

United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.J. Res. 865. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of \$250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 866. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 867. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public place if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study the problems of Presidential succession and continuity of Government, to make findings of fact and recommendations for constitutional, legislative and administrative changes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 587. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 588. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 2d session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9473. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Guinot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9474. A bill for the relief of Miss Orina Sarlan (Sarioglu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9475. A bill for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 9476. A bill for the relief of Ginevra Parenzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 9477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9478. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Zingarelli, also known as Pedone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9479. A bill for the relief of Chong-jin Kim and Illhyang Ko Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 9480. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Tahir Kaplan and Sevim Alton Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

512. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass legisla-

tion for the preservation of all District of Columbia boundary markers, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 11, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O Thou desire of nations, again as our hearts are drawn by the lure of the manger, as time draws near the birthday of the One whose coming broke the ages in two, enable our spirits to kindle with the joy of simple shepherds of long ago. Thou, who in times past, across yearning centuries, spoke to the fathers, through the prophets, hast spoken to us in the word made flesh, whose name is the Prince of Peace, and upon whose shoulder the government of men must ultimately rest.

We thank Thee that not on one wondrous night alone did a star of hope light the heavens, but that straight down the crowding years the starlit pathway leads, reminding our earth-filled eyes that the highest truth is born in lowly places, clad in humble garb.

As the Christmas star rains its fire once more on an earth plowed with spite and hate, may we see in it a shining symbol that if we would find the truth and the life abundant, we must follow our starry ideals, no matter over what burning sands or to what lonely deserts they take our faltering feet.

We ask it in the name of the One who didst come to a violent world, and who is now remembered and adored, while the ruthless dictators are forgotten. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 10, and Wednesday, December 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

OMISSIONS FROM THE RECORD OF DECEMBER 11, 1963

The following was omitted from the RECORD of December 11, 1963:

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 20, 1963:

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Nava'jo Tribe of

Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

On November 26, 1963:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

On November 29, 1963:

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88-72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on December 11, 1963, he had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4157) to

enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5338) to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552-C, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California;

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code; and

H.R. 6143. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk; and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 235) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the remainder of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House, and the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign during such adjournments or recesses enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Rules and Administration.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Committee on Public Works.

The Foreign Relations Committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eugene G. Hulett, of Oregon, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT OF 1958—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on yesterday, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate Executive R, 88th Congress, 1st session, being a protocol for the prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958. At the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol; that the protocol and message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the text, as certified by the British Government, of the Protocol for the Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, dated at London, August 1, 1963.

The Protocol was adopted by the United Nations Sugar Conference, 1963, and was open for signature at London from August 1 to September 30, 1963, inclusive. It was signed in behalf of the United States of America on September 27, 1963.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State explaining the purposes and provisions of the Protocol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 1, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936, TO ESTABLISH THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION LOAN ACCOUNT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsections (a) and (b) and to repeal subsection (f) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish the Rural Electrification Administration Loan Account, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 23 reports covering 25 overobligations of appropriations within the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE SITUATION IN YEMEN

A letter from the Adviser to the Government of the Kingdom of Yemen, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, certain letters relating to the situation in Yemen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, SILT PROJECT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Silt project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Buckley, Wash., Kiwanis Club, favoring the inclusion of funds for the Port of Tacoma project, Washington, in the public works appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1322. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 768).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2317. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties (Rept. No. 770).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2364. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress (Rept. No. 772).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif. (Rept. No. 771).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 1767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 773).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service (Rept. No. 774).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4338. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 776).

EXTENSION OF MAXIMUM MATURITY OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION GUARANTEED OR INSURED HOME LOANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 769)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on the bill (S. 385) to extend the maximum maturity of Veterans' Administration guaranteed or insured home loans for a newly constructed dwelling or the construction of a dwelling, from 30 to 35 years, without amendment, together with the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed with the report of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2376. A bill for the relief of Hsui-Hua Shung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2377. A bill to provide for the colnage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2378. A bill for the relief of Mardiros Kouyoumjian and his wife, Manig Kouyoumjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LONG of Missouri; Mr. METCALF, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2379. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

S. 2380. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administration prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 2381. A bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2382. A bill for the relief of Mrs. In Suk White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 2383. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 235) authorizing receipt of messages from the House and the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions during adjournments or recesses, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the foregoing resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXEMPTION FROM EXCISE TAX CLUB DUES PAYMENTS MADE TOWARD EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT PLAN

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Under present law a large number of employees of the social, athletic, and sporting clubs of the United States are not receiving retirement protection from their employers primarily because of the particularly oppressive impact of the excise tax on club dues.

The clubs of this country employ over 310,000 people with an annual payroll of \$750 million. They pay over \$214 million in taxes each year, of which the Federal excise tax on club dues exceeds \$70 million. This club dues tax is exacted at the extremely high rate of 20 percent. The only other items subject to a 20-percent rate are admissions to dog and horse races. Moreover, under the present statute, this 20-percent tax is imposed on all amounts paid to the clubs by their members—except those for capital construction or improvements—regardless of the purpose for which such payments are made.

The harsh manner in which the present statute operates discourages club members from making contributions for the establishment of retirement plans for the club's employees. In other words, unlike the normal employer who gets a tax deduction for the contributions he makes to an employee pension trust, the club member not only gets no deduction but must pay an additional 20 percent on any such contribution. He is thus severely penalized for making a payment which he knows will be used only for the benefit of the club's employees.

It is most inequitable that the retirement needs of such a large segment of the working population as that represented by the employees of the club industry are being neglected whereas persons performing identical work for employers who obtain a tax deduction are being afforded protection. In 1962 Congress enacted the Self-Employed Individual's Tax Retirement Act in an effort to alleviate a similar unfairness which existed between employees and self-employed persons. The bill I am introducing would be a real step toward providing more equitable treatment among groups of similarly situated employees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2381) to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF A VICE PRESIDENT BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a proposed constitutional amendment to provide for the election of a Vice President by the two Houses of Congress, in joint session, with each Member having one vote, in the event the Vice President elected by the people succeeds to the Presidency. Under the proposal, Congress could elect one of its own number or a member of the Cabinet, and he would assume the duties of the Vice Presidency until the end of the term for which his predecessor was elected.

The tragic death of President Kennedy has focused sudden national attention on the adequacy of our governmental machinery to adapt fully to the loss of the Chief Executive. The Founding Fathers in their great wisdom provided specifically in the Constitution for the succession of the Vice President to the Presidency, and this automatic succession has taken place now with reassuring efficiency. But the drafters of the Constitution did not foresee how important the Vice Presidency would, in fact, become and did not provide for the replacement of the Vice President once, as in the present case, he has succeeded to the Presidency. The exigencies of our split-second nuclear age make it imperative that at all times there be a Vice President who is fully apprised of the President's work and able to take over immediately in the event of sudden tragedy.

The Constitution provides only that the Congress shall designate who shall act as President in the event that both the President and Vice President are unable to serve, but it does not provide for replacement of a Vice President who has succeeded to the Presidency. All three of the congressional enactments under the original authorization have been premised on the absence of both a President and Vice President. In 1792 Congress designated the President pro tempore of the Senate, followed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and if both offices were vacant, a special election by the electoral college; in 1886 it substituted the Cabinet officers, beginning with the Secretary of State; and in 1947, at President Truman's urging, it placed the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate ahead of the Cabinet.

The present situation has aroused two elements of dissatisfaction with the existing machinery, in my view. First, no order of succession under the present constitutional provision will permit the replacement of the Vice President, so that any officer designated as next in the line of succession will not be free, as an elected Vice President would, to participate to the fullest extent in the work of the President. In the last two administrations the Vice President was kept fully advised and prepared to take over the reigns of Government, and the efficiency of the transfer of power in the present case is often attributed to this fact.

But under existing law, as many commentators have noted, there is a real difficulty in keeping the next officer in the line of succession, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, equally fully advised. He is the operating chief of the House, in duties and powers comparable to the majority leader of the Senate, and clearly there is an element of conflict between the duties of the Presidency and the duties of the chief officer of the House of Representatives. This is not a conflict in the sense of competition between the executive branch and the legislative branch, but in the sense of separation of powers—that wise division of our Government into three distinct branches, each of which, by acting in its own sphere, serves as a check against the others.

If the succession were simply changed so that the Cabinet were next in line, as they were between 1886 and 1947, the separation of powers problem would be eliminated but a further difficulty would arise—the Vice President who became President would have the sole power to select his successor. This was the very reason that this order of succession was changed.

The second difficulty with the present method of designating a successor is that any such order of succession imposes new duties on the officer selected who has served for years in a necessarily quite different job. This officer would have to resign his own post, after a lifetime of work, to serve, perhaps only temporarily, in the Presidency.

In my view the answer to this dilemma lies in providing for the immediate election, in situations like the present

one, of a person to act as Vice President who resigns from his prior office and devotes full time and attention as a member of the executive branch to preparing for the Presidency if he should be called upon to assume it. Accordingly I am today introducing a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of a person to act as Vice President, when that office is vacant for any reason, by the two Houses of Congress in joint session, each Member of Congress having one vote. The Congress may, under this provision, elect a Vice President from among the members of the Cabinet or from the Congress itself. He would then assume all the duties and responsibilities of the Vice Presidency and would serve until the end of the term for which his predecessor was elected.

The virtue of this procedure, as opposed to appointment of a Vice President by the new President—which has also been suggested—is that some element of popular selection would be exercised, but without the delay and other problems inherent in a special election by the people. At the same time, the influence of the new President's choice would undoubtedly be given great weight by the Congress just as a presidential nominee's choice is given weight in party conventions.

Also, having Congress elect a new Vice President has a parallel in the existing constitutional provision to solve deadlocks in the electoral college after a regular popular election. Under that provision the House elects the President, voting by States. My proposal differs from this, since it gives a vote to each Member and adds the Senate. This would overcome the objection which is often voiced against the deadlock provision—that it gives disproportionate power to States with small populations. The proposed provision permits some balance between proportional representation in the House and equal representation in the Senate.

The proposal does not attempt to solve a further problem, which we hope will never arise but which must be faced—a virtually simultaneous vacancy in both the Presidency and the Vice Presidency. The terms of the amendment make it clear that in such a case the existing constitutional provision and the succession statute enacted pursuant to it remain operative, and a President would immediately be identified. The Vice President would then be elected under my proposed provision. This leaves unresolved some of the difficulties with the present system which have already been discussed. But the difficulties cannot be readily eliminated, for an elective approach to replacements would entail a measure of delay which, again our split-second world does not permit us. And a system of interim appointees, named in the statute of succession and who would yield to the elected President and Vice President after a special election also seems too cumbersome and uncertain because of the possibility of having three Chief Executives in rapid succession, the second one knowing that his term may only be temporary.

This last problem is one which deserves study by the Congress and by the Nation, but its difficulties should not interfere with a speedy solution of the present problem—the absence of a Vice President, a situation we have faced twice in less than 20 years. I feel this vital problem can be solved reasonably through this proposed constitutional amendment.

I send the proposed constitutional amendment to the desk for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN STEWART MURPHY—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 4, 1963, the bill H.R. 5083, for the relief of John Stewart Murphy, was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and was placed on the Senate Calendar. Subsequent to that action information was received which requires further study by the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 5083 be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 359)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments (No. 359) intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT — AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 360)

Mr. DODD submitted amendments (No. 360) intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS OR LOANS UNDER CERTAIN ACTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators BURDICK, ERVIN, and SIMPSON may be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2350) to provide

for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts.

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

RENAMING OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 136.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF JOHN MORGAN DAVIS AND A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, December 19, 1963, at 1:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

John Morgan Davis, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Thomas C. Egan, deceased.

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice J. Cullen Ganey, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 11, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.;

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 736, and that the following measures be considered in sequence; and I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate points in connection with these measures, I may be authorized to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the reports or recommendations and statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, both requests by the Senator from Montana are granted.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY MOTOR VEHICLES

The bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 756), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter into agreements with motor vehicle passenger-carrying common carriers, without advertising for competitive bids and without bond, for transporting mail over established routes upon which the carrier is permitted, by law, to carry passengers.

STATEMENT

Title 41, United States Code, section 5 (public contracts) requires public advertisement and competitive bidding for transportation-of-mail contracts. However, the Post Office Department has found this requirement to be an impediment to providing the most efficient postal service because, regardless of what terms the Department advertised, only one bus company could respond to the bid. No two passenger-carrying common carriers have service and comparable schedules between any two places. Common carriers do not conform their schedules to departmental requirements as is usually done with formally advertised contract procedures.

Because of these peculiar characteristics of bus company transportation, the Department, several years ago, began negotiating a number of nonadvertised short-term contracts with these carriers. These contracts allowed bus companies to carry mail at a fixed rate—usually 75 cents per mailpouch—regardless of the distance involved.

