble aspirations of all mankind.

Pope John XXIII, who had only a short time to reign as Supreme Pontiff and knew it, but who with complete serenity and confidence promulgated one of the great documents on peace of all time.

Lastly, John F. Kennedy, whose life was struck down at a time when he had set his Nation firmly down the path to peace.

Our task—indeed it is our solemn duty—is to finish the work started by these great world leaders.

Let's get on with the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. 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 (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 25, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Foreign Service officers named in the following lists for promotion in the Foreign Service to the classes indicated, effective April 12, 1964:

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.

Taylor G. Belcher, of the District of Columbia.

Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.

Leo G. Cvr, of Maine.

Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.

John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Herman H. Barger, of Connecticut.

Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken, of Florida.

Robert M. Brandin, of New York.

John Hugh Crimmins, of Maryland.

William N. Dale, of New Mexico.

Rodger P. Davies, of California.

Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.

Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.

Millan L. Egert, of Maine.

Richard Funkhouser, of California.

Fred L. Hadsel, of Virginia.

Norman B. Hannah, of Illinois.

Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts.

Daniel L. Horowitz, of New Jersey.

Frederick Irving, of Rhode Island.

Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland.

Boris H. Klosson, of Maryland.

Miss Carol C. Laise, of the District of Columbia.

L. Wade Lathram, of Virginia.

Howard P. Mace, of Ohio.

Roswell D. McClelland, of Connecticut.

Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland.

Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Virginia.

Adrian T. Middleton, of Virginia.

Joseph Mintzes, of Pennsylvania.

George S. Newman, of New York.

David D. Newson, of California.

James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.

Howard L. Parsons, of Iowa.

Richard I. Phillips, of California.

Idar Rimestad, of North Dakota.

Harry H. Schwartz, of Ohio.

Joseph John Sisco, of Maryland.

Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.

Earl D. Sohm, of California.

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.

Miss Margaret Joy Tibbets, of Maine.

Alfred G. Vigderman, of Pennsylvania.

David Wilken, of New Jersey.

Randall S. Williams, of New York.

James M. Wilson, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Robert O. Blake, of California.

Henry C. Boudreau, of Maine.

Delmar R. Carlson, of the District of Columbia.

Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Florida.

Ernest J. Colantonio, of Massachusetts.

Charles T. Cross, of Virginia.

Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey.

Leroy F. Day, of Maryland.

Frank J. Devine, of New York.

Enoch S. Duncan, of Texas.

David H. Ernst, of Maryland.

Robert C. F. Gordon, of California.

Robert A. Hancock, of Michigan.

Peter Hooper, Jr., of Virginia.

Alan G. James, of the District of Columbia.

Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.

Valdemar N. L. Johnson, of Florida.

William C. Lakeland, of New York.

Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.

George T. Lister, of Texas.

Dayton S. Mak, of the District of Columbia.

Edward E. Masters, of Ohio.

Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.

Edward W. Mulcahy, of Arizona.

Joseph W. Neubert, of Washington.

Bernard Norwood, of New Jersey.

Melville E. Osborne, of Florida.

Alexander L. Peaslee, of Ohio.

LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.

Lewis M. Purnell, of Delaware.

Earle J. Richey, of Kansas.

Jordan T. Rogers, of Maryland.

Ralph Scarritt, of Illinois.

David T. Schneider, of New Hampshire.

Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.

Sidney Sober, of Arkansas.

Wells Stabler, of Connecticut.

Herbert B. Thompson, of California.

Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.

Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.

William H. Witt, of Maryland.

Chalmers B. Wood, of Virginia.

Charles G. Wootton, of Connecticut.

Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.

Parker D. Wyman, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

James E. Akins, of Ohio.

Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois.

John C. Amott, of New Jersey.

Robert F. Andrew, of California.

Daniel N. Arzac, Jr., of California.

Robert E. Barbour, of Tennessee.

Richard W. Barham, of Texas.

Malcolm R. Barnebey, of Texas.

Raymond J. Barrett, of New York.

Paul M. Bergman, of New Jersey.

Charles K. Bevilacqua, of Pennsylvania.

Richard J. Bloomfield, of Connecticut.

Richard W. Boehm, of Maryland.

George F. Bogardus, of Arizona.

C. Arthur Borg, of New York.

William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.

William G. Bradford, of Illinois.

Jack B. Button, of Kansas.

William C. Canup, of Michigan.

Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania.

