vided at the plaza entrance. It is not unreasonable to predict that the generation of demand for bus transportation by the Center will result in fully adequate bus routes to it. D.C. Transit has always been most willing to service profitable areas, by regular routes, special bus service, and by minibus, as required.

The location of a subway stop in the vicinity of the Center has not been as precisely determined as have the location of stops in the downtown area. While subway service to the Center will not be available for 2 or 3 years after the completion of the Center under present plans, there is no reason to believe that planning of the subway will ignore an important facility such as the Center. Rather, it is to be expected that subway design will take due consideration of its relation to the Center, regardless of the location of the Center.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

Pedestrian access to the Center will be superior to pedestrian access to the unimproved Center site as regards safety, and almost all existing pedestrian routes will be preserved. Pedestrian safety will be increased and routes which presently do not exist will be opened up by the construction of pedestrian overpasses.

Apart from pedestrians coming directly from the Watergate Town and directly to the Plaza along New Hampshire Avenue, it is not really known whether pedestrian attendance at performances will be truly significant in numbers. Nevertheless, ample pedestrian walks are provided from other routes in anticipation of daytime tourist visits. Pedestrian access from all quarters is both more direct and vastly more safe than pedestrian access to the Jefferson Memorial or the Lincoln Memorial.

My conclusion is that the Potomac site is more accessible to most of the District of Columbia and to suburban Maryland and Virginia than would be the location which has been proposed on Pennsylvania Avenue. The task force also did a complete analysis of unloading from all types of vehicles: private cars, taxis, and buses, and concluded that unloading capacity is more than adequate to serve the peak demand.

LOCATION AND PRICES

Mr. Speaker, there has also been a considerable amount of nonsense in the press about the prospective price of performances at the Kennedy Center. Let me say first of all that there is no relation whatsoever between the site of the Center and the price of performances. Senator CLARK has demonstrated that the cost of the proposed Pennsylvania Avenue site would be considerably greater than building on the river site. This would lead to the conclusion that prices would have to be higher on Pennsylvania Avenue than on the river, as a simple matter of economics.

I know as a trustee that there has been consideration of the use of Center facilities by the Smithsonian Institution of educational and public service programs. Such programs would undoubtedly be free. The program committee, chaired by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, has fully in mind the obligation to make programs available at moderate prices or free.

For example, the Kennedy Center and the Lincoln Center recently sponsored an International University Choral Festival at the National Cathedral, and at least half the audience only paid $2. The National Opera Company, a joint venture of the Kennedy Center and the Metropolitan Opera, will play in large cities and small towns and on college campuses during the coming year, at moderate prices which will result in a deficit in many places. This deficit will be absorbed to make this public service available.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very fortunate that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center, Mr. Roger Stevens, is one of the most experienced and knowledgeable men in the country on all phases of the performing arts. He has made it clear on many occasions that the facilities at the Center will be the finest in this country for both the artist and the audience and the presentations will not be made at Broadway prices.

We have in mind an endowment program to help students, children, veterans, and the handicapped.

People who are ignorant of the plans of the Kennedy Center to live up to its obligation, required by law, to foster and encourage the performing arts, are in no position to criticize these plans. Still less is it possible to relate the location to a program which is still in the process of formulation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no substance in the arguments advanced against the river site. When they are dissipated like the morning fog they resemble, we are left with the hard, practical, crystal-clear facts that the river site is the best site available, that it is the site which has been chosen, and that it is the site upon which the Center is being built now.

This was the conclusion of WTOP radio and television in an editorial broadcast on September 26 and 27.

NEW CULTURAL CENTER

There's something about Washington for almost everyone to dislike, and still it's an inspiring and wonderful city. The Treasury Building sits where it does in interruption of the White House-to-Capital vista because an irritated, temper-ridden President Andrew Jackson tired of argument and said put it there.

The Pentagon has been reviled as an architectural monstrosity, and lately the third House Office Building has been lumped into the same category. But they serve their purposes somehow and for every target, of course, there is a defender. We would like to step into that role with respect to the new cultural center.