In 1959, the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that negotiated contracts were in violation of the law unless Congress adopted legislation to extend an exception to such procedures. Contracts ex-

isting at the time of this decision (39 Comp. Gen. 485) were allowed to expire at the completion of their term.

H.R. 5179 would authorize the Post Office Department to begin again utilizing such contracts. It would eliminate the requirement of advertising mail-transportation contracts and allow the Postmaster General to determine which type of contract—advertised or negotiated—will best serve the interests of the postal service. It will bring a desirable degree of flexibility into scheduling mail transportation which now exists in the areas of railroad and airline mail transportation contracts. It should be emphasized that negotiated contracts would be permitted only in passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and not in trucks of the common carrier. Additionally, the routes to be covered are only those regularly established and permitted by law.

Common carriers are now subject to financial review by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee sees no necessity in requiring additional bond since such a requirement would merely increase the costs of mail transportation without securing additional protection for the Government.

HEARINGS

Public hearings were held on H.R. 5179, by the Subcommittee on Postal Affairs. The views of the Post Office Department and representatives of other interested groups were expressed. No opposition was expressed.

COST

The rate per mailpouch, under previously existing negotiated contracts, generally was less than the rate for advertised contracts. The committee believes resuming negotiated contracts and establishing more flexible procedures will reduce cost.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, read a third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

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

INCREASE IN AREA IN WHICH POST OFFICE STATIONS MAY BE ESTABLISHED

The bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 757), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This measure has two purposes. It would grant new authority to the Postmaster General to:

1. Establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices within 20 miles of the limits of boundaries of a city in which the main post office is located, the present limitation being 10 miles.

2. Establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices at airports irrespective of the distance of the airport branch from the limits or boundaries of the city in which the main or parent post office is located.

The Post Office Department has stated that this authority is needed to provide the necessary postal service to suburban areas of large cities on an orderly and economical basis, and to provide adequate service at airports located a considerable distance from the cities with which they are identified.

STATEMENT

The rapid growth of the suburbs of large cities in recent years has made unrealistic the 10-mile limitation of existing law on the establishment of branch post offices. The Post Office Department has stated that in view of the availability of modern transportation networks, it is more efficient to extend postal operation in a growing metropolitan area by the establishment of branches rather than a number of independent offices.

Requests received by the Department for the establishment of independent post offices usually are motivated by a desire on the part of patrons in an area for community identity. This community identity can be provided by the establishment of a named branch of the metropolitan post office if the area is located within 10 miles of the metropolitan city limits. Such a branch not only provides the desired community identity and the needed local service; it also contributes to the efficient operation of an economical and unified postal district under one independent post office.

Because of the present 10-mile limitation, however, the Department cannot respond affirmatively to justified requests for community identity received from patrons living in suburban areas beyond this distance. These requests must either be denied or an independent post office must be established at considerable expense.

In addition to the expense incurred, the establishment of independent suburban post offices is sometimes not desirable for the following reasons:

Frequently the area from which requests for independent offices emanate is provided city delivery service even though it is beyond the 10-mile limit. If an independent office and an independent postal district were established, the area could not qualify for the city delivery service. The Department reports that, in such a case, the establishment of an independent office would result in a reduction in service. The law requires that an independent post office shall have a minimum of \$10,000 in gross postal receipts for the preceding fiscal year before city delivery service is authorized. Furthermore, experience has shown that it is operationally and economically unsound to establish city delivery service at offices where there are fewer than 2,500 patrons.

Few of the suburbs under consideration would meet these requirements on an independent basis.

Accordingly, the 10-mile limitation is now an impediment to the orderly extension of postal service.

The authority to establish post office branches at airports without regard to their distance from the cities which they serve is requested because many of today's commercial airports, often requiring long runways to accommodate jet aircraft, must frequently be located at considerable distance from the cities with which they are identified. It is impractical and unrealistic to make a postal facility at a large airport a branch of the post office of a small nearby village simply because the post office of the village is the closest independent post office.

The Department cites Dulles International Airport as an example—an airport universally

associated with Washington, D.C. The Department cannot legally establish a branch at Dulles because the branch would be located beyond the present 10-mile limitation.

Precedent for the removal of the 10-mile limit exists in current law authorizing the establishment of postal stations, substations, or branches at camps, ports, or stations of the Armed Forces and at defense and other strategic locations without any limitation of distance.

The committee concurs with the Post Office Department in these two recommendations, recognizing that the Postmaster General should have the requested authority.

HOUSE AMENDMENT

The House report on H.R. 5778 stipulates that " * * * the authorization to establish such stations, substations, or branches should be coupled with a clear statement of congressional intent that it shall not be used as a basis for discontinuing any established post office. Such a statement of intent will safeguard against any possible future application of this authority in a manner inconsistent with legislative intent."

Further, the House has amended H.R. 5778 so that it specifically amends section 705(c) of title 39, United States Code, by the addition of the following sentence: "This authority may not be used by the Postmaster General as a basis for discontinuing an established post office."

The committee agrees entirely with this stipulation and with this amendment and notes the assurance of the Department that the purpose of H.R. 5778 is not to increase the Postmaster General's authority to discontinue established post offices, since he now possesses sufficient authority for this under existing statutes.

It is the committee's understanding that should an independent post office be discontinued, the discontinuance would be made upon the basis of the Postmaster General's existing authority and it would not be discontinued because a branch was replacing it under the authority granted in H.R. 5778.

COST

Enactment of H.R. 5778 will not entail any additional cost to the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE PEACE CORPS ACT

The bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 759), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

I. BACKGROUND AND MAIN PURPOSE

On July 9, 1963, President Kennedy transmitted to the Senate draft legislation to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat.

612), as amended. The draft legislation was introduced as S. 1916 by Senator FULBRIGHT by request on July 18, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. H.R. 9009, a similar bill, passed the House of Representatives on November 13 by a voice vote and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the following day.

The main purpose of H.R. 9009 is to authorize the appropriation of \$102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964.

II. COMMITTEE ACTION

On December 3, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the pending legislation. Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, accompanied by William Josephson, General Counsel of the Peace Corps, appeared in support of the administration bill. The hearing is printed as an appendix to this report.

The committee is unaware of any objections to the proposed amendments to the Peace Corps Act.

On December 10, the committee met in executive session and, without objection, ordered H.R. 9009 reported favorably to the Senate.

III. PROVISIONS OF H.R. 9009

A. Authorization

Section 1 of the bill, by amending section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, would authorize an appropriation of \$102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964. This sum would enable the Peace Corps to have 11,300 volunteers either in training or overseas by August 31, 1964.

Assignment of volunteers

Region	Aug. 31, 1963		Aug. 31, 1964 (estimated)	
	Countries	Volunteers	Countries ¹	Volunteers ²
Africa.....	17	2,208	19	3,370
Far East.....	6	1,177	3 ⁴	1,730
Latin America.....	17	2,466	18	4,820
Near East and south Asia.....	8	783	8	1,380
Total.....	48	6,634	49	11,300

¹ The rate of increase of countries in which the Peace Corps program has been or will be initiated in 1962 and 1963 is not applied to 1964. It is assumed that during 1963, programs will have been developed for the majority of countries in which the Peace Corps at present has a potential for service.

² Includes 3,595 replacements in continuing programs of volunteers who will have completed service or whose service will have been terminated early during the period Aug. 31, 1963, to Aug. 31, 1964.

³ Establishment of the Federation of Malaysia makes the 3 countries of Malaya, Sabah (formerly North Borneo), and Sarawak, 1 country.

It will be noted that the additional volunteers requested for fiscal year 1964 would primarily be sent to Latin America and Africa. Both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk recommended this increase.

Of the \$102 million requested, it is estimated that 19.9 percent, or \$20,300,000, will be spent for administration and that the remainder will be spent to support volunteers.

The annual cost per Peace Corps volunteer is \$9,000, the same as it has been since the inception of the Peace Corps. The percentage represented by administrative expenses has changed slightly. In fiscal year 1962, the costs directly related to volunteers and projects were \$6,300 per volunteer; administrative costs were \$2,700. In fiscal 1964 it is anticipated that \$7,000 will be earmarked for volunteer and project costs, while \$2,000 will be earmarked for administrative expenses. The training costs for volunteers have risen because the Peace Corps, on the basis of its experience to date, believes it desirable that a volunteer achieve more proficiency in the language he will need in his work abroad prior to his being sent overseas.

In the hearing appended to this report will be found tables showing (1) Peace Corps

Congress authorized an appropriation of \$63,750,000 to finance the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1963. The amount actually appropriated was \$59 million to provide for 9,000 volunteers for training or overseas duty by August 31, 1963. By that date, however, only 6,634 volunteers were in training or overseas, and the Peace Corps consequently returned to the Treasury \$3,870,000 of the appropriated funds. Several factors contributed to the failure to attain the projected number of volunteers. In the first place, the Peace Corps raised the standards by which it selects volunteers. In the second place, it chose to program people with certain skills—mathematics and science teachers, and doctors and nurses—because they are most urgently needed overseas. Applicants possessing such skills are not plentiful.

In his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on December 3, the Director of the Peace Corps expressed confidence that during fiscal year 1964 the Peace Corps would be able to have either in training or in projects overseas the total number of 11,300 covered in its \$102 million appropriation request. It might be noted that as of November 30, 1963, there were 7,185 trainees and volunteers. In each succeeding fiscal year during which the Peace Corps has been in existence, there has been a rise in the number of Peace Corps applications received. Nearly 7,000 applications reached the Peace Corps headquarters in the past 2 months.

There follows a table indicating the assignment of volunteers by region on August 31, 1963, and as planned through August 31, 1964.

not make a flat guarantee. In matching volunteers and projects, the committee would rather the Peace Corps adopt a cautious approach than indulge in hasty and ill-conceived programing in order to obtain the maximum number of volunteers it requests. While the Peace Corps fell short of its goal last year, in the committee's view, its action was prudent and wise.

The committee's opinion is that the past achievements and present prospects of the Peace Corps are ample justification for recommending that there be authorized an appropriation of \$102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964.

B. Transfers of supplies and equipment and of property received by gift, devise, or otherwise (sec. 2(a) and sec. 5(b))

Section 2(a) of the bill would amend section 5 of the Peace Corps Act to make it possible for certain supplies or equipment provided volunteers to be transferred to the government or to other entities of a country or area where volunteers have been serving.

In order for such transfers to be made, it will be necessary for a Peace Corps representative to make a determination that the supplies and equipment are no longer useful to the volunteer to whom provided or to his Peace Corps replacement, if any. Moreover, there may be transferred only "work" or "project" supplies or equipment, such as teaching aids, textbooks, tools furnished community development volunteers, and recreational equipment. Medicines, household furnishings, and vehicles are illustrative of non-transferable items.

In some cases, the actual value of supplies and equipment remaining on hand at the conclusion of a Peace Corps project would be exceeded by the cost of transporting them to the sites of other projects or back to the United States. Too, such supplies and equipment usually would be of considerable value to the beneficiaries.

Section 5 of the bill would amend section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act to permit donated property to be transferred to the government or other entities of the country or area with which the volunteers are serving when such transfers would generally further the purposes of the act.

At present, if the Peace Corps accepts from a donor property which is sent overseas for project use, the property cannot be disposed of except by following the procedures applicable to all Government property. In certain instances, donated items no longer needed for a particular project would not be readily salable or usable in projects elsewhere, or worth return shipping or storage costs.

In addition, the authority granted by section 5(a) would permit selective acceptance, shipment, and transfer of donated property to the entities abroad in which volunteers are working. An example of property which might be handled in that manner would be reference books for a library in a school where volunteers teach.

C. Counseling programs for returned volunteers (sec. 2(f))

Section 2(f) of the bill would add a new subsection (k) to section 5 of the Peace Corps Act. Pursuant to the new subsection, the Peace Corps would be authorized to undertake programs under which volunteers could be counseled with respect to opportunities for further education and employment.

The programs will be designed to assure that the skills and experience which former volunteers have derived from their training and their service abroad will be best utilized in the national interest. Peace Corps activities under section 2(f) of H.R. 9009 will be carried out in cooperation with other Government agencies, private employers, educational institutions, and other entities of the United States.

administrative expenses by object classification, (2) ratio of Peace Corps employees to Peace Corps volunteers, and (3) ratio of administrative expenses to volunteers and project costs.

Evidence exists to show that the interest of Americans in serving in the Peace Corps continues high. As noted above, the number of Peace Corps applications has annually shown a steady rise. Moreover, of the volunteers who have successfully completed one tour of duty, roughly 10 percent expressed an interest either in spending another 2 years continuing to work on their initial assignment or in being assigned to other projects.

In addition, the work the volunteers have performed in providing skilled manpower to countries and areas less developed than our own has led, in all cases, to more requests for volunteers. Countries in which no projects have been in operation have also sought help from the Peace Corps.