James L. Carson, of Oregon.

Edward R. Cheney, of New Hampshire.

Irving G. Cheslaw, of Maryland.

W. Kennedy Cromwell 3d, of Maryland.

John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.

John M. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.

Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.

Lee F. Dinsmore, of Maryland.

Robert B. Dreessen, of Illinois.

Walter H. Drew, of Arizona.

William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.

William B. Edmondson, of Nebraska.

Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.

Miss Barbara C. Fagan, of New York.

John M. Farrior, of North Carolina.

Guy Ferri, of Pennsylvania.

Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.

Welko A. Forsten, of Florida.

Ronald A. Gaiduk, of California.

John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.

John L. Gawf, of Colorado.

Raymond E. González, of California.

Dale E. Good, of Ohio.

Ernest S. Guaderrama, of California.

John L. Hagan, of the District of Columbia.

Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.

Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnesota.

William A. Helseth, of Florida.

Harrison M. Holland, of Washington.

Miss Margaret Huseman, of Idaho.

George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.

Paul Kelly, of Pennsylvania.

Andrew I. Killgore, of Maryland.

William S. Krason, of Virginia.

Paul H. Krelsberg, of New York.

John Krizay, of Pennsylvania.

Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.

John C. Leary, of Virginia.

James L. Lee, of California.

Robert F. Lent, of Maryland.

Donald A. Lewis, of New York.

Henry J. Lillienfeld, of Maryland.

Harry M. Lofton, of Arizona.

Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.

Edward S. McClary, of New York.

Henry Hunt McKee, of the District of Columbia.

Harry R. Melone, Jr., of New York.

Dudley W. Miller, of Colorado.

William B. Miller, of Ohio.

James D. Moffett, of Iowa.

George C. Moore, of California.

John A. Moran, III, of New Jersey.

Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.

Jacob M. Myerson, of the District of Columbia.

E. Jan Nadelman, of New York.
 Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
 Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
 Daniel O. Newberry, of North Carolina.
 Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
 Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
 William V. M. Owen, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
 Grover W. Penberthy, of Maryland.
 Raymond L. Perkins, Jr., of Colorado.
 Miss Françoise G. Queneau, of the District of Columbia.

James F. Relph, Jr., of California.
 Woodward Romine, of Indiana.
 Arthur H. Rosen, of Missouri.
 William E. Schaefe, Jr., of Ohio.
 Richard R. Selby, Jr., of Ohio.
 Ray Sena, Jr., of New Mexico.
 Robert G. Shackleton, of Ohio.
 William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
 Harry W. Shlaudeman, of California.
 Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
 Andrew Stalder, of the District of Columbia.

G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
 Charles J. Stanley, of Ohio.
 Francis R. Starrs, Jr., of California.
 Robert A. Stein, of New Jersey.
 Kenedon P. Steins, of Pennsylvania.
 Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
 Toshio G. Tsukahira, of California.
 Nicholas A. Vellotes, of California.
 Harold C. Voorhees, of Connecticut.
 Theodore A. Wahl, of California.
 Royal J. Wald, of California.
 Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
 Peter C. Walker, of Maryland.
 Robert Gill Walker, of Pennsylvania.
 Karl F. Weygand, of Massachusetts.
 Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

J. Bruce Amstutz, of Massachusetts.
 G. Michael Bache, of New Jersey.
 Charles White Bass, of Tennessee.
 John T. Bennett, of California.
 David A. Betts, of New York.
 Eugene H. Bird, of Oregon.
 Hyman Bloom, of New Jersey.
 Merritt C. Bragdon, Jr., of Nevada.
 Miss Dorothy V. Broussard, of Texas.
 Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert A. Brown, of California.
 William A. Brown, of New Hampshire.
 Paul F. Canney, of Massachusetts.
 Eugene E. Champagne, Jr., of Florida.
 Miss Hulda Christiansen, of California.
 Miss Joan M. Clark, of New York.
 Miss Kathryn O. Clark, of the District of Columbia.

Ray H. Crane, of Utah.
 Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
 Miss Dorothy J. Dugan, of New Jersey.
 Fred A. Durling, of New York.
 Paul S. Dwyer, of Ohio.
 George Falk, of the District of Columbia.
 Arthur W. Feldman, of Washington.
 John R. Ferchak, of Virginia.
 Robert E. Ferris, of California.
 Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.
 Richard Forschner, of Illinois.
 Richard D. Forster, of Colorado.
 Louis A. Gallo, of New York.
 Robert K. German, of Texas.
 Seymour S. Goodman, of Virginia.
 Miss Shirley M. Green, of Missouri.
 Clifford H. Gross, of Florida.
 Robert P. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.