This outstanding prospective memorial to the late President Kennedy's intense interest in the arts is to be built beside the Potomac near the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. Critics of the plan with considerable reason have called attention to shortcomings in the site—away from the center of town, cramped for potential parking space, unsuitable as a terminal point for auto travel, and too far from anywhere to walk. The critics, their ranks newly enlarged by an informal group of close to four-score distinguished Washingtonians, would like the project delayed, restudied, and presumably moved in whole or in pieces to the central city to enhance the Pennsylvania area and downtown redevelopment plans. Something might be gained from this, but something far more, we believe, would be lost. What would be lost in our judgment, would be the cultural center itself.

It's hard to believe that trying to push the project through Congress now in some other form could meet with any immediate success. Such an effort might result in scrapping the whole thing. Faults now forseen can be resolved at least in part. We have the money, we have the site, we have the go-ahead. The thing to do now is build it and enjoy it—as one more new contribution to an inspiring and wonderful city.

This was a WTOP editorial, Frank Wilson speaking for WTOP.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

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

Eternal God, before whose all-seeing eyes the ages pass, apart from Thy will all the little schemes of our own devising are as futile as a painted ship upon a painted ocean.

In the midst of things as they are, so tangled and tragic, we thank Thee for stirrings of discontent within us, lighted candles of hope for brotherhood, justice, and a righteous peace that no darkness, however dense, can put out.

In this dismaying era in which our lot is cast, we are grateful for the values that cannot be shaken and for guiding beacons that no winds of violence can ever extinguish.

With this flaming faith in the permanence of goodness restore our souls, steady our faltering steps, and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the history of our American labor movement and of the laws which govern labor-management relations in this country is the history, by and large, of a battle for equality. That is the issue before us now, as well.

As the issue stands, Mr. President, our policy as a nation on the question of union shop agreements is clear. But it is not uniform because the Taft-Hartley Act contains an exception to the rule which recognizes and sanctions the union shop when freely arrived at through the process of collective bargaining. That exception is section 14(b), which permits individual States to option out from under the national law.

It makes no sense, Mr. President, for us to continue to permit States to exempt themselves from a national policy designed to encourage free collective bargaining between equals. And there is no question but that the so-called right-to-work laws are meant to undermine unions' equality at the bargaining table, to deny them the bargaining position of strength, and, in fact, to bust them. Yes, this so-called right to work which is law today in 19 States is a union-busting law. It is designed to keep wages low, to keep labor cheap. The name right-to-work is itself a fiction. These laws made possible by section 14(b) guarantee to no one the right to work. If they guarantee anybody anything it is the right to be a freeloader, the right to accept the benefits of union-won contracts without accepting the responsibility that goes with those benefits. Workingmen have a name for them; they are called right-to-scab laws.

If we are to speak of the right to work, then let us speak of the real right to work, which, admittedly is and always should be a foremost goal of this Government. And that is not the phony right to work before us today. No, the right to work, if we honestly apply that name, is the right of every person to hold a decent job, the right of every man to earn a decent living for himself and for his family. As our President has said:

> The promise of America is opportunity for our people.

And without a livelihood, there can be no opportunity. That is the essence of the real right to work.

There is another facet to this issue on which I would like to touch, Mr. President, and that is the divisiveness of these so-called right-to-work laws. I speak from experience, for Wyoming is among the States which have had such a law imposed upon them by a coalition of pressure groups which represented the same collection of antilabor interests which have for so long, and so loudly, declaimed against repeal of section 14(b) by trying to clothe that provision in the sacrosanct garb of individual liberty. The workingman himself, they claim, does not want repeal. But during the long series of secret NLRB elections on union shops between 1947 and 1951, more than 90 percent of the workers casting ballots voted for union shops. Labor won 97 percent of those elections, which numbered in excess of 46,000. So the workingman, with rare exceptions, wants a union shop. He wants this scab we call 14(b) removed from his back. That is clear.

Who is it, we can ask, who then favors these so-called right-to-work laws and wants section 14(b) retained? Understandably, there are big businessmen and groups which have bought the idea that these antiunion laws will somehow cut their labor costs, so they have jumped on the bandwagon. But there are some strange allies associated with the amalgam called the National Right-To-Work Committee, Mr. President, namely farm organizations which would better serve their own members if they would pay more attention to the job of getting a fairer share of the dollars spent for food for American farmers, and less attention to the affairs of organized labor. We have not heard organized labor telling the farmer how to farm. It is not labor's place. But we have heard much from some so-called farm leaders telling labor how it should—or, more exactly, how it should not—organize.