It cannot be known with precision at this time whether or not the Peace Corps will be able to meet its goal of having 11,300 volunteers in training or overseas by August 31, 1964. Nonetheless, the committee believes there is a good chance that the Peace Corps will be able to fulfill the quota set and that it should not be penalized because it can-

The Peace Corps policy will be to enable a former volunteer to avail himself of its counseling services up to 1 year after his termination from duty with the Peace Corps. For a former volunteer who, in the intervening time, is called to active military duty, an appropriate time extension will be made.

When the legislation to establish a Peace Corps was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1961, the committee rejected an executive branch provision which would have established a career development board. The committee felt that the need for such a board did not exist at that time, and also that able volunteers who did a good job overseas were capable of planning their own careers. The committee now believes that counseling assistance for returned volunteers can be justified.

In fiscal year 1964, it is anticipated that approximately 3,000 volunteers will successfully complete a tour of duty abroad and will return to the United States. Many of these volunteers have been serving in remote spots around the world and have had little opportunity to become informed on further educational possibilities available or jobs which may be open to them upon their return to the United States. Many have significantly altered their career goals.

In the 2 years these volunteers have served overseas, representatives of the Peace Corps will have had occasion to observe and measure their on-the-job performance, as well as their personal talents and skills. If these volunteers are able to receive timely and expert guidance and counsel to help them channel their lives into careers for which they appear well qualified and interested, their opportunities for future service to the Nation may well be enhanced.

It might be noted that the Carnegie Corp. of New York awarded a special 1-year grant (July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1964) to the American Council on Education to enable the latter to establish in Washington, D.C., a Peace Corps Volunteer Career Information Service for the benefit of returning Peace Corps volunteers.

With the cooperation of the Peace Corps, personnel of the service have undertaken systematically to apprise volunteers of educational and other opportunities available to them, and to offer counsel to volunteers seeking it. Committee hopes that the Peace Corps will gain useful information and knowledge from the pilot project made possible by this private grant. As this project is phased out, the Peace Corps can undertake the same services under the authority provided by section 2(f).

The committee expects these programs envisaged to be modest in scope and the counseling services offered not to be made compulsory for volunteers.

D. Restriction on use of official seal or emblem and name "Peace Corps" and penalties for unauthorized use

Section 7 of the bill provides that the use of the official Peace Corps seal or emblem and the use of the name "Peace Corps" shall be restricted exclusively to designate programs authorized under the Peace Corps Act. Unauthorized use will subject a violator to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both. A violation may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General, U.S. attorneys, or other persons duly authorized to represent the United States.

Section 7, which would amend section 19 of the Peace Corps Act, is similar to other prohibitions on the use of names and insignia contained in chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code, and is specifically based on 18 U.S.C. 707 which prohibits the unauthorized use of the 4-H Club name or insignia.

Various individuals or groups in the United States have been using the name "Peace Corps" in connection with, or to identify,

their activities. Among the difficulties that are apt to arise if this use is not prohibited is that of confusion both in the United States and abroad as to whether a particular endeavor can be characterized as official or unofficial.

E. Encouragement of establishment by other countries and areas of voluntary service programs (sec. 8)

Section 8 of the bill would add a new title III to the Peace Corps Act. The new section 301(a) of the act would declare that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of the Peace Corps Act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower, and to encourage less developed countries or areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to meet their needs for trained manpower.

The new section 301(b) of the act would restrict this authority in the following ways: First, not more than \$300,000 may be used in fiscal year 1964 to carry out the purposes of the new title III. Second, the activities authorized to be carried out pursuant to the new title III are limited to the furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower. Third, none of the funds available to carry out the purposes of the act which are used in furtherance of the purposes of the new title III may be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof; nor may such funds be used to pay the costs of developing or operating volunteer programs or to pay any other costs of such organization, government, or agency. Moreover, it is provided in section 8 of the bill that activities carried out pursuant to the new title shall not compromise the national character of the Peace Corps.

While none of the \$300,000 available for the purposes of encouragement of voluntary service programs may be contributed to any international organization, or to any foreign government or agency thereof, the Peace Corps would not be prohibited, under separate authority in section 14 of the Peace Corps Act, from detailing, assigning or otherwise making available any officer or employee (1) to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of any international organization, or (2) to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or agency thereof.

In the committee's opinion, if other countries and areas are sufficiently interested in establishing volunteer projects of their own, they should be willing to assume the primary financial burden of getting those projects underway.

In connection with its future examination of the Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1965, the committee intends to look carefully at the utilization of the \$300,000 authorized pursuant to section 8 of this bill, as well as at the percentage cost sharing of bilateral and international projects undertaken pursuant to section 8.

F. Other provisions of the bill

(a) Payment of readjustment allowance to volunteers (sec. 2 (b) and (c); sec. 3)

Section 2(b) of the bill would change in several respects section 5(c) of the Peace Corps Act which authorizes the payment to each volunteer at the end of his service of not to exceed \$75 for each month, or portion thereof, of satisfactory service. In subsection (c) the phrase "readjustment allowance" is to be substituted for the phrase "termination payments" to express more clearly the purpose of these payments. The other change would make it clear that the Peace Corps may withhold all or part of the

readjustment allowance of a volunteer assigned overseas until he has actually returned to the United States, rather than making payments overseas where his service usually terminates.

Section 2(c) and section 3 of the bill are conforming amendments which would reflect in section 5(f)(2) and section b(1) of the Peace Corps Act the changes made by section 2(b) of H.R. 9009.

(b) Assignment of volunteers to duties on staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad

Section 2(d) of the bill would amend section 5(g) of the Peace Corps Act to make possible the assignment of not more than 100 volunteers to carry out secretarial and clerical duties on the staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad.

While a number of persons with secretarial and clerical experience and skills have applied to join the Peace Corps, projects in which their abilities might be useful have not developed to any appreciable extent. However, the skills of such persons could be utilized by their assignment as volunteers to work on overseas staffs of the Peace Corps, with the result that Peace Corps administrative costs abroad will be reduced.

(c) Miscellaneous provisions

Section 2(e) of the bill would amend section 5(h) of the Peace Corps Act in two respects:

First, Peace Corps employees would be classified as Federal employees for the purposes of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.). The effect of this amendment would be to enable the volunteers to receive appropriate assistance of an administrative nature with respect to the exercise of whatever absentee voting rights they may already possess under State law.

Section 2(e) of the bill would also serve to classify volunteers as Federal employees for the purposes of the act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, section 4 (5 U.S.C. 73b-5). This act, authorizes, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the use of appropriations chargeable for transportation of baggage of Government employees for such payment of general average contributions as may be required in connection with authorized transportation of baggage. General average contributions are the contributions which each party to a sea venture may be required to make in order (1) to make good the loss sustained by any one of their number on account of sacrifices made of part of the ship or cargo to save the residue or the lives of those on board from impending peril, or (2) to share extraordinary expenses necessarily incurred for the common benefit and safety of all.

Section 4 of the bill contains an amendment to section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act to remove a possible ambiguity which might lead to an unintended interpretation which would preclude the Peace Corps from compensating at supergrade rates persons detailed to agency supergrade positions, such as Foreign Service or Public Health Service officers. The change proposed would in no way increase the total number of supergrades authorized for the Peace Corps.

Section 6(b) of the bill would amend section 13(a) of the act, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, by striking out the words "Peace Corps" which appear therein and substituting the word "President." This change merely reflects the fact that the act in itself does not create a Peace Corps agency, but confers authorities and functions upon the President.

IV. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Fiscal year 1964 will denote the third full year that the Peace Corps has been in operation. Except for a few isolated incidents the volunteers have performed well the tasks to which they have been assigned and their

presence and their accomplishments seem to have been genuinely welcomed and appreciated by the peoples of the countries and areas served.

As the committee noted both last year and the year before "the success of the Peace Corps will depend largely on the type of employees it has and the type of volunteers who will be sent abroad." The consistent overall high caliber of both employees and volunteers is markedly impressive.

The committee is satisfied with the Peace Corps' record of achievement to date and strongly recommends Senate approval of H.R. 9009.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which this bill was passed be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 217) to authorize a study of a national system of scenic highways was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF EULOGIES OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, DELIVERED IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

The resolution (S. Res. 230) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the eulogies of the late President, John F. Kennedy, delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on November 24, 1963, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the eulogies to the late President John F. Kennedy delivered in the rotunda of the United States Capitol on November 24, 1963, by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed five hundred and forty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which one hundred and three thousand shall be for the use of the Senate and four hundred and forty-one thousand for the use of the House of Representatives.

SAMUEL T. MOORE

The resolution (S. Res. 233) to pay a gratuity to Samuel T. Moore was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Samuel T. Moore, father of Harmon A. Moore, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

KATIE L. DISNEY

The resolution (S. Res. 234) to pay a gratuity to Katie L. Disney was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Katie L. Disney, widow of Francis L. Disney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works, certain information on water pollution control was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on water pollution control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.

HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE DEBATE TOPICS

The bill (S. 2311) to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to prepare compilations of pertinent excerpts, bibliographical references, and other appropriate materials relating to (1) the subject selected annually by the National University Extension Association as the national high school debate topic and (2) the subject selected annually by the American Speech Association as the national college debate topic. In preparing such compilations the Librarian shall include materials which in his judgment are representative of, and give equal emphasis to, the opposing points of view on the respective topics.

Sec. 2. The compilations on the high school debate topics shall be printed as Senate documents and the compilations on the college debate topics shall be printed as House documents, the cost of which shall be charged to the congressional allotment for printing and binding. Additional copies of such documents may be printed in such quantities and distributed in such manner as the Joint Committee on Printing directs.

PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY—SECOND INSTALLMENT"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 230) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax Exempt

Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 231) authorizing the printing of the study "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN SUPREME COURT OPINIONS INVOLVING OFFERING OF PRAYERS AND READING FROM BIBLE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 237) providing for the printing of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMVETS

The bill (H.R. 8751) to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS shall be printed as a House document was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is in order.

AMERICAN INDIAN CRAFTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the present administration of our Federal Indian policy there is a concerted effort being made to encourage the American Indian initiative in helping himself and the development of useful talents and industries. The most obvious success has been in the field of Indian arts and crafts. We have known for a long time about the crafts on certain reservations but not until recently did we realize the extent and quality of this work.

This month there are three exhibits in the Washington area which bring to sharper focus the fine arts and crafts that are being introduced by the American Indian. Now underway is the first one-man showing of the east coast of the paintings of Oscar Howe, the noted Sioux Indian artist. The main lobby of the Department of State is the site of an extensive exhibition of contemporary American Indian crafts. This exhibit includes objects from 30 States, including sculpture, jewelry, weaving, basketry, pottery, and a wealth of other items.

Later this month an exhibition of the traditional and new design concepts in objects handicrafted by Eskimos and Indians of Alaska will be opened at the Baltimore Museum of Art in Baltimore.

In discussing Indian art and crafts I would be derelict if I did not mention the extremely fine Museum of the Plains Indian at Browning, Mont. Also the December 1963 edition of the *Holiday* magazine contains a feature on "Our Indian Crafts" which I recommend to all.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board are to be highly complimented for their work in stimulating this creative work among our Indians and Eskimos.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the article which appeared in the December 1963 edition of *Holiday* magazine.

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

[From *Holiday*, Dec. 1963]

OUR INDIAN CRAFTS

(By Robert Phillips)

One of the most absorbing and admired pieces of sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City is a 30-foot-high totem pole carved by two Indians of the Pacific Northwest. The first time I saw it I wondered what it was doing in that setting. Was it modern? Was it art? That was years ago and I have since learned that assuredly it is both. But then I have also found that Indian crafts with their rich combination of decorative and symbolic art have universal appeal and stir the imagination as deeply as the creative work of any people.

The ancient Indian sketched men and animals on flat rock with colored clay or with a sharp stone. His wife wove a basket of reed yucca or grass so tightly it would hold water. Their whole existence revolved around two powerful, intertwined forces, nature and religion. Often ritual was woven into art, and always art into ritual, through ceremonial masks, costumes, dolls, sand paintings, and such.

The old religious ways are largely gone now, but the inspirational source remains. As René d'Harnoncourt, a man who knows his art and Indians, points out, "Now spiritual and functional values are replaced by purely esthetic values. But Indian work retains its fundamental feeling and sense of style. It remains a regional expression—the wood carver of the Northwest conveys the essence of the gloomy fogbound coast, the pueblo potter creates effects of the Southwest only."

D'Harnoncourt was the first general manager of the Department of the Interior's Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Until that Board was established early in the 1930's, the Federal Government had made every effort to replace Indian ways with white ways. The old art, language, and customs were not only discouraged, but suppressed. Creation of the Board marked a turning point—a decision to promote the economic welfare of the tribes through encouragement of their crafts. D'Harnoncourt approached the Indians with respect, and gave them the benefit of his vast background in the folk art of his native Austria and of Mexico. Through the years, the Board raised artisans' sights and standards. Under its present Chairman, Dr. Frederick Dockstader, director of the Museum of the American Indian in New York, it encourages the adaptation of traditional work into salable merchandise which harmonizes with modern dress and decor.