C. Norman Hanley, of Washington.
 Alfred Harding IV, of New York.
 Miss Elizabeth J. Harper, of Missouri.
 Tobias Hartwick, of Montana.
 Erland H. Heginbotham, of California.
 Brewster R. Hemenway, of New York.
 George Borman High, of Illinois.

Roger P. Hipskind, of Illinois.
 George R. Irminger, of Missouri.
 George W. Jaeger, of Missouri.
 Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
 William R. Jochimsen, of California.
 Chadwick Johnson, of Massachusetts.
 James T. Johnson, of Montana.
 Miss Viola Johnson, of Indiana.
 Miss Betty-Jane Jones, of Wisconsin.
 Thomas A. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
 P. Wesley Kriebel, of Maryland.
 Dennis H. Kux, of New York.
 George B. Lambrakis, of New York.
 Malcolm Lawrence, of the District of Columbia.

Burton Levin, of New York.
 Robert A. Lewis, of Connecticut.
 Jack Liebof, of New York.
 Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
 James Gordon Lowenstein, of Connecticut.
 M. ss Ingeborg M. Lueders, of New York.
 Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
 John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
 Francis J. McNeil III, of Florida.
 Allen P. McNeill, Jr., of California.
 Calvin E. Mehler, of California.
 Alan G. Mencher, of New York.
 Thomas N. Metcalf, Jr., of Massachusetts.
 Miss Colette Meyer, of California.
 S. Paul Miller, Jr., of California.
 James B. Moran, of Washington.
 Miss Martha J. Moses, of Texas.
 Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
 John Patrick Mulligan, of California.
 Frederick E. Myers, of Ohio.
 Leonardo Neher, of Illinois.
 Anthony F. O'Boyle, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert C. Ode, of Michigan.
 Kiyonao Okami, of Maryland.
 Miss Nancy Ostrander, of Indiana.
 John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.

Howard H. Palmatier, of Florida.
 John G. Panos, of Illinois.
 Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
 George W. Phillips, of Florida.
 J. Stanley Phillips, of Tennessee.
 William B. Pounds, Jr., of Ohio.
 John M. Powell, of Illinois.
 Arthur W. Purcell, of Massachusetts.
 Virgil P. Randolph III, of Virginia.
 Charley L. Rice, of Texas.
 Miss Lillian A. Ross, of North Carolina.
 Edward M. Rowell, of California.
 Leo J. Ryan, of Florida.
 Paul Sadler, of Tennessee.
 Munee Sakaue, of California.
 John D. Scanlan, of Hawaii.
 Edward W. Schaefer, of Connecticut.
 Stanley H. Schaub, of Maryland.
 Alfred Schelp, of Missouri.
 Charles B. Selak, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
 James F. Shea, of Maryland.
 Spiros A. Siafacas, of Florida.
 William N. Simonson, of Virginia.
 Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
 Miss Violet Smith, of New Jersey.
 Denman F. Stanfield, of Texas.
 Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.
 Birney A. Stokes, of New Jersey.
 George H. Strunz, of Arizona.
 Raymond J. Swanson, of California.
 Robert C. Texido, of Rhode Island.
 Ross P. Titus, of Illinois.
 Miss Elizabeth B. Tolman, of New Hampshire.