Then there is the other element in this campaign: the far right.

Some of the most reactionary forces in the country are the most avid supporters of these antiunion laws, and not as a guarantee of liberty, but as a union-busting device. Their purpose is not to confer any right on anyone, but to make the worker's right to bargain collectively ineffective.

And who, Mr. President, has more interest in this issue than the workers of America? The unions we are discussing are his unions and no one else's.

Management, of course, does have a legitimate interest, as one of the two principals in any labor contract. But this issue in no way affects its right to hire whom it pleases so long as other legal requirements are not violated. Whether a union shop exists or not, the contract arrived at in the bargaining which goes on between representatives of the management and the workers of any shop applies to all covered employees, whether they belong to the union or do not. Under the law, the union is required to represent all.

And our unions consider this an honor, not a burden. But to do so effectively, the union must, out of necessity, truly represent all the workers. When it does, then and only then can the representatives of the two sides go to the negotiating table as equals. The labor negotiator knows his opponent, as it were, speaks for the company. Things are equal when the company negotiator knows, too, that his opposite number speaks for all the workers involved.

In 19 States now, however, the company representative need not—indeed cannot—legally acknowledge that the union represents all the workers involved in contract talks. He cannot do so even if he wants to. And what is the result?

In Wyoming, Mr. President, where I have firsthand knowledge, the result is, as I have said, divisiveness. The question has gone to our State supreme court, where the law was, in part, nullified, and where the majority opinion upholding it in the main was not without dissent. But the litigation is nothing compared to the discord produced between neighbors, between friends, as men and women take up sides.

The great irony, Mr. President, is that, of perhaps all the States, Wyoming was one which, until this law was enacted in 1963, had achieved a history almost totally without the scars of labor strife. We simply had none—at least, not in a serious sense. Imposition of this very restrictive right-to-work law on our laboring people, then, was unwarranted and constituted nothing but a slap in the face. Why then, Wyoming? I think the answer is clear, Mr. President, that our State was chosen because such a law was possible there at that time, now more than 2 years ago, even if it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, warranted. The goal of those pushing for these so-called right-to-work laws, and hence for retention of 14(b), is to bust unions nationally. They cannot do it all at one time, in one fell swoop. So they have set about working at it step by step, State by State.

This is, perhaps more than anything else, an emotional issue. Look at the turmoil it has caused in State after State. Its appeal is one of low wages, hence cheap labor. The result is resentment on the part of those people who work for their living in our great industries. Another result is a phony, cheap type of competition among States for new industry, based on the alleged appeal of weak unions and cheap labor.

Mr. President, my State is a so-called right-to-work State, but I shall cast my vote for repeal of 14(b) and for doing what our legislature failed to do by but one vote. The so-called right to work has been a phony issue from the start. The people want shed of it.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

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

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 23, 1965, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

ROGER WILLIAMS NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I ask

unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7919, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7919) to provide for the establishment of a Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on September 22, 1965, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported favorably and on September 23 the Senate passed S. 1855, a bill almost identical to the House bill now before us. Shortly after the Senate passed S. 1855, the other body passed the House bill which was referred to our committee. Normally, the Senate bill would go to the President, but in this case in order to save time at the approaching end of the Senate session, the sponsors of the Senate bill, Senators PELL and PASTORE, have agreed to accept the House bill in order to assure enactment this session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce there will be no further business transacted today. However, there will be talks, at least one by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed on the subject of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, without it being counted as a speech upon the pending business. I understand that that is agreeable with the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I noted, as I am sure other Senators noted, in the Washington Post this morning, an article entitled "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp Bogs in Senate," written by Julius Duscha.