These craft items merit the attention of any discriminating shopper or decorator. Certainly the wild assortment of imitations fabricated everywhere from Brooklyn to Hong Kong emphasizes the value of the genuine article, which only the Indian can make. Let me take you around the country and point out some of my favorite artisans.

We begin far above the Arctic Circle, with the Eskimo basket weavers. At Point Barrow they make a basket of baleen, the long, slender fronds extracted from a whale's jaw, sometimes mistakenly called whalebone. The basket weavers, mostly men, first coil and soak the brownish-black blades, then split them into strips less than a half-inch wide. They weave the baskets on a base of walrus-tusk ivory, with incredible tightness and symmetry, perfectly round and about five inches high. Then they top them with an ivory carving—usually a walrus head—for the lid. Until recent years only a few baleen baskets could be found outside museums, and they sold for large sums. But these lovely pieces, which look like small ornamental sewing baskets, are now more generally available at prices of \$40 to \$50.

Many other handsome crafts, both useful and decorative, are produced by the Alaskan Indians and Eskimos. Ceremonial masks and driftwood carvings, inlaid with abalone shell, show a touch of surrealism and would feel in place on a modern wall. The ivory of the walrus tusk is carved into small, delicate figures of birds, penguins and the old walrus himself. Parkas and boots of caribou fur and moccasins of sealskin are the warmest of outer garments—and much less bulky than you would expect.

Among individual artisans to remember, there is Mrs. Ethel Washington, an Eskimo of Kotzebue, and a master skin sewer. In younger days she helped her husband fish and hunt the beluga, or white whale, and supplied the family with footwear and clothing. The women of Kotzebue make a doll family—man, woman and child dressed in parkas and mukluks—so faithful in detail they could serve as Eskimo models in any museum.

California is the hearth of basketry, where women of small, impoverished tribes continue the oldest of New World arts. The aboriginal Californians wove beautiful baskets, using bird plumage with techniques equaled only by the Peruvians and Polynesians. The greatest weaver of recent history was Dat-so-la-lee, of the Washoes, who transmitted the legend and lore of her tribe through 256 magnificent baskets before her death in 1925. Her finest piece, "Myriads of Stars Shine O'er the Graves of Our Ancestors," has no less than 86,590 stitches and is now valued at \$10,000. Though her work may never be matched, you can still purchase baskets of museum quality from women of the Washoe, Pomo and Hoopa reservations.

On the Hoopa Valley Reservation, for example, in the high, forested mountains northeast of Eureka, the basket makers weave white grass, black maidenhair fern, willow root, woodworth shrub and hazel. One of their designs is a progressive zigzag in brown and pale green, named "rattlesnake."

Among the northern California weavers, Mrs. Lizzie Smith combines the sense of the past with the needs of the present; she makes large cooking baskets for preparing pinole (a meal made from plant seeds) as her grandmother did. Mrs. Smith also makes finely woven wine bottle covers traditional in pattern but adaptable to any modern setting. The price is \$10. You can also order her more expensive baskets which combine porcupine quills, dyed yellow with lichen, and other materials in browns and beiges.

The tribes of the northern and southern plains create beadwork art, buckskin garments, feathered war bonnets and long fringed shirts that have been collectors'

items for years. They draw inspiration from a heritage of master painters who inscribed their shields with life forms and recorded history on buffalo hides. In fact their forebears used nearly every part of the buffalo in some way. From the hides women made clothing, tepees, and rawhide vessels. They plaited the hair into ropes and the sinew into thread, they carved the horns into spoons and made the skull a ceremonial altar.

Women of the plains also developed the art of embroidering with brightly colored porcupine quills. Such quillwork is purely Indian but unfortunately it is almost a thing of the past. Before the introduction of glass beadwork, young girls were taught to apply the quills to buckskin in many designs. Here and there this dying craft is still practiced, or at least demonstrated, and it may yet come back. But protecting the authentic beadwork is problem enough, since the Plains are presently being flooded with cheap Hong Kong imitations. If you want the real thing you must shop carefully; it is worth the effort.

The Bannock and Shoshone of Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, for example, produce exquisite and precise floral designs on beaded purses and moccasins. In the southern plains of Oklahoma, on the other hand, the Kiowa, Arapaho, Comanche and other tribes do bolder beadwork on suede, in geometric and medallion forms reminiscent of warriors' belts and bridles. Buckskin jackets with fringed yoke and beaded decoration sell for \$75 to \$125, suede for \$55. Beaded necklaces are \$3 to \$8, sturdy deerskin gloves, \$4.50, and rawhide baskets \$25.

In the upper reaches of North Dakota, the Turtle Mountain Chippewa are another tribe famous for beadwork. This area also produces a type of woodwork not found elsewhere: highly polished "diamond willow." The naturally grooved diamond shapes, caused by a fungus growth in the tree, become visible once the bark is removed. Whittlers make the most of the curving grains in the wood—and sometimes diamonds within diamonds—while fashioning lamps, chairs, bedsteads, and canes.

In Oklahoma, where 60 tribes number almost 58,000, the town of Anadarko has become one of the major Indian centers of the country. Here are located the Indian Hall of Fame and the Southern Plains Exhibit and Craft Center, and here is held, in mid-August (the American Indian Exposition featuring crafts demonstrations, ceremonies, and the National Indian War Dance Contest).

To show the genuine nature of the craft revival, I like to cite the example of the late Acee Blue Eagle, a distinguished Oklahoma Indian artist, who studied and lectured at Oxford, and became an articulate spokesman for his race. Although his primary interest was painting the lives of his people, their dances, their dress, and the land around them, he did exhaustive research in the ancient arts of ceramics, leatherwork, and jewelry. He traced the history of the Indians highly stylized little figures molded or carved as fetishes and charms, and of wooden figures carved on ceremonial staffs, spoons, or feast bowls. In museums he studied and sketched the way his ancestors treated the head, arms, legs, and feet in their art and tried to deduce a form of sculpture as characteristic of the Indian as their painting, beadwork, silver, and weaving.

At Pipestone, Minn., for three centuries the Sioux have quarried and carved ceremonial pipes. The "classic ground" George Catlin once called the sacred quarries. Catlin, artist, explorer, and devoted friend of the Indians, almost lost his life at the hands of the Sioux when he entered that ground in 1836. But he received his rewards: a pipe quarried for him by a chief, and the name "catlinite" later given to the smooth red stone.

The pipe filled a high role in tribal life. Treaties were arranged, lands acquired, and wars terminated over a pipe. But a pipe from these quarries was held in special esteem, for the red stone was believed formed from the flesh of the Indians' ancestors. The quarry is protected as Pipestone National Monument, and its use is reserved to Sioux members of the Indian Shrine Association. They preserve a vanishing skill in carving varieties of the highly ornamented plains pipe. The best known pipe, the Sioux calumet, has a wooden stem made of ash, 2 to 3 feet long, decorated with feathers, beadwork, or paint. On some pipes the stone bowl is carved in the form of a buffalo, bear, tomahawk, or eagle claw. Pipes sell for prices up to \$35; there also are smaller effigies of turtles, bears, and buffaloes suitable for paperweights and ashtrays.

North America's highest expressions of aboriginal art survive in the Southwest. Among the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, the Hopi on their high mesas in Arizona, the Navajo, Apache, and Papago, the way of life is tied to ancient heritage, culture, and religion. Many individuals cling to old rituals, the occult, the secret society; consequently the purest art forms are reserved for their own eyes and use.

But undoubtedly the Southwest, in a 200-mile arc around Gallup, N. Mex., offers the purchaser the greatest volume and variety of fine Indian crafts. The Hopi alone, in their three principal villages overlooking the Painted Desert, offer more types of significant items than any other Indian group in the country. The best known are the kachina dolls, effigies of the spirit rainmakers, carved of cottonwood root, painted with vegetable and earth colors and embellished with feathers, fur, and cloth. Thousands of Japanese-made clay and plastic kachinas are sold to people willing to be duped, yet the real thing can be bought for 85 cents or a dollar.

Each Hopi village has its specialty. The first mesa is the source of almost all decorated Hopi pottery, made by hand, without benefit of a potter's wheel, and fired in the open without a kiln. The most characteristic Hopi pottery is colored red, with intricate black designs—often conventionalizations of feathers of birds—following the contours of the jar or bowl. The second mesa produces beautiful baskets, exceedingly strong and durable, made of galleta grass and split yucca-leaf strips. Four colors, usually vegetable dyes of yellow, green, black, and rust red, are combined with the cream background of the yucca. The third mesa makes wicker baskets, not so durable (nor so expensive), from branches of the wild currant bush and rabbit brush.

The Hopi once were known as crude silverworkers and copyists of other Indians, but the Museum of Northern Arizona at Flagstaff has given them guidance and encouragement. Now Hopi silver has come into its own as a distinctive, desirable type to compare with that of the Zuni and Navajo. Hopi work is characterized by an overlay: a pattern of symbolic designs (often adapted from pottery) is cut out of a thin sheet of silver which is then soldered to the main silver bracelet or brooch. The two-layer effect is highlighted by the use of oxidation to darken the base and polishing to brighten the overlay. To be sure you are buying the genuine Hopi article, rather than a machine-made piece, look on the back for the emblem of the Hopi Silversmiths Guild, a sun shield.

The Zuni, whose pueblo reservation lies south of Gallup, are the undisputed masters of turquoise, the semiprecious stone which their forefathers carved into fetishes of spirits and animals. The use of turquoise for jewelry is far older than the use of silver. It was revered because it matched in color the deep-blue habitat of the gods; a piece of turquoise would protect its owner from dan-

ger and calamity; and turquoise deposits brought prestige to a community.

The Zuni jewelry of today has evolved over a long period. About 1830 the tribe began to fashion pieces from brass and copper. Later they learned from the Navajo how to work silver and make dies, and began to set turquoise in silver. The "squash blossom" necklace is their classic, with delicately cut stones clustered in blossoms and the crescent "Naja" silver pendant hanging beneath them. (Both blossom and Naja derive from ancient sources in the Mediterranean, and came to the Indians by way of Mexico; all the Indian meanings written into them by zealous traders are without foundation.) Quite different from the squash blossom, but equally overwhelming, is the Zuni inlay, vivid compositions of oxblood coral, green and blue turquoise, and gray abalone shell, representing the sun, rainbow, and thunderbird. Then there is channel work—narrow silver strips are soldered to form geometrical channels or cells, into which stones are fitted. The Zuni's most recently developed style, called nugget, combines polished rough-cut turquoise with nuggetlike silver pieces for a highly modern effect.

A large Zuni belt, bracelet, or necklace not only requires some courage to wear, but can be expensive. Smaller pins, rings, and earrings cost from \$2.50 to \$11. For the finest turquoise pieces, choose deep or clear colors and well-matched stones. "Spiderweb" stones, containing a delicate netting of black streaks of other minerals, are popular among the Indians. Deep blue is considered the choice color, but green is attractive, too. Stones to be avoided are whitish, flat-colored, or "doctored" turquoise—the last bathed in oil for temporary luster. There is also a tremendous assortment of cleverly made plastic imitations. Some of the finest Zuni craftsmen are employed at reputable shops in Gallup, where you can see the products made.

Navajo jewelry is different from the Zuni and Hopi—bolder and more forceful, with the accent on silver rather than turquoise. The Navajo learned their skill from Mexican silversmiths but have modified designs to express their own artistic feelings—and a Navajo squash blossom, Naja pendant or ornamental bow guard is unmistakable. From sheet silver they make discs called conchas (the Spanish word for shell) for belts, bracelets, and bolo ties. But the Navajo also pursue another method, sandcasting, in which the silversmith carves his design, freehand, on a mold of sandstone, then pours in molten silver to make heavy pieces for earrings, bracelets, belts, and buttons.

Among the whites who helped keep the real Indian talent alive, probably none wrote a more lasting record than Lorenzo Hubbell, called "Naakal Saani" (Old Mexican) in Navajo, and "King of Northern Arizona" in Yankee lingo. He lived in the company of good books and fine paintings in a sprawling adobe trading post, which he built in 1880 at Ganado, Ariz. To encourage Navajo silverwork, he imported Mexican silver, which is soft and easily worked; and it is said he once brought a Mexican platero, or silversmith, to live at his store and teach any Indian who wanted to learn. Among the first to work under Hubbell was the grandfather of Ambrose Roanhorse; now Ambrose is known by his people as "Beshlakal Natani" (the leading silversmith).