Lewis R. Townsend, of New Jersey.
 Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
 James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
 Jacob Walkin, of New York.
 Robert T. Wallace, of Florida.
 Frank J. Walters, of the District of Columbia.
 Miss Dorothy H. Webb, of California.
 Robert E. White, of Massachusetts.
 Samuel G. Wise, Jr., of Virginia.
 Victor Wolf, Jr., of New York.
 Albert L. Zucca, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Gordon R. Beyer, of Maryland.
 John R. Clingerman, of Michigan.
 Richard H. Howarth, of Pennsylvania.
 The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Madison M. Adams, Jr., of Florida.
 Julio Javier Arias, of the District of Columbia.
 Rodney E. Armstrong, of California.
 David P. Banowetz, of Louisiana.
 Norman E. Barth, of Illinois.
 Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of New York.
 Calvin C. Berlin, of Ohio.
 Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
 Richard C. Bialock, of Oklahoma.
 Archie M. Bolster, of Virginia.
 Thomas D. Boyatt, of Ohio.
 Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Illinois.
 Charles W. Bray III, of Texas.
 Jere Broh-Kahn, of Ohio.
 Carroll Brown, of Florida.
 Frederick Z. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
 John A. Bushnell, of Connecticut.
 Harry A. Cahill, of Virginia.
 David W. Carr, of Massachusetts.
 William Clark, Jr., of California.
 Raymond C. Collins, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Ernst Conrath, of Wisconsin.
 Goodwin Cooke, of New York.
 John E. Crump, of Kansas.
 Frazier Draper, of Florida.
 Richard A. Dwyer, of Indiana.
 William J. Dyess, of Alabama.
 Joseph O. Eblan, of New Hampshire.
 Richard W. Paville, Jr., of California.
 Charles E. Finan, of Ohio.
 Robert H. Frowick, of Connecticut.
 Howard V. Funk, Jr., of New York.
 Herbert Donald Gelber, of New York.
 James L. Gorman, of Washington.
 John M. Gregory, Jr., of Virginia.
 John C. Griffith, of Connecticut.
 Terrence T. Grindall, of California.
 John T. Haldane, of the District of Columbia.

Kenneth O. Harris, of West Virginia.
 Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
 Samuel F. Hart, of Mississippi.
 Henry A. Holmes, of Kansas.
 Harold E. Horan, of Texas.
 Hume A. Horan, of New Jersey.
 Edward Hurwitz, of New York.
 Alton L. Jenkins, of West Virginia.
 Peter E. Juge, of Louisiana.
 Richard W. Kautsky, of Arkansas.
 Frederick T. Kelley, of Massachusetts.
 Miss Bernice M. Kelly, of Texas.
 Edson W. Kempe, of California.
 James E. Kiley, of California.
 Gilbert H. Kinney, of the District of Columbia.

Donald A. Kruse, of Pennsylvania.
 Larry E. Lane, of Texas.
 Miss Morelle Lasky, of California.
 James N. Leaken, of California.
 Melvin H. Levine, of Massachusetts.
 Wingate Lloyd, of Pennsylvania.
 Hugh Cooke MacDougall, of New York.
 Gifford D. Malone, of West Virginia.
 William H. Mansfield III, of Connecticut.
 Wade H. B. Matthews, of Florida.
 James A. Mattson, of Minnesota.
 Miss Mary E. McDonnell, of Massachusetts.
 W. Douglas McLain, Jr., of Illinois.
 John C. Monjo, of Connecticut.
 Richard B. Moon, of Connecticut.
 John T. Morgan, of Illinois.
 Robert J. Morris, of Iowa.
 Gottfried W. Moser, of Connecticut.
 Roy C. Nelson, of Arizona.
 Richard F. Nyrop, of Minnesota.
 Daniel A. O'Donohue, of Michigan.
 Oscar J. Olson, Jr., of Texas.
 Ronald D. Palmer, of Michigan.
 Michael B. Peceri, of Florida.