Mr. Duscha usually reports objectively and fairly, but since I note that there are some details in his published report which cry out for correction, both as to their objectivity and their fairness, and since I note that the writer of the headline, who I am sure was not Mr. Duscha, likewise departed from the standard of fairness which should have been exercised, I wish to make some remarks about the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Duscha article, containing many fair statements but some which are completely unfair, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 9, 1965]

BUILDING OF FAIR IN FLORIDA SWAMP BOGS IN SENATE

(By Julius Duscha)

A 15-year lobbying effort to drain Federal funds into a Florida mangrove swamp to help turn it into a trade center—completely equipped with a Disneyland—bogged down in the Senate yesterday.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee dug into the project for nearly 2 hours and then instructed its staff to find some formula regarding the increasing demands for Federal aid to trade and other fairs.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee, indicated that the Florida project would be rejected if it came to a vote in its present form.

The Florida project is known as Interama, or the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. It would include a Tower of Freedom and would be located on reclaimed land on Biscayne Bay north of Miami Beach's luxurious Diplomat Hotel.

TWENTY-TWO-MILLION-DOLLAR LOAN

The project was conceived in 1941 and Florida businessmen and members of the State's congressional delegation have been seeking Federal funds for it since 1950.

Last February the Community Facilities Administration approved a $22 billion loan to Interama for the construction of a building to house exhibits by the United States and the governments of several Latin American countries.

The agency's money is supposed to be used largely to help depressed cities and towns to build water and sewer systems.

An exception was made in the case of Interama after the promoters of the project hired a Washington lawyer, Raymond M. Jacobson, who served as an advance man for Vice President HUMPHREY in 1964 campaign.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT SIGNATURES

Jacobson helped to get the signatures of 50 Senators and 228 Representatives on a petition endorsing Interama's application for a community facilities loan.

Also helping to lobby for Interama was Richard K. Donahue, a former aid to President Kennedy.

But the loan was made contingent on the approval by Congress of funds for the construction and maintenance of the U.S. exhibit in the building.

Two weeks ago the House approved a bill providing $15 million for the U.S. exhibit.

The approval came on the House's annual pork-barrel day when it blithely voted to authorize $1.7 billion in new public works projects and earmarked another $250,000 to study the feasibility of Federal participation in a HemisFair planned for 1968 to mark the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio, Tex., by the King of Spain.

ALASKA ALSO MAKING BID

Nor is HemisFair the last grab for a brass ring on the fair merry-go-round. Alaska's two Democratic Senators, E. L. BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING, want Federal funds to help their constituents celebrate the centennial in 1967 of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, an implacable foe of both Interama and HemisFair, has noted that the merry-go-round began with the 1962 Seattle Fair, to which the Federal Government contributed $8.5 million for a building, and continued with the New York World's Fair, which closes this month and has had a $17.5 million Federal building.

LAUSCHE told the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that it was time for the Federal Government to get off this merry-go-round.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, the title of the article, "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp Bogs in Senate," is not fair. As a matter of fact, the mangrove swamp in which the fair will be built will be completely reclaimed by the use of funds with which the Federal Government has no concern whatever and before the development of this important agency can be attained. So the portion of the headline which reads "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp" is misleading, and any references in the article itself to that effect are likewise misleading.

I think it is appropriate to state rather briefly the history of the planning for this important activity. In 1950, there was introduced in both Houses of Congress, and passed, a resolution giving the approval of Congress to the particular objective involved. The resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by my then distinguished colleague in the House [Mr. SMATHERS] and in the Senate by my then distinguished colleague in the Senate, Mr. PEPPER, and myself, and passed both bodies by unanimous votes.

Later, in 1951, Florida set up the Inter-American Center Authority to administer the project, which has operated at considerable expense since that time with all costs borne by the State of Florida and local agencies, without any Federal money.

Included among the members of the commission have been some of the most distinguished citizens of Florida, including our present Governor, Mr. Haydon Burns, who at the time he served actively on the commission was the mayor of the city of Jacksonville, some 350 miles from Miami, the location of the cultural and trade center. Many other distinguished Floridians have served on the commission. I mention only one of them, the brother of my distinguished colleague in the Senate, Mr. Frank Smathers, of Miami, one of that city's most distinguished citizens. Other members of the commission have been of similar character, reputation, and stature in our State.

Mr. President, the location of the proposed Cultural and Trade Center is not in the exact place stated by Mr. Duscha, though I think the mistake was inadvertent. He says that it was north of the Diplomat Hotel, when as a matter of fact it is south of the Diplomat Hotel, and nearer to Miami and the centers of both Miami Beach and Miami than the place he indicates.