Other Indians may work well with silver, but when it comes to rug weaving the Navajo artist stands alone. The weaver, always a woman, shears her own sheep, scours and cards her wool, spins with a hand spindle, dyes with vegetable roots and leaves, and weaves at the side of her hogan on a simple vertical loom. Primitive? Possibly so, but the Navajo rug defies duplication. A remarkable part of its story is that vegetable-dye making was almost forgotten after the

introduction of German aniline dye and commercial yarn (for brighter colors and quicker sales). Yet in the past 20 years a generation of young women, who had to be taught anew, have surpassed their grandmothers in dye making, as well as in originality of design.

The genuine Navajo rug is practically indestructible and will last at least 50 years. It should not be acquired as a curio, but as a house furnishing. Scarcely anywhere can one purchase more hours of human labor and artistry. Some textile manufacturers have chosen Indian designs for products merchandised and carelessly bought as "Indian blankets." In the real thing, the warp is wool (many rugs are woven on cotton warp to save time), and the weft is twisted and battened down tightly. The best guarantee is a "certificate of genuineness" issued by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, attesting that the article is made altogether of local wool, locally handspun, woven entirely on a native Navajo loom.

The Navajo weaver has no pattern to copy but works before the loom with a preconceived vision fixed in her mind's eye. Varieties of rugs are identifiable by types of weave, design and color and are named for the section of the reservation where they are made or the trading post nearby. The Two Gray Hills, made throughout the central part of the reservation, uses only natural wools—white, mixed with darker wools to form gray and brown—with fine close weave, intricate design, and a border of symmetrical right-angle patterns. It is expensive; you can find an attractive Two Gray Hills measuring 34 by 62 inches for about \$175, but they run to as much as \$1,600. Crystal, made in the area around Crystal Springs, is generally woven with large weft and conservative colors in a tweed effect; it is most often used as a wall decoration and is medium priced. The Wide Ruins is light and finely woven, with soft natural and vegetable colors, in the ancient striped style. Prices begin at about \$130. The Tecnospos, from the northeast corner of the reservation near Shiprock, features many threads to the inch, with busy looking zigzag lines in various colors; actually, this pattern came into popularity with the new commercial yarns in early railroad days. The rug is thin but finely made and high priced. The larger, heavier Yelbelchal rug depicting symbolic figures of the healing ceremonial usually is not so fine in weft size, but is well woven and thoroughly battened down. It normally costs from \$75 to \$300.

Of all the world's pottery makers, only the American Indian has never turned to the potter's wheel. The work of Pueblo women, master potters for 1,500 years, shows little white influence. They still create their pots by rolling native clay into coils, painting them in earth colors freehand with a yucca leaf, and firing them over a bed of coals (with the vessels often covered with dry dung).

The pottery of each pueblo has its own style and uses. The best sources of utilitarian ware are Acoma (distinguished by its thinness), Zia, Zuni and Hopi. Among the most beautiful designs are the graceful, fanciful animal figures on the curving rainbow band of Zia ware. Best for decorative use are the heavy walled wares of Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque.

The ranking artist of the pottery world is still aged Maria of San Ildefonso. In 1908, when Dr. E. L. Hewett was excavating the cliff ruins in Frijoles Canyon, N. Mex. (now part of Bandelier National Monument), he observed the young wife of one of his workmen making utility pots of great beauty. He asked her to duplicate vessels newly unearthed from the ancient cave rooms, and so encouraged this woman, Maria Martinez, to take a leading role in renewing the art of pueblo pottery. Maria undoubtedly is one of the great Indian personalities of our time.

Among her many honors are the Palme Academieque of the French Republic and the Craftsmanship Medal of the American Institute of Architects. Through accident or experiment in firing, she and her late husband, Julian, created their black pottery, with a dull design against a polished body. The deep black is applied not by painting but by smoking—by enveloping the red-hot jars in caked manure. Other women have taken up the art; Legoria Tafoya, of Santa Clara, to name one, produces highly respected vessels that sell for \$5 to \$40.

The Indian School in Santa Fe includes a department of painting founded by the energetic Dorothy Dunn. It was she who encouraged Indian painters to study their graphic heritage—the high-spirited paintings on the great buffalo hides, the designs on shields and costumes, the motifs of quillwork and basketry. "Talk with the old people of your tribe," she urged, "and enlist their help in interpreting, preserving and developing Indian art. Then, from your own enriched knowledge, create and recreate."

Out of such study, pursued long and faithfully, emerged the so-called two-dimensional Indian style. It looks contemporary, though actually its strong lines and areas of flat opaque color have been characteristic of Indian art for centuries. Its subjects are equally ancient—sacred symbols such as the rain, rainbow and clouds, or expressions of the rhythm of the ceremonial dance, the grace of the horse, the speed of the antelope.

Mrs. Dunn's students have included Oscar Howe, Quincy Tahoma, Andrew Tsihnahjinnie, Allan Houser, Richard West, Harrison Begay—men whose work adorns the walls of the finest museums.

Before leaving the Southwest, let us mention the intertribal ceremonial, held at Gallup for 4 days in early August. Thousands of Indians, 5,000 Navajo alone, representing tribes from Alaska to Florida, come to watch and participate in rodeos, dances and exhibitions. Artisans work at their crafts in full view, competing for prizes before an exacting board of judges.

The Seminole, living in southern Florida's grass prairies, adapted a white man's craft to create a dress of striking effect. It began when the Seminole women took a liking to patchwork quilting. They tore cloth into strips, strips into pieces, then sewed hundreds of pieces together on hand-operated sewing machines. They have been doing it ever since and the traditional Seminole patchwork yields a rich variety of blouses, sports shirts, swim trunks, aprons and stoles. Price is determined by the number of design strips in the garments; skirts cost \$15 to \$35, aprons \$3.50 to \$5.

Twenty-five years ago, Tommie Parker, a Seminole woman living near Lake Okeechobee, began making and selling dolls. Others did the same, business grew and the Seminole Crafts Guild was organized.

Recently, at Dania, between the reservation in the Everglades and booming Fort Lauderdale, the tribe constructed a replica of an Indian village for tourists who had been getting most of their ideas of Seminoles from chickees (thatched huts) along the Tamiami Trail, and commercial "monkey jungles." Craftsmen demonstrate patchwork sewing, carve model canoes from cypress and make necklaces, earrings and baskets. In mid-July, ceremonials are staged; these give some idea of the real feasting, fasting and purification rituals, held deep in the glades, removed from the public eye.

I have saved the Cherokee of North Carolina for last because these great people synthesize the Indians' determination to survive and advance, as Indians, and to perpetuate their own crafts. Tremendous odds have been against them. Once their domain covered virtually the entire southern Appalachians. Their lands were stolen, their treaties violated. In the 1830's most of the

tribe were forcibly moved to the West by Federal troops over the infamous "trail of tears,"—a horrifying chapter of American history. Those remaining are descendants of the few who hid in the mountains and scratched the barest existence by farming the steep slopes. They endured official and public apathy and unending, frustrating changes in Government policy. Yet in the 1930's they achieved a revival of basket art as fine as anything done earlier, and today almost 20 percent of the eastern band derive some share of their income from a healthy, growing crafts industry.

Basketry owes much of its vigor to Lottie Stamper, a slender, soft-spoken but extremely determined Indian, a native of the town of Cherokee. Years ago the secret of the complicated double-weave was dying out, known to only one old woman who taught Mrs. Stamper to a certain point but refused to go further. Lottie struggled alone until she mastered the craft, then undertook to teach it to others. In 1939 she began teaching at the Cherokee Indian School. She showed her students how to collect their own materials—river cane, split oak, and honeysuckle vine, gathered early in the year before the snakes awake in the woods—and how to use roots and leaves for dyes. Consequently, many Cherokees now make fine baskets using the double-weave as it was practiced 200 years ago. And their teacher has become one of the most highly regarded craftworkers in the southern Appalachians.

One of my favorite craftsmen anywhere is James Going Back Chiltoskey, master whittler and wood sculptor, whose work is characterized by precision, realism, and smoothness. His favorite subjects are animals of the woodlands, carved in every wood from sugar pine of California to rockhard lignum vitae of the tropics, but he has also filled more church commissions for statues of Saint Francis than he can remember. At one time when Chiltoskey taught woodwork at the Indian school in Cherokee, a plump little girl named Amanda Crowe came to his class armed with pocketknife and half-whittled wooden rabbit; she had started carving almost before she could talk. She is now the teacher in woodcarving and sculpture. In her own right Miss Crowe has won national recognition for her work in almost every medium: wood, metal, ceramics, and terra cotta, including large, modern pieces selling for several hundred dollars.

Two hundred Cherokee craftsmen are members of the Qualla Arts and Crafts Mutual, whose annual sales have grown from \$7,000 in 1946 to \$41,000 last year. Recently this cooperative organization erected the most modern building in Cherokee as its headquarters. To indicate prices: baskets range from \$2 to \$23; linen guest towels are \$1.75; small carved animals, \$1.60, large ones \$6.75 up; and hand-carved cherry dolls \$6 up.

Among other tribes as well, ancient crafts are being preserved or revived. The Choctaw of Mississippi have renewed their basketry. So have the Makah, of Neah Bay, Wash. In upper New York State the last remnants of the great League of the Iroquois continue to make their false faces of wood and braided corn husks (though only a few have been found for sale, more are becoming available now).

This cultural story has far from reached its climax. In the fall of 1962 the Bureau of Indian Affairs opened a new Institute of Indian Art at Santa Fe to encourage students of all tribes. The Indian community is growing (the Navajo Tribe, for instance, at a greater rate than the national population). Wherever the Indian still lives on his own soil, he expresses spirit and history through his craft. As Dr. Frederick Dockstader, chairman of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, told me, "Crafts have brought a dignity, a pride of self, to the Indian, and

enabled the rest of us to discover his true genius."

FINDING THE AUTHENTIC

There is no harm in the purchase of pseudo-Indian merchandise, as long as the buyer realizes he is getting a machine-made facsimile. The trouble is that counterfeit items are sometimes sold at high prices, and it takes extreme care to avoid being led astray. The merchandising that I find least forgivable is the sale of Indian-type curios (made in Hong Kong) in some of the national parks, where concessioners are permitted to exercise their preference for high mark-ups and profits.

The best general rule to assure purchase of authentic Indian crafts is to shop only at tribal guilds or at dealers with a reputation for handling quality articles.

Buying from individual Indians who trade on street corners can be hazardous. Some sell cheap curios, such as pottery painted with poster colors after firing, or substandard items rejected by the guilds. Others sell 10-cent-store jewelry at five times what they paid. The truth is that few people can outbargain the Indian.

In shops, the most frequent misrepresentations are accomplished by association: The genuine and the machine-made are displayed side by side or intermingled, with the implication they are all genuine. The buyer should be alert to tricky labels ("Indian design," "Indian style," "Indian made") which are legal within the framework of a Federal law prohibiting fraudulent labeling of imitations. "Indian made" is often used for products made by machines operated by Indians, but by no means craft items. The buyer has the right to ask for a bill of sale with certification of authenticity, which no honest dealer will refuse. If you have questions about a purchase, or believe you have been duped, advise the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Indian paintings are becoming more widely available in the galleries of New York and other cities at prices ranging from \$35 to several hundred dollars. Annual shows are held at the Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla.; the New Mexico Museum of Fine Arts, Santa Fe; and at Scottsdale, Ariz. The Denver Art Museum and De Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco, have also played a large part in the encouragement and presentation of Indian paintings and drawings.

Craft items, authentic and carefully chosen, are sold at a few museums in major cities, including the Museum of the American Indian, New York, the Brooklyn Museum, the Museum of Art, Baltimore, the De Young Memorial Museum and the Museum of Fine Arts, San Francisco. The newest important display and sales outlet is the American Indian Arts Center, 843 Lexington Avenue (near 64th Street), New York, operated under the auspices of the Association on American Indian Affairs.

The following craft organizations are further reliable sources, well worth visiting in the course of one's travels. A few, which are indicated, provide mail-order lists. Even they may be slow in replying, though patience will provide its reward.

Alaska Native Arts & Crafts, Post Office Box 883, Juneau, Alaska (mail order).

Hopi Arts & Crafts Guild, Oraibi, Ariz.

Papago Tribal Store Enterprise, Box 296, Sells, Ariz.

Navajo Arts & Crafts Guild, Window Rock, Ariz. (mail order).

Hoopa Subagency, Hoopa, Calif.

Seminole Arts & Crafts Center, 6075 Stirling Road, Hollywood, Fla. (mail order).

Tama Indian Crafts, Route 2, Tama, Iowa.

Pipestone Indian Arts & Crafts, Pipestone, Minn.

Choctaw Craft Workers Association, Choctaw Area Field Office, Philadelphia, Miss.

Northern Plains Indians Craft Association, 804 North 29th Street, Billings, Mont. (mail order). Also the Museum of the Plains Indian, at Browning, Mont., includes an arts and crafts shop, operated by the Northern Plains Association.