Thomas R. Pickering, of New Jersey.
 Mrs. Ann Pomroy, of Illinois.
 Miss Jane M. Potter, of Maryland.
 Charles T. Prindle, Jr., of Illinois.
 Datus C. Proper, of Pennsylvania.
 Donald E. Rau, of Florida.
 John D. Rendahl, of Minnesota.
 Kenneth N. Rogers, of Florida.
 David Rowe, of Maryland.
 Frank M. Schroeder, of Michigan.
 Leslie Andrew Scott, of New York.
 William T. Shinn, Jr., of Minnesota.
 William L. Simmons, of Mississippi.
 Kenneth N. Skoug, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Clint E. Smith, of New Mexico.
 Joseph L. Smith, of Indiana.
 Wayne S. Smith, of California.
 Roger A. Sorenson, of Utah.
 Frederic N. Spotts, of Massachusetts.
 Herbert D. Swett, of California.
 Eugene S. Szopa, of Maine.
 John J. Taylor, of Tennessee.
 Nathaniel B. Thayer, of Massachusetts.
 Donald C. Tice, of Kansas.
 Ronald A. Webb, of California.
 Kenneth D. Whitehead, of Utah.
 Albert W. Whiting, of Kansas.
 Marshall W. Wiley, of Illinois.
 Albert N. Williams, of Michigan.
 Larry C. Williamson, of California.
 James P. Willis, Jr., of California.
 Herbert Gilman Wing, of Pennsylvania.
 Sidney L. Woollons, of California.
 Brooks Wrampelmeyer, of Ohio.
 The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:
 David Anderson, of New York.
 Charles E. Angevine, of Colorado.
 Roy J. Apel, of California.
 Alfonso Arenales, of New York.
 James E. Baker, of Maryland.
 Miss Margaret J. Barnhart, of Pennsylvania.
 Carl A. Bastiani, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Margaret E. Beshore, of Indiana.
 Harry R. Bieling, Jr., of New York.
 James K. Bishop, Jr., of New York.
 C. Thomas Bleha, of Michigan.
 William D. Boggs, of West Virginia.
 Miss Alix S. Bouldin, of California.
 M. Lyall Breckon, of Oregon.
 John Allen Buche, of Indiana.
 Pierce K. Bullen, of Florida.
 Thomas J. Carolan, Jr., of Maryland.
 George F. Carr, Jr., of Texas.
 Allen E. Caswell, of New York.
 Glenn Richard Cella, of New York.
 Timothy W. Childs, of Connecticut.
 Geryld B. Christianson, of Minnesota.
 William P. Clappin, of Virginia.
 Hovey C. Clark, of New Jersey.
 Harry L. Coburn, of New York.
 Temple G. Cole, of Kentucky.
 Thomas C. Colwell, of California.
 James Ford Cooper, of Michigan.
 Edwin G. Corr, of Oklahoma.
 Trusten Frank Crigler, of Arizona.
 Howard B. Crotinger, of Iowa.
 John S. Davison, of Michigan.
 R. Robin DeLaBarre, of the District of Columbia.
 John W. DeWitt, of Pennsylvania.
 Guy F. DiNocenza, of Connecticut.
 Robert B. Duncan, of New Jersey.
 Thomas P. H. Dunlop, of North Carolina.
 Emil P. Ericksen, of California.
 Otho Evans Eskin, of the District of Columbia.
 Robert E. Ezelle, of California.
 James R. Falzone, of Massachusetts.
 Harvey Fergusson, of New Jersey.
 James Ferrer, Jr., of California.
 Richard H. Flanagan, of Massachusetts.
 Miss Dagmar Frahm, of Ohio.
 Alec L. France, of Ohio.
 Albert A. Francis, of the District of Columbia.
 Anthony G. Freeman, of New Jersey.

Norman H. Frisbie, of Massachusetts.
 Robert E. Fritts, of Illinois.
 Peter F. Frost, of Connecticut.
 Gregory Gay, of Ohio.
 Gerald D. Gilbertson, of Florida.
 Alan A. Glise, of Indiana.
 Paul John Glasoe, of Ohio.
 George G. B. Griffin, of South Carolina.
 Kurt F. Gross, of Virginia.
 James T. Hackett, of California.
 Frank J. Haendler, of Illinois.
 Frederick A. Hahn, of New York.
 William H. Hallman, of Texas.
 Paul J. Hare, of the District of Columbia.
 M. ss Thurza Maureen Harris, of Kansas.
 Donald F. Hart, of Massachusetts.
 George W. Heatley, of California.
 Martin G. Heflin, of Florida.
 John P. Helmann, of Illinois.
 Charles Higginson, of Massachusetts.
 Sean M. Holly, of New York.
 John W. Holmes, of Massachusetts.
 David C. Holton, of Virginia.
 Marvin W. Humphreys, of the District of Columbia.
 Herbert H. E. Hymans, of California.
 Don C. Jensen, of California.
 George Lockwood Kelly, of the District of Columbia.
 Richard N. Kilpatrick, of South Carolina.
 Anthony S. Kochanek, Jr., of New Jersey.
 David C. Lacey, Jr., of Ohio.
 John J. LaMazza, of New York.
 William E. Landfair, of Ohio.
 Donald R. Lesh, of Arizona.
 Jon S. Lodeesen, of Tennessee.
 Matthew T. Lorimer, of New Hampshire.
 George E. Lowe, of Illinois.
 George Q. Lumsden, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Edward A. Mainland, of California.
 Louis M. Marrano, of California.
 Richard R. Martin, of the District of Columbia.
 Robert W. Mashek, of Iowa.
 Robert S. McClellan, of New York.
 William J. McDonough, of Illinois.
 Howard M. McElroy, of New York.
 Richard H. Melton, of Maryland.
 Lionel B. Miller, of Massachusetts.
 James M. Montgomery, of New Jersey.
 John H. Moore, of the District of Columbia.
 Gerald H. Murphy, of New York.
 Edward V. Nef, of the District of Columbia.
 John D. Negroponte, of New York.
 William V. P. Newlin, of Pennsylvania.
 Thomas J. O'Donnell, of Michigan.
 Robert O'Neill, of New Jersey.
 Gerald G. Oplinger, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert P. Paganelli, of New York.
 Ross C. Parr, of Florida.
 Noel L. Pazdral, of California.
 Miss Emily Perreault, of Illinois.
 Donald K. Petterson, of California.
 Miss Anne Pinkney, of California.
 J. Keith Powell, of Texas.
 Henry Precht, of Georgia.
 Frederick S. Quin, of New York.
 Alexander L. Rattray, of California.
 Leo J. Reddy, of Maryland.
 Robert G. Richmond, of New Hampshire.
 Robert Holmes Ross, of Minnesota.
 George L. Rueckert, of Wisconsin.
 Thomas J. Scanlon, of California.
 Charles W. Schaller, of Wisconsin.
 Carl W. Schmidt, of New Jersey.
 Richard C. Scissors, of Missouri.
 William C. Sergeant, of Florida.
 Robert E. Service, of the District of Columbia.
 Pierre Schostal, of New York.
 Henry Sears Sizer, of New York.
 John W. Stahlman, of Ohio.
 Robert R. Strand, of Ohio.
 Peter A. Sutherland, of Massachusetts.
 Gerald M. Sutton, of California.
 T. Elkin Taylor, of Georgia.
 Richard W. Teare, of Ohio.