It is located on what was, and part of it still is, a mangrove swamp lying at the north end of Biscayne Bay, about opposite and west of the Bakers Haulover Inlet, which I am sure will fix the location in the minds of Senators who know Miami.

As a matter of fact, it is located within a few hundred yards of important hotels, apartments, residences, and other high-priced developments on various islands located in Biscayne Bay and in Miami Beach, as well as being in close proximity to the mainland, where North Miami, Miami Shores, and the city of Miami itself are found.

I say rather clearly, for the information of all who may be interested, that the mangrove swamp referred to is the same kind of terrain upon which most of what is now Miami Beach and other important developments of the Gold Coast were created.

The first time I saw Miami Beach, it was a little string of sand and coral rock along the Atlantic, with a long stretch of mangrove swamp, identical with this mangrove swamp, back or west of it, which has since been filled in and occupied by many, many homes, hotels, and apartments, constituting some of the most valuable real estate in the State of Florida, worth, of course, many thousands of dollars an acre.

As a matter of fact, when I was Governor of Florida, I found—and I state this as a matter of fact—that the submerged land of Biscayne Bay, shallow enough to be filled in and made into this kind of development, itself was worth many thousands of dollars an acre.

We sold for the State some of the land such as would be approved by the Corps of Engineers for such development at huge prices. It has been developed and now is the location of some of the highest priced developments in our State—I believe in any State.

The 1,700 acres was granted to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center by the city of Miami. It extends across from the mainland to Miami Beach, on that long island, with the exception of the narrow body of water which constitutes the Intracoastal Waterway and which extends out of the northeast corner of Biscayne Bay northward leading toward Jacksonville and other points along the Atlantic coastline. The area is very valuable. Others who know more than I do about value, state that the 1,700 acres by itself, without any development, is worth approximately $60 million.

I have no reason to doubt that conclusion, because I know from my own experience something of the vast value of all lands in that general area which are developable. This area is easily developable as it is close to Miami and Miami Beach, and lies south of Hollywood and a little farther south of Fort Lauderdale. It could not be more strategically located.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of its actual development, 680 acres have already been filled and reclaimed, and settlement of the fill has taken place. They are ready for construction and for such other development as may be called for in connection with the Cultural and Trade Center. The rest can be, will be, and is capable of being developed in exactly the same way.

The State of Florida has undertaken the putting in of the many roads and bridges and other structures of that kind, without expense to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center which, as I have already stated, is controlled by a commission appointed by the Governor and created by State law, with authority to make this development.

With reference to the value of the roads, bridges, and other structures, I am not able to say how much they will cost, but I understand the cost will be approximately $6 million, for which the State of Florida has assumed complete responsibility.

In addition, the city of North Miami, the closest area from the standpoint of availability of water and sewage service, has undertaken to accomplish, without expense to the Center, the installation of the water mains, the sewerage structures, and other structures of that kind which will be necessary for the servicing of this important area.

With reference to the other utilities, the Florida Power & Light Co. has undertaken, without expense to anyone other than itself, to build all of the facilities which will make power available in the entire area; likewise, the Southern Bell Telephone Co. has undertaken to furnish service to the area, at its own expense. It is estimated that the cost to the utility companies will be approximately $15 million.

In addition, the well-known bonding firm of Goodbody & Co. has approved a fully validated $21 million bond issue upon the area and has actually bought the first $8 million of bonds—and this was as I understand before a spade had been turned, or any development had begun—indicating that there is great value in this particular area.

I have said this much about the material things involved here, because the article of Mr. Duscha does not give a clear picture of the great value in the development already completed, and the value of the rest of the tract of approximately 1,000 acres which is to be reclaimed and which is equally accessible and equally available and valuable as the 680 acres already completely reclaimed and ready for buildings.

Mr. President, as to what the Federal Government has done, Mr. Duscha is correct, except that the linotype operator made a mistake. Mr. Duscha says that the Community Facilities Administration approved "a $22 billion loan" last year. It was, of course, a $22 million loan. The purpose of the loan was not to build only the building mentioned by Mr. Duscha, but along with other funds gained from the bonding issue, and otherwise, to construct other buildings required to house the exhibit of the United States of America, which will not have to put up a dime to construct its own building, and the buildings of the Latin American countries already interested in the fair which wish to have their own participation in this important project.