Qualla Arts & Crafts Mutual, Post Office Box 76, Cherokee, N.C. (mail order).

Oklahoma Indian Arts & Crafts Cooperative, Post Office Box 447, Anadarko, Okla. (a part of the Southern Plains Indian Museum).

Sequoyah Indian Weavers Association, Tahlequah, Okla.

Tipi Shop, Sioux Exhibit & Craft Center, Box 1504, Rapid City, S. Dak. (mail order).

Shoshone Indian Craft Shop, Wind River Indian Agency, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

PHYSICAL EDUCATOR RESEARCH AIDS U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, very recently a most interesting and unique cooperative research project came to my attention. The project involved the graduate students of the physical education department at Montana State University and the Engineering Development Center operated in Missoula, Mont., by the U.S. Forest Service.

Briefly the graduate students work at the Development Center where new types of equipment for the Forest Service are used and they in turn attempt to evaluate the effects this equipment has on the men using it. It is my understanding that this is the only project of its kind. The project was recently presented to the national meeting of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues here in the Senate may be more fully informed on this unique project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the November 25, 1963, issue of the Missoulian and the presentation prepared by Wayne E. Sinning at Montana State University.

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

[From the Missoulian, Nov. 25, 1963]

PHYSICAL EDUCATOR RESEARCH EASES FORESTERS' TASK

Learning to teach, coach, be an administrator and do research—this is the life of a physical education graduate student at Montana State University.

The above picture shows graduate students in physical education at Montana State University doing research. How much energy does it take for that firefighter to carry his pack up a hill? Is the pack too heavy—too light—how does smoke, dirt, apprehension affect the amount of energy he will use? These are some of the problems these physical education graduate students are trying to solve.

The university's expanding graduate program in physical education has made it possible to obtain as graduate assistants a select group of students from various parts of the country. They are working toward master's degrees under the direct supervision of Wayne Sinning, head of the physical education graduate program. Their research activities are concentrated on this cooperative venture which is a part of the total

program in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics.

Missoula is the only place in the country where this particular type of research is being carried on in respect to Forest Service equipment. The effectiveness of the graduate program is enhanced by the unique cooperative enterprise agreement Montana State University has with the Missoula Equipment Development Center of the U.S. Forest Service.

The development center produces new types of equipment for Forest Service use. The graduate students attempt to evaluate the effects this equipment has on men using it. As compared to the old tools, are the new ones more economical in the use of human energy? Can a man do more work with them in the same amount of time? Another problem is to establish basic requirements and methods for measuring human effort and fatigue factors in the use of the new machines. Standards are being established to evaluate (1) the use of various safety items (respirators, goggles, guards, etc.), (2) working under adverse conditions (smoke, dust, heat, etc.), (3) operating various machines, (4) using various tools, and (5) using various methods of operating machines or doing work. Perhaps the greatest advantage to both the equipment development center and the department of health, physical education and athletics is that each can have a more extensive program for the evaluating of human performance than they could if they were working independently.

The equipment development center feels that the university will conduct research of this type on a higher level than that which could be attained were the center to do it themselves. Also, having an outside group such as the university personnel working on these projects provides a system of checks and balances that makes the evaluation program more objective and valid. It also felt that many indirect benefits will arise due to the accumulation of knowledge about human effort while performing forestry tasks.

This agreement gives direction to the research program of the department of health, physical education and athletics. Unless there is a unifying undercurrent of some sort running through the program, the research is too apt to become aimless and is nothing more than a matter of fulfilling thesis requirements.

It should be noted that this is not the only type of research that is pursued in the department, for studies more directly related to sports skills and physical fitness are also undertaken. Students who work under the terms of this research agreement may use the data for master's theses.

Many problem areas in development are being attacked in the project. The first of these is building firelines. There has been no real evaluation of different mechanical methods, or mechanical methods compared to older hand methods. The first studies in relation to this problem were completed this past year and additional ones are now underway.

Gear carrying and the development of testing equipment are also high-priority projects.

In addition to research and classwork, the graduate assistant must also help coach a varsity intercollegiate sport, teach physical education classes, attend all staff meetings, and participate in all department activities as a full-fledged staff member, thus obtaining an intimate knowledge of all phases of the department and how it functions. He also learns the intricacies of the profession as he works closely with the individual staff members. These duties plus a regular class load produce a topflight teacher-coach who will represent Montana State University and Montana with distinction.

A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT—A UNIQUE METHOD OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

(By Wayne E. Sinning)

INTRODUCTION

The difficulty of attaining financial support for research in health, physical education, and recreation is recognized. This report describes a method of support through a cooperative research agreement rather than through direct grants of money to a department or an individual. It is felt the general approach of this plan has possibilities for the support of research in health, physical education, and recreation pursued by departments in other colleges and universities.

The agreement discussed here has been made between the Montana State University Department of Health, Physical Education, and Athletics, and the Missoula Equipment Development Center of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.¹ The Equipment Development Center was established in 1952 as part of the northern region of the Forest Service. Its original responsibility was for aerial development for the entire Forest Service, but it has since expanded into the development of all types of forestry equipment. Much of this equipment is used by smokejumpers who parachute into remote areas to fight fires.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AGREEMENT

It is felt that this agreement has certain characteristics that are essential if any such agreement is to be workable. These characteristics are discussed separately.

Written contract: A memorandum of understanding was developed to the satisfaction of both parties and signed by the administration of both Montana State University and the northern region of the U.S. Forest Service.

Budget provision: The use of funds must be defined. Each party to this agreement operates on an independent budget. The main emphasis is that provision has been made for the cooperative development of projects rather than mutual expenditure of funds. If either party should contribute money to the other, supplementary agreements would be necessary. Under this arrangement, the research program could continue even though one party might find it difficult to secure funds for a certain budget period.

Provision for independent work: Materials developed together can be used in independent studies. Both the Equipment Development Center and the Montana State University Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics plan to do research independently of the other. When mutually developed materials are used for independent study, provisions must be planned within the framework of the total program.

Stipulations on the use of results: It is required that each party provide the other with copies of the results of research completed either cooperatively or independently. Also, any inventions arising from cooperative research on the part of either party must be fully disclosed through publication or patented and made available for free public use. Procedures have also been established for the publication of research results.

Organized cooperative planning: Programs are to be reviewed and cooperatively planned annually. Supervisory responsibilities and immediate objectives are established at this time.

¹ The original concept of this agreement must be credited to the chairman of Men's Physical Education at Montana State University, Mr. C. H. Hertler, and the Chief of the Missoula Equipment Development Center, Mr. H. K. Harris.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

Certain objectives have been established for the program. These objectives are presented here to show the scope of the program and the type of research that is being done. These objectives are:

1. To search for and evaluate published reports, conduct necessary research, and to determine basic and applicable methods for measuring and analyzing the physiological cost of doing prescribed forestry jobs.
2. To purchase, design, develop, or construct equipment as necessary (1) to establish basic requirements and methods for measuring human effort and fatigue factors, (2) to measure human effort and fatigue factors under field conditions, and (3) to transmit measurements to a recorder for control and analysis.
3. To develop standards for comparison of physiological cost of (1) various safety items (respirators, goggles, guards, etc.), (2) working under adverse conditions (smoke, dust, apprehension, etc.), (3) operating various machines, (4) using various tools, and (5) using various methods of operating machines or doing work.
4. To conduct laboratory and field tests and measurements of physiological cost of doing work, as determined by program directors and within guides or limitations established by the university and the Forest Service.
5. To conduct either related cooperative work which may be financed or approved by either or both cooperators.²

ADVANTAGES OF THE AGREEMENT

Perhaps the greatest advantage to both the equipment development center and the department of health, physical education, and athletics is that each can have a more extensive program for the evaluation of human performance than they could if they were working independently.

The equipment development center feels that the university will conduct research of this type on a higher level than that which could be attained were the center to do it themselves. Also, having an outside group such as the university personnel working on these projects provides a system of checks and balances that makes the evaluation program more objective and valid. It is also felt that many indirect benefits will arise due to the accumulation of knowledge about human effort while performing defined forestry tasks.³

This agreement gives direction to the research program of the Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics. Unless there is a unifying undercurrent of some sort running through the program, the research is too apt to become aimless and is nothing more than a matter of fulfilling thesis requirements. It should be noted that this is not the only type of research that is pursued in the Department, but studies in this project will be available to qualified graduate students. This agreement also helps the Department build a better laboratory faster due to the pooling of equipment.

CURRENT STATUS

Three studies are either in progress or near completion in this year's program. One student has completed a study of strength decrement while backpacking a typical Forest Service load on the treadmill at different grades with speed held constant. Another student is examining the use of a predic-

tive formula for determining energy expenditure during treadmill walking at rather severe grades. A third student will compare energy expenditure while building fireline with two types of mechanical trencher.

Both the university and the Equipment Development Center have contributed a considerable amount of equipment to the project this year. The Equipment Development Center has supplied a treadmill that their personnel designed and constructed, a tensiometer testing table, a calibrator for tensiometers, and is now having a cardiostomometer made. There are excellent opportunities for developing new equipment since the Equipment Development Center can utilize its shop facilities and engineering knowledge.

The university has also added much equipment. A room had been set aside for a laboratory and equipment purchased for the analysis of respiratory gases. This includes a 600-liter chain compensated gasometer, Douglas bags, a dry gas meter for field work, micro-Scholander apparatus, and miscellaneous materials essential to gas analysis.

FUTURE EMPHASIS

Two main problem areas in equipment development are being attacked early in the project. The first of these is building fireline. There has been no real evaluation of different mechanical methods, or mechanical methods compared to older hand methods. The first research in relation to this problem is now in progress and plans have been made to study this more next year.

Gear carrying is also an important problem. Once equipment has been dropped into backwoods areas, it must be brought out and returned to base areas. There has been a variety of equipment developed but nothing has really proven superior to backpacking by men. The study of pack carrying on the treadmill, which was mentioned earlier, is the first contribution here.

Development of testing equipment is also a high-priority project. Much of this development will merely be adapting existing procedures or tests, but each item will have to be tested and validated for the situations in which their use is anticipated.

IMPLICATIONS

This cooperative approach to research could have applications for other colleges and universities in other areas of research interest. For example, a similar arrangement could be made between a department and a public or private secondary school to study teaching methods; some phase of administrative problems related to health, physical education, or recreation, or for child development studies. Local industries might have problems similar to those of the Equipment Development Center and would possibly welcome some arrangement similar to the one described here. Another approach would be some form of written agreement between the physical education department and other departments in the same college or university where there is interest in similar research applications.

MONTANAN IS SPECIALIST IN
MIGRANT EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with each new administration there is always a great many new faces in the agencies and departments of the executive branch. Many of these are people who come from their home States to make a short or long term contribution in a field in which they have some expertise.

Many friends and acquaintances from Montana have come to the Nation's

Capital and are making considerable contributions. One of the most talented is the former superintendent of schools for Butte, Mont., George E. Haney. George Haney, a longtime friend, has just published a new book "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education" in his capacity as a specialist for the Office of Education. George is an acknowledged expert in the field of migrant education and the problems confronting the children of this country's migrant labor force.

George Haney did a great job as superintendent of schools in Butte and is doing even greater things within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to add my congratulations and good wishes to the many others for his accomplishments in this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a feature story which appeared in the December 8, 1963, issue of the Montana Standard.

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

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., Dec. 8, 1963]

EX-BUTTE MAN IS AUTHOR

George E. Haney, former superintendent of schools for Butte, now in Washington, D.C., where he is specialist in education for migrant children, has achieved distinction as an author in that field.

Haney, with the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been praised in educational circles and has had articles published in several educational journals, including School Life, official journal of the Office of Education.

FIRST WORK OF ITS KIND

His book, "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education," is the first of its kind to be written in the U.S. Office of Education. It is already receiving wide circulation in school districts, libraries, teacher training institutions and in educational associations of the Nation.

His pamphlet, "The Education of Migrant Children," has been in such demand that there already have been reruns for additional needed copies.

The publication "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education," was written by Haney after visits to several States where he reviewed educational facilities and programs for migrant children.

Highlights of the work include a study of seven States with educational programs for migrant children which defines certain specific problem areas and areas of needed research.

Among principal points outlined in the publication are:

Migratory children attend school irregularly, become academically retarded, and pose future educational problems for society.

There is evidence suggesting a definite trend in planning and organizing educational programs for these children on a State level.

One means of improving educational programs for migrant children lies in the growth of makeup summer school programs. In California, the State provides three-fourths of the costs and the school district one-fourth for operation of summer schools for migrant children. In six States, the State agency provided 100-percent reimbursement of the current operation expenses for such classes.

²From the contract covering the agreement, pp. 1-2.

³From a conversation with Mr. H. K. Harris, chief, Missoula Equipment Development Center, Missoula, Mont.

NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

In "Questions and Answers on the Education of Migrant Children," Haney reports that it is estimated there are 320,000 to 500,000 migrant children, including those who do not move with their parents.

The majority of domestic migratory farm-workers in the United States includes Spanish-speaking Americans, Negroes, native whites, Puerto Ricans, and some Indians. The majority are of Mexican origin.

The migrant workers follow the Florida harvest starting in the winter. In the spring they move up the coast to New England. They follow the sugarbeet and fruit movement through Texas, and into the North Central, Mountain and Pacific Northwest States. Grain harvesting extends through Montana, North Dakota and even into Canada, with California and other Pacific Coast States, attracting workers in the fruit, vegetable and nut harvesting fields.

Haney also has prepared material for legislation on education for migrant children and the Domestic Service Corps. He served as a member of the Committee on Migratory Labor, and on other committees in that field.

Haney was city superintendent of schools here from July of 1952 to June of 1961. He and his wife, Alice, reside in Alexandria, Va. A son, Michael, a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is now an engineer with a large aircraft company in the East. A daughter, Marlyss, is married to an Air Force officer, Lt. Donald Erickson.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT BENEFITS WEST VIRGINIA AND THE NATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, November 26, the Senate of the United States approved S. 2265, the amendment to Library Services and Construction Act. It was my responsibility to express support for this measure on the previous Friday during the debate, just prior to the tragic announcement of the death of President Kennedy. As I remarked on that occasion, the library bill is one of the most important measures to be considered by this body during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. It was, therefore, a matter of the keenest satisfaction to note at the time of the vote on this measure that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate shared enthusiasm for this legislation.

During the past two centuries, the American public library has frequently been called the university of the people. It is a unique educational facility in that it offers the opportunity for learning to all who wish to enter its doors. There are no qualifications to be met or examinations to be passed by those who choose to use it. Serving the interests of people of all ages and from every type of life, it provides materials and services which can meet the user on his own terms and at his own level of need.

In 1956 the Congress recognized the importance of public libraries by passing the Library Services Act—Public Law 597, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended. These grants for rural public library development have had a degree of success well beyond the amount of Federal funds involved. Since 1961 all eligible States and territories have been participating in this matching-grant, State-plan program. The accomplish-

ments of the Library Services Act have been recognized and appreciated by librarians and congressional sponsors of the bill, and also by State and local officials. I know of its value to the millions of citizens in rural areas who have received and who have used substantially improved library services. Our experience with this program, limited though it has been to areas of less than 10,000 population, offers conclusive evidence that Federal, State, and local governments can join forces in an effective partnership to achieve mutually desirable goals.

The accomplishments in West Virginia have been noteworthy. In our State, 103,464 rural residents who had no library service whatever prior to the Library Services Act program now have access to public libraries of their own. In addition to these, 429,286 people in 29 counties have had their existing public library services expanded and improved. West Virginia has purchased 12 new bookmobiles under our State plan and these units are now operating in demonstration projects and in the various regional libraries. In one such regional library, serving Harrison and Upshur Counties, both the number of volumes available and the number of books loaned doubled between 1956 and 1961. The collection grew from 49,087 to 100,216 and the circulation of these books rose from 103,466 to 200,432.

These gains are very real and most satisfying, but even after 7 years of determined effort much remains to be done. In the country as a whole, more than 18 million Americans have no public library. Almost 110 million more have woefully weak libraries. Many of these can offer only small and obsolete collections, overcrowded or dilapidated quarters, and they are often open for use only a few hours per week.

In West Virginia, 716,026 citizens are without local public libraries. Of the thousands who have only inadequate service, nearly 500,000 are in urban areas which cannot participate in the present program. The proposed amendment to the Library Services Act will offer an effective tool for assisting the State to come to grips with this distressing situation. Of the \$25 million authorized annually for the improvement of services, West Virginia would be eligible for an annual allotment of \$301,862 to be matched by the State each year with \$181,736.

As we evaluate the accomplishments of the Library Services Act and at the pressing needs yet to be met, one fact is clear. It is the very success of the present program which has helped show us the way to greater achievement. The present limitation of benefits to areas of under 10,000 population has been a serious obstacle to the organization and maintenance of high quality library units. All of the States have recognized the economy and the efficiency to be obtained by building rural library systems around more highly developed libraries, which are in urban centers. Because these libraries are prohibited from benefiting, directly or indirectly, under

the present law, they have had little incentive to participate in any of the demonstration programs. As a result, further rural library development in many places has been handicapped.

The Library Services and Construction Act which we have just approved removes this artificial population restriction. The inclusion of urban areas will allow State plans to build substantial programs of library extension and improvement on the library resources of the larger cities. In this way, the improved library facilities and resources can be shared by all users regardless of their places of residence. Therefore, it can be said that in order to accomplish the original purpose of the rural library program, the urban libraries must become fully participating partners in the State plans for library development.

Another imperative need for this legislation is to help the urban libraries themselves. The rapid increase in our population, particularly the growth in metropolitan areas and the swarming suburbs, is creating a tremendous concentration of demand on the library facilities in these areas. More than 60 million people in these metropolitan sections have inadequate public library service because of submarginal budgets. The proposed amendment to the Library Services Act will encourage a system of libraries in which the small, the medium-sized, and the large public and regional libraries will be strengthened to better serve the educational needs of the Nation.

In order to stimulate and encourage the growth of a public library system of real excellence, more is needed than assistance for operating expenses. The ability of any library to respond adequately to the needs of its constituency is directly related to the adequacy of its physical plant. The present Library Services Act specifically prohibits the use of funds for the purchase or construction of buildings, or for the purchase of land. This restriction has unquestionably retarded both the extension of service into rural areas and the involvement of urban libraries in the program. Too often there has not been room to house an enlarged book collection or the necessary staff specialists.

The Library Services and Construction Act will authorize an appropriation of \$20 million for the construction of public library buildings. In West Virginia the allotment for construction would be \$241,894. The required matching expenditures would be \$145,389. I am confident that this modest inducement will effectively stimulate West Virginia communities to renewed activity in the construction of public library buildings.

My commitment to the American free public library as an educational agency is constant and unequivocal. My confidence in the Library Services and Construction Act as a sound and substantial contribution to better libraries is equally strong. I was gratified, therefore, to cast my vote, along with 88 of my colleagues in the Senate, in favor of passage of this eminently desirable library legislation.

REFLECTIONS ON THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our respected colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, has delivered a most impressive address to the 50th anniversary dinner of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Speaking on Sunday, December 1, Senator NELSON said:

America is in the midst of a crisis. In an hour of unprecedented challenge at home and overseas it has lost through senseless murder the gifted man who led the Nation so well and who we now discover had won the confidence of the civilized world to a rare degree.

Senator NELSON said further:

It is a crisis borne out of hatred and violence in the mind of a man. * * * It is important that the people of America know the origin of this crisis for only then will they know how to face it.

Mr. President, because of the excellence of this address, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON AT PFISTER HOTEL DINNER MEETING MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

I have refrained from making any public comment on President Kennedy's tragic death, in the long week of agony which has followed, because I knew nothing I could say which was adequate for such an awful occasion.

Throughout these empty days, as I stood before the casket in the rotunda and beside the grave in Arlington Cemetery, I had the same chance all of you have had to reflect on how it happened, and on where we go from here.

Now I am called upon to speak and to a unique organization—one which has spent 50 years fighting hatred—and finally it seems that there is something which clearly must be said.

America is in the midst of a crisis. In an hour of unprecedented challenge at home and overseas, it has lost through senseless murder the gifted man who led the Nation so well and who, we now discover, had won the confidence of the civilized world to a rare degree.

This is a crisis created not from the rival aspirations of powerful nations, or the inexorable swings of the economic cycle, or by some great disaster of nature.

It is a crisis born out of hatred and violence in the mind of a man—a hatred which may have had no logical basis and yet which grew until it could be contained no longer, and then it burst out and killed our President.

It is important that the people of America know the origin of this crisis, for only then will they know how to face it.

If there was any doubt as to the origin of the crisis in the moments following the assassination, it should have been erased in the hours and days which followed. For a moment we didn't know what to fear. There was a killer on the loose. Who was he? Where would he strike next? Was he an enemy agent? Was he part of an armed band?

It almost seemed as though we tried to detect some plot or plan to bring some semblance of sense, some discernible motive to this senseless deed.

But we soon learned there was no sense, no plot, no motive that rational men would recognize. Only a strange and frightening and powerful kind of hate, which turned an insignificant and unsuccessful young man into a powerful enemy of America.

President Kennedy was assassinated by one man's hate, and all the world must pay the price.

All the Secret Service men and all the policemen in Dallas couldn't save him.

Then we swiftly learned that no one is safe once hatred is unleashed in the land—not even a man in a police station surrounded by 60 policemen and lighted by the glare of nationwide television. Hatred—unreasoning, senseless—broke through what was thought to be perfect security, and killed again.

Nor did it end there. Hatred breeds hatred, and the senseless hate killings in Dallas sowed a whirlwind of threatening telephone calls, aimed at attorneys and policemen and frightened mothers and little children.

Still numb from the shock of our great loss, many of us seem to be looking around, wondering where the violence will break out next.

This is the crisis we face.

What can we do about it?

I have heard the suggestion that the finest memorial we could erect to John F. Kennedy would be swift enactment of the civil rights legislation to which he had courageously committed his whole future political life.

I couldn't agree more. For this would be a lasting, a living, and a growing memorial. It would advance the cause for which President Kennedy was willing to give his life—the cause of representative democracy founded on equality before the law—and it would strike at the very terror which took him from us.

It seems out of place now to discuss the technicalities of civil rights legislation, and perhaps that is a good thing. What matters now is not whether we use the interstate commerce clause, or the 14th amendment, or whether the Republicans or Democrats get credit or blame. What matters is that our exalted system of government, faced with a great crisis born of hate and violence, respond to that crisis by repudiating hate and proclaiming justice and equal treatment for all our citizens as the unquestioned law of the land.

No other act could so swiftly redeem our American reputation before the court of world opinion.

But even if we are successful in passing a civil rights bill, I think much still remains to be done before the crisis resulting from the President's death can pass from us.

By passing a civil rights bill, we can remove hate from the official acts of State and Federal Government.

The next step is to remove it from our hearts. Only then can we be safe from this menace.

The fact is, we have been on a collision course with hatred and violence in this country for a long time. Hatred has been steadily becoming a standard form of political activity.

The list of the targets of hate seems to grow longer each day:

Chief Justice Earl Warren, a warm-hearted and wonderful man whose service to democracy has been matched by few men, now hated by many even in the State which repeatedly elected him to high office by overwhelming majorities;

Adlai Stevenson, a man with the soul of a poet and a gift for exemplifying democracy which has made him beloved around the world;

Eleanor Roosevelt, the First Lady of the world, who came to symbolize humanitarian compassion, and who is still hated, even in death.

The United Nations, the first real step toward the brotherhood of man which we all profess to believe in, and especially that branch of it, UNICEF, which collects pennies to buy milk for hungry children regardless of their commitment in the cold war.

The National Council of Churches, and the newly appointed Secretary of the Navy, because he once served as a Christian layman on a Council of Churches committee which sought a way to avoid a nuclear war.

The U.S. State Department.

The New York Times—and much of the time, all the major communications media of the Nation. And here at home, newspapers, such as the Milwaukee Journal, whenever they have spoken out forthrightly against demagogues and tried to stem the tides of hate.

I could cite hundreds of individuals and institutions who belong on this list—who are the regular targets of hate letters which come to my office and spread all across the Nation.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has been fighting hate movements such as this for 50 years. I don't need to tell you of the danger those groups present because you know from hard and brutal experience where hatred can lead.

You know that the first swastika scrawled on a synagogue wall, the first rabble-rousing speech by a politician feasting on hate, can lead to the murder of 6 million people in gas chambers and ovens.

And you have learned first hand that one form of hatred breeds another, and so you have not been content to fight just for your own heritage and your own freedom, but for the freedom and dignity of all men. I saw the banners of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish organizations in the great march on Washington back in August, and it struck me at the time that those banners have been marching in this cause much longer than the rest of us.

Even in the darkest crisis, we must find hope, and my hope today is that the assassination of President Kennedy will bring home to the American people the consequences of hatred—just as the assassination of the Jews of Europe brought this message home to the world almost two decades ago.

Our democracy cannot survive unless hatred perishes. That is the real message of the tragedy of Dallas.

We cannot seek comfort in the belief that the hate groups are a minority and that we can triumph over them through the political process, because we saw in Dallas what even a minority of one can do to a free society.

Furthermore, we cannot deal with the hate groups in the conventional political way because that simply spreads and aggravates the disease. Hate groups, by their very definition, will not accept defeat at the polls, or in open debate, or in the jury box. If they are outvoted, they will become all the more implacable, all the more convinced that they are the victims of some dark and sinister plot which lurks behind the scenes and explains why they have not been able to win. Then we turn to hating them because they are saying such hateful things about people and institutions which we cherish so.