Charles H. Thomas, II, of New Hampshire.
 Richard S. Thompson, of Washington.
 Thomas M. Tracy, of Massachusetts.
 Elwin T. Vangas, of New Hampshire.
 James A. Verrees, of Missouri.
 Stephen Lee Walles, of Florida.
 Charles W. Walker, of California.
 John A. Warnock, of California.
 Jerome V. Wattel, of New York.
 E. Allan Wendt, of Illinois.
 Walter G. West, of Colorado.
 Keith W. Wheelock, of Maryland.
 Robert T. Willner, of Connecticut.
 H. L. Dufour Woolfley, of Louisiana.
 Warren Zimmermann, of the District of Columbia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Charles K. Townsend Ray E. Moses
 Ronald L. Newsom

To be lieutenants

Sigmund R. Petersen	Leonard E. Pickens
J. Rodney Lewis	Frederick H. Gramling
C. William Hayes	Richard B. Fallgren
Seymour R. Kotler	Maurice L. Geiger
Darrell W. Crawford	Gerald R. Cichy
Arthur L. Moshos	Michael H. Fleming
Paul A. Chernoff	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

J. Rodney Lewis	Leonard E. Pickens
C. William Hayes	Frederick H. Gramling
Seymour R. Kotler	Richard B. Fallgren
Darrell W. Crawford	Maurice L. Geiger
Arthur L. Moshos	Gerald R. Cichy
Paul A. Chernoff	Michael H. Fleming

To be ensigns

Woodrow E. Bliss, Jr.	Phillip C. Johnson
David L. Hough	Rodger K. Woodruff

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Lavon L. Posey
 Philip J. Taetz
 James K. Richards
 Robert W. Franklin
 Sidney C. Miller
 Ronald M. Buffington
 Wesley V. Hull
 Wayne L. Mobley
 Charles A. Burroughs
 Richard E. Alderman
 Ray M. Sundean
 George M. Poor

To be ensigns

Joseph M. Lushene
 Carl N. Davis
 Edward E. Jones
 Frederick J. Kuehn, Jr.
 Robert H. Leininger
 John E. Dropp
 Conrad E. Huss
 William Y. S. Williams
 Fred T. Knowles
 Lindley E. Barnett
 William J. Cooke
 Neal A. Horst
 Joseph W. Dropp
 Walter F. Forster II
 Delwyn C. Webster
 Joseph T. Smith
 James O. Murphy
 Peter M. Schidrich
 Robert C. Westphall
 Billy G. Morrison
 David P. Van Weele
 Ronald K. Brewer
 Gerald R. Schimke
 John D. Boon III