Mr. President, so much for those items. I believe that there are other points to which I might refer briefly.

Mr. Duscha has this paragraph which I believe leaves a particularly unfortunate implication. After saying that the Community Facilities loan in the amount of $22 million had been made, which he says is $22 billion—a slight difference, Mr. President, and I am sure a typographical error—and was highly secured interest bearing, and on a bank-worthy basis, he says:

> The agency's money is supposed to be used largely to help depressed cities and towns to build water and sewer systems.

Mr. President, I doubt if many of the cities which have been helped with Community Facilities would be complimented by being included within the classification of depressed towns and cities.

However, this is the part to which I specifically refer:

> An exception was made in the case of Interama after the promoters of the project hired a Washington lawyer, Raymond M. Jacobson, who served as an advance man for Vice President HUMPHREY in the 1964 campaign.

That carries the implication that the action was taken as a result of the hiring of this estimable and highly capable young man—incidentally, a Floridian—or as a result of his political activities. Neither of those things happens to be true.

This action was taken because the Housing Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives through colloquies upon the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House conducted between Members of the Florida delegation and the chairmen of those two committees, made it abundantly clear—and this appears in great detail in the record of both Senate and House—that where an area is designed for developments such as this, and does not lie within the actual limits of any city, as is the case here, it was completely eligible and completely qualified for such a loan. Both distinguished chairmen of the committees—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Senate—made it clear, as the record will show, that the Community Facilities Administration must be careful to be sure the loan was safe and worthy of the making; and that appears with complete clarity.

So far as I am concerned, I would not have wanted the loan made on any other basis.

The Senator from Florida happened to be the one who had the pleasure of having the colloquy with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Senate, to which I have referred. One of my colleagues in the House, Representative PEPPER, had the similar colloquy with the chairman of the House committee, to which I have referred. In

both instances it was made clear that nobody wanted a Federal loan in connection with the project except a loan that was well secured and could be approved by any eagle-eyed banker as being so secured, as it is.

In addition to the very large expense which the State of Florida has carried since 1952 in this matter and the great contribution of the city of Miami and the other agencies which I have mentioned as well as the bond issue, independent entrepreneurs are interested in this project to the extent that they have stated their willingness to put up large amounts of money in the development of entertainment and other features of great value.

I have already said that the article by Mr. Duscha contained many fair and objective statements. One of the statements he made in the article is that it would include a tower of freedom.

The tower of freedom as planned, and the financing is already planned, would be the highest structure in the world and would command the attention of all coming to that part of the State and all arriving by air from Latin America and elsewhere at the International Airport at Miami.

I want to make it very clear for the RECORD why I say Miami is the exact spot for such a cultural exchange center. It happens to be in almost the geographic and population center of the Western Hemisphere. Anyone can determine this for himself if he wants to look at a map. It happens to be the funnel through which literally millions of people going to Latin America, either from the United States or elsewhere, or coming here, pause for various periods on their way to visit Latin America or our own country. The International Airport at Miami handles literally millions of visitors going to or from Latin America.

In addition, Miami happens to be the spot where most tourists who go to Florida like to make one of their visits before they leave our State. We are getting between 15 and 16 million tourists each year.

In addition to that, it so happens that the gold coast area of Florida has grown with great rapidity. Dade County, which includes Miami, has well over 1 million permanent residents, not including the Cuban refugees. Broward County, just north, whose boundary is just a short distance from Interama, has some 350,000 people. The county immediately north of that, Palm Beach, has a population of between 200,000 and 250,000.

So this center is located at the exact spot where many people coming to or from Latin America go in the largest numbers, and where literally millions will have an opportunity to see located at that spot in Florida the exhibits and other structures which will be there.

This Cultural and Trade Center will contain the evidences of culture, education, science, industry, trade, and agriculture which we think would tend to promote greater closeness between ourselves and the Latin American peoples.

Incidentally, I may say that the Latin American Ambassadors both to the OAS and to our own country have shown very great interest in this project. Dozens of them went to the White House with us in presenting this project to the President himself before the approval of the $22 million loan, evidencing their interest and hopes and willingness to participate.