And when that happens—and it happened some time ago in this country—we are headed down the road to violence.

That is why I say that all of us must forswear hatred and violence if America is to survive this crisis.

I think this would be easy to do if we understand what hatred is and how foolish it is in a healthy mind and a free society.

Hatred is a defense mechanism. It is a refuge into which a mind retreats when it is frightened and doesn't know what to do. It is a kind of alibi or a hideout.

But it is a very poor defense and a very insecure hideout.

In a democratic society such as ours, we have no right and no need to use hatred as a political weapon. We have an open society. We have a great free press—which demonstrated in the days after Dallas its tremendous ability and devotion to informing the public. It is utterly ridiculous for us to think in terms of plots and conspiracies involving the Supreme Court and the State Department—or the Knights of Columbus—because these grandiose secrets simply cannot dwell in a free and open society.

Furthermore, we have the greatest opportunity of any people in history to redress our grievances, to speak our piece, to amend and repudiate any policy of which we have reason to disapprove. We don't need to write on walls; we can write to our Congressmen or our President or our local newspaper, and have a far greater impact.

We don't have to resort to firearms, because we have the election ballot.

And this is a point which many Americans who glorify the ultimate resort to firearms should remember. There are guns all over the world. They have been passed out to the masses time and time again, and used by men with high hopes to shoot their way to freedom. But nowhere have guns alone bought freedom. Only where the guns have been laid down and an orderly society of law and order established in their place, has there ever been freedom. Everywhere else we have simply had unfinished revolutions, where the guns would simply pass from one side to the other, and the killing would go on and on with no logical end.

The difference between the American Revolution and the revolution in Cuba, for instance, is that Americans used their revolution to end tyranny and substitute law and order, while in Cuba it was used merely to substitute one tyranny for another.

So history proves conclusively that hatred must end if an orderly society is to survive. We must banish it from our national life—and we must banish it from our own minds. We must recognize that hatred is a disease, a definable form of mental illness, and one which we all must guard against.

The New York Times interviewed psychiatrists who speculated on the mental illness that undoubtedly had gripped the President's assassin. In that story they pointed out that a paranoid is one who attributes his failures to the enmity of others. He says, in effect, "I hate you because you hate me." The psychiatrists said the paranoid twists actual situations, while the schizophrenic makes them up out of whole cloth. And then one psychiatrist added the comment that those labels are inexact because these symptoms appear in all gradations, and there is a little of them in all of us.

That is our enemy—that bit of hate in all of us which can grow and create a national crisis.

The human mind can be excused for acting strangely because it seems that the times are making more terrible demands on us with each passing year.

But we had an example this week of how a real person can react to the most terrible tragedy—without seeking refuge in the hideout of hate.

If ever a person was justified in such a reaction it was Jacqueline Kennedy. Here was a young woman who, we have long known, did not really like the awful demands which politics makes on a man and his family. I think many of us have felt that Mrs. Kennedy wished the Nation would allow her and her children to have a little more of her husband. And I think all of us must know how she reacted in recent months to the vicious and bitter personal attacks on her husband in many parts of the Nation.

With that background, think what that assassin's bullet did to her. Who would have been surprised if she had cried out in hatred at that empty window from which the fatal shot came? Who would have criticized her if she had been bitter at the Dallas police, and the Secret Service, and the very office of President, and the Nation itself.

But she quickly saw—as each of us must see—that this was not the thing to do. She realized that the way to triumph above hatred is to vow that you will not let it win in you or anywhere else. When senseless hatred stole her husband, she moved to protect what was left—her own dignity and that of her children, and the shaken confidence of an entire Nation.

I need not dwell on what this has meant to the American people. Every commentator has seen it and extolled it already.

In an hour of the darkest crisis, the wife of the President did the most important thing she could do. She helped the Nation decide whether to wipe out its grief in a binge of hate, or to wipe out hate itself.

We all have seen her towering example. Now it is up to us.

PROTECTION FROM EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Tariff Commission heard representatives of the livestock industry who were asking that beef, beef products, lamb and mutton be eliminated from the preliminary negotiation list. It had been proposed that the tariff on these commodities be eliminated or reduced by as much as 50 percent in the upcoming GATT negotiations.

Several of the statements that were presented to the Tariff Commission have been made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These statements clearly demonstrate that there is a need for protection from the excessive imports rather than a further reduction of tariffs. I am hopeful that the Tariff Commission will strike these commodities from the negotiation list and that corrective action will be taken by our Government.

Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho presented a statement to the Commission which deserves the attention of the Senate. He speaks with great wisdom and understanding. LEN JORDAN has been a farmer, a rancher, and an economic adviser as well as serving as Governor of his State. Thus, he knows and appreciates the problems experienced by our livestock industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement which reflects the spirit of the livestock industry of Idaho and the Nation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN OF IDAHO AT HEARINGS BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND THE TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 10, 1963

I am U.S. Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho, and I am making this statement to you in the interest of the livestock producers, feeders, and processors of my State and in addition for the livestock industry and the consumers of this country.

Agriculture is the economic lifeblood of Idaho and most of the other Western States. Livestock is the keystone of our agriculture economy. More than one-fourth of our total

returns from agriculture in 1962 were from the sale of livestock and of course the largest part of our agricultural sales of feed grains and hay were for livestock feed.

American consumers expect quality in their meat purchases and they have been able to get it. Our citizens consume one-third of the world's total supply of beef and veal. They rate far above world averages in sheep and mutton consumption and in the use of pork products. They have always been assured of an adequate supply of high-quality meats from American farms. In addition, the production, feeding, and processing of American meat products give job insurance to millions of our workers. The livestock industry in our western country gives direct and indirect benefits to grain growers, feed plants, merchants, implement car and truck dealers, the transportation companies, and many, many others. This in turn creates buying power to keep industrial workers employed.

In Idaho in a 1960 survey made by our own University of Idaho, it was determined that the capital investment in the beef cattle industry was \$441 million, which included land, buildings, machinery, feed, supplies, and cattle. The income in 1960 was approximately \$56,400,000 and the expenditures about \$36,200,000, but the expenditures did not include labor charges for the operator or his family nor for interest charges. It is estimated the average investment per animal was about \$325, not including the value of the animal.

Our sheep industry in Idaho is carried on by some 2,000 owners and operators on farms, ranches, and ranges, with about 1 million head of sheep of which approximately 820,000 are breeding ewes. There has been a marked reduction in numbers in recent years because of the profit squeeze. Costs have risen and prices received have declined. The average expenditure for each breeding ewe in Idaho is approximately \$25 per head per year. The average return per ewe per year is \$20 for a 110-pound lamb and \$6.20 from the sale and Government support price on a 10-pound wool clip. This leaves a profit of \$1.20 per head but does not include death losses and replacement costs. When these are added, an actual loss is shown. An investment of \$40 for each ewe is indicated in lands, improvements, and machinery. This does not include the value of the ewe herself. These capital investments for cattle and sheep operations furnish much of our property tax base, which maintain our schools, road systems, and county government. It is an essential and integral part of our whole economy. With Idaho still 65 percent federally owned, we must maintain and enlarge, if possible, our tax base.

The breeding, raising, grazing and feeding of livestock coordinate the use of our private, State and Federal lands. We need your assistance and support to maintain this balance of use and earnings.

The average prices of all classes of cattle are down about 10 percent below 1 year ago. There can be no question but that increased imports of beef, veal, and meat products are largely responsible for this. Our own production has increased slightly to keep pace with local needs from about 2 percent per year over the past 5 years with the exception of 1962 when the increase was 4 percent. Meat imports, on the other hand, have increased 60 percent from 1958 to 1962, and imports of meat and meat products during January to August, 1963, were up 22 percent above the same period in 1962. We are told that 80 percent of these are from boneless beef, but that competes with utility cows and aged ewes, and they in turn compete with higher grades of beef and mutton, so the whole price structure is affected.

The consumers in the United States need protection as well as the producers. When

high quality meat can be produced here at reasonable prices and the profits from such livestock operations furnish local employment, there seems no reason to increase import quotas or to lower import tariffs. We must keep the industry healthy, prosperous, and growing. It is my earnest request that you carefully weigh all the factors involved and that the members of this Commission, as well as members of the Trade Information Committee, recommend proper action to protect our livestock industry against imports of livestock and meat products which threaten to topple the whole structure.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CABINET LEVEL SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on November 5, 1963, Dr. Michael F. Walsh, director of development for Vernon Court Junior College in Newport, R.I., and former commissioner of education in my State, delivered an address before the annual Teachers' Congress at St. John's University in New York in which he advocated the establishment of a separate Cabinet-level post for Secretary of Education.

This is an address with which I wholeheartedly concur, and which I believe commends itself to all persons interested in the educational system in the United States. We find ourselves constantly talking about the problems in education, and in fact, for the first time in some years, we are actually devising and passing constructive legislation to meet the growing needs of this Nation. But we merely indulge ourselves when we, at the same time, fail to make provision at the highest Federal level for the direction and coordination of far-reaching Federal programs in this field.

The education of the youth of America ranks equally with any program undertaken by government. It demands the full efforts and resources of a separate Department of Education which under the guidance of a Secretary of Education, can plan and coordinate with the States and local communities and thus help develop our system of education to its very highest potential.

In this regard, I commend the efforts of my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, who has introduced two bills, H.R. 9160 and H.R. 9161, which would create separate Departments of Education and Health.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD, Dr. Walsh's speech before the Teachers' Congress be reprinted in full.

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

SPEECH OF DR. MICHAEL F. WALSH, DELIVERED AT ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, BROOKLYN, NOVEMBER 5, AT ANNUAL TEACHERS' CONVOCATION

In responding to the challenge, "Crucial Issues in Crucial Times," it is imperative that one at first consider the position of the United States in its international, as well as its national setting. One must approach this problem on the local, State, and national stage with the background of America's welfare at heart. And on this stage of

crucial times, American education must play a crucial role. For as our Nation stands at the crossroads of many national and international complexities, one might well ask American educators and leaders "Quo Vadis—Whither Goest Thou."

Upon the answer to this question may well rest the future happiness and success of millions of American youth, who are at present sitting in our classrooms. For the youth of today demands leadership—a dynamic leadership that is farsighted. A leadership that can visualize the drama on the stage of tomorrow upon which American youth must play its part in American citizenship. To the degree that such a part will be played will be dependent in no small measure upon the intelligent leadership that American educators exert now and upon the loyal and dedicated service of teachers to the great cause and philosophy upon which this Government of a free people is based.

Perhaps at no time in the history of our country, outside that of actual fighting warfare, has the future of this Nation been so seriously threatened and challenged as it is in this day and age. I say outside of actual warfare because, in fact, we are at war. This war is not on the battlefield of bloodshed. It is a socioeconomic warfare that will be long and lasting and that will test to the limit the intelligence, the fortitude, and the patience of the American people.

American educators must come face to face with these issues and in so doing make adjustments in the curriculum of our schools so that the youth who are in their formative stages might be properly prepared to face these issues when they enter the world of affairs.

The America of today is not that of yesterday. No longer are we isolated from Europe. What took 7 to 8 days to travel from shore to shore, now takes but a few hours. What took seemingly unending hours and hundreds of ships to transport troops to the shores of Europe during World Wars I and II now can be accomplished through airlift in a matter of hours.

Dramatic changes have been made in our social relations with other nations of the world, and for that reason dramatic changes must be made in our educational system to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Think of the many small nations of the world since the two World Wars that have either secured their independence or are striving for it. They are seeking recognition and economic security. And we must not forget when we think about these nations that they are doing now what the Colonies did in 1775—they are breaking away from tyranny and suppression. We, too, rebelled against tyranny and suppression and from our rebellion came a free people, which people founded a government that was dedicated to the principle of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We hear murmurs in every walk of life about aid to foreign nations, but what would have happened to the colonies had the French nation turned a deaf ear to the pleas that we made during the time of the Revolution? This world of ours is in a state of evolution, and we must be prepared to meet the changes that such evolution will bring about.

Let us look at the horizon and take cognizance of the problems that hover about us and the challenge that they present to our educators. We see such disturbing forces as communism, integration, the Common Market, automation, 35-hour week, adult education, explosive population, dropouts, just to name a few.

These are some of the crucial issues that must be faced in this crucial age. These issues must be faced realistically and the students who are now in school must be made aware of their existence and taught ways and means of living with them. These will be their problems. What are the steps

that must be taken in order that our youth will be properly prepared?

In the first place, I believe that our educational system should be more sharply pointed toward American needs and American welfare. By that I mean that the attention of our educational leaders and teachers in every city, town, and hamlet must begin to direct their attention toward the problems of the National Government. Our educational sights must be lifted. In the perpetuation of a free people, ignorance becomes a mortal enemy, and the