As to what would be done there, let me remind the Senate that we are now spending billions of dollars in the Inter-American Alliance. We are trying everywhere to help them in their building, in their development, in their agricultural projects, in their educational projects, to obtain greater independence and a higher standard of living for their people.

Along with that, we are trying in many ways to build a better understanding with them on a person-to-person basis.

Included in the person-to-person projects, I may mention that several cities in my State have sister cities in Latin America, and people from those cities frequently visit back and forth. Every institution of higher learning in our State has many Latin American students, and some of our students go down to some of their fine institutions of higher learning. I have been active in connection with the conduct of our helping to build the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road. I have twice attended Pan-American highway meetings, in which the United States has actively participated. I know something of other projects in which we have helped them and they have helped us.

For instance, I remember flying in one of the helicopters of our engineers that was used in Nicaragua to help the people of Nicaragua make the first accurate map of much of their country which they ever had. That is true of several areas of Central America, where there had been no accurate mapping because of the very rough terrain.

I could mention several educational projects. I have been several times to visit officially the Panama Canal. I know of some of the friendly relations there, although we have read generally of unfriendly incidents.

At Caracas, although we hear of some of the outbreaks against our country or our important visitors, there are evidences of much closeness between those people and our own and we know of the progress being made in that country.

We in Florida have, since 1951, or prior to that time, made a great contribution toward this project. We have contributed much money and energy over the past 15 years to this project. I am not overstating it when I say that in value we have contributed over $100 million.

I can say that the real, acid test of acceptance by the Latin Americans of their invitation to exhibit in the buildings we shall construct for them is the question of whether the United States of America is to have a creditable exhibit there also.

Mr. President, I have frequently felt that as to fairs elsewhere, there was a worthwhile value for our country. Senators will recall that I handled on the floor of the Senate the item of appropriation from the funds of this country to make sure that we would have a creditable showing in behalf of our Nation at the New York World's Fair. I assisted the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in a similar effort with respect to the Seattle Fair. I will always try to help American areas which are trying to advance the interests of our country, and the mere fact that they are at the same time advancing the interests of their own community is to be taken for granted, because if the project is successful, of course, it will serve the interests of their community.

I believe that this showing of great interest, at great investment by the State of Florida, the city of Miami, and the county of Dade, and other areas at their own cost, has not been equaled elsewhere and I doubt if it will be equaled anywhere else as a showing of willingness to spend for something that we believe worthwhile for the interest of this country and of ourselves.

I am sorry the matter has been slowed down in the able Committee on Foreign Relations. I call attention to the fact that it passed in the House of Representatives only the other day. Again, Mr. Duscha reflected little credit upon the project by saying it passed on what he calls Pork Day. Let me get the exact wording. I do want to quote it correctly. He called it "Annual Pork Barrel Day."

Mr. President, this is not a pork barrel matter. A pork barrel item is a name given to appropriation items for cities, States, or agencies, which are never asked to contribute in proportion to the contribution of the Federal Government.

In this instance we have contributed very greatly; far more than we are asking the Federal Government to contribute in this project. We only want them to put in money to finance the U.S. exhibit there and to keep it going for 4 years, which we believe will demonstrate the usefulness and the success of this project.

This is a permanent project, but if it is not successful in those 4 years the United States always has the right, if it wishes, and Congress will have control of that, to say that it is not successful and has not met the objectives and dreams of those who worked so long on it. That will be the privilege of Congress, even if Congress passes the pending bill which calls for $11 million for the exhibit with various features in it which are very unusual, such as in the facilities and films for the audio-visual features which will be in the various languages of the people who will be passing through it.

Then, it has $1 million a year for each of the 4 years for the actual operation and maintenance of the project.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the long dreams, work, and expenditures, which are a very heavy contribution of the people and the State which I represent in part, will be recognized in an appropriate way in this Congress.

The only reason I have risen to speak today before the matter was pending on the floor of the Senate is because of this article in the Washington Post this morning in a very prominent place, which I believe does not give the real picture of this proposed cultural exhibit.

Mr. President, if there is anything we need to do to supplement our great investments through the Inter-American Alliance, which we are making by the hundreds of millions, and by the billions, it is to have more friendship and complete understanding with those people who are our neighbors. Our future and their future is going to depend more on the building of better understanding and more on the better appreciation, each for the other, than any other factor and not on the fact that we contribute heavily to the building of a system of highways. We contributed two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway through Central America which has a rugged terrain, and small populations or assets of their own upon which to draw.

That is fine, but nothing will be done to make a greater impression than will be created by a great continuing institution where we may have exhibits of their activities which show their culture as we display ours.

I do not know how many of us know that in the city of San Jose, in Costa Rica, there is a beautiful grand opera building similar to the one in Monte Carlo. I happen to have been in both places. It has a fine company playing there a large part of the year.

I can cite instance after instance of things which they are developing in their culture which we would admire and which we would love to have the chance to enjoy and which our people, if they have the chance to enjoy, would better understand why we are spending these many millions of dollars in the inter-American program and the Inter-American Alliance.

I shall not weary the Senate further by speaking on this subject. I wish, however, to remind the Senate that the community of Miami has responded nobly to the crisis forced on it by the policy of our Nation as a whole by the welcoming of Cuban refugees. They have received in that one city better than 200,000 refugees, many of them now resettled.

The Federal Government has done a fine job there. My hat is off to it. Nothing, however, can compare to the tremendous impact on the Miami people themselves of that invasion of refugees, many of them arriving without anything except the clothes they had on their backs. The impact has fallen most heavily on the city of Miami and its people have responded in perfectly noble fashion.

So far as I am concerned, I feel that they are entitled to some credit for having done that. We are now entering into this new program which we say will bring 15,000, 20,000, 25,000 new refugees, who for the most part will be there; although some will resettle elsewhere.

Mr. President, the city of Miami is doing its part. The county of Dade is doing its part. The State of Florida is doing its part. We believe that this meeting place between the cultures of Latin America and our own, which is almost the exact center of the geographic Western Hemisphere and of the population of the Western Hemisphere, is an ideal and unique spot in which to set up a place where the cultures may meet, where people may meet, where acquaintances may be made, where we can learn the good things about them, and where they can learn the good things about us and about our people.

I am sorry that this matter has gotten into controversy, and that some of our very able friends have seen fit to make it the subject of delaying tactics in our committee. I close by reminding our good friends that, after serious debate and full discussion on the floor of the House following hearing and report, and a good record of both of the hearing and the report, the House passed this legislation by a majority of better than 2 to 1 on a rollcall vote.

I hope that we may give equally careful, equally patriotic, equally generous, equally prompt consideration to this matter in these closing days of the session, when it will be difficult to get matters up for consideration, because the interest on the bonds is being paid, and it is costing money, and the continuing expense of the whole project is something that must be considered. Therefore, the Federal Government ought to move ahead without further delay.

After all, 15 years is a good, long time for even the Federal Government to consider a project, particularly when it involves so little money as this, which will go to those who have so highly lived up, I think, to the test of Americanism as have the people and the governments of Miami and Dade County, and of the State of Florida as a whole.

I thank the Senate for yielding me this time, which does not count as time upon the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, October 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: II Timothy 2:14: *Of these things put them in remembrance.*

Almighty God, we celebrate these many days in our national history as a time of high and holy remembrance; days that bring back a medley of memories, exaltations, regrets, and dismay.

Help us to call to mind in our prayers the heroism of the men and the fortitude of women in the days of terror and trial—those who endured with valor; those who suffered with patience; and those who gave their all, even the very blood of their bodies for the dawn of a better day.

We beseech Thee to stir our minds and the minds of men everywhere that a nobler spirit and wiser vision may rule our thoughts and ways.

May we humbly acknowledge that we are not praying for the peace of ease but for the peace of righteousness and good will and the moral law that fulfills itself in fellowship and guides humanity out of chaos and confusion into brotherhood.

Enlighten our darkness; may ignorance, poverty, oppression be done away. May the Prince of Peace reign supremely everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 8, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up bills from his subcommittee.

PROVIDING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR MAKING CERTAIN TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10497) to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

(b) A violation of this section shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place at which the telephone call was made or the place at which the telephone call was received.

(c) Whoever violates this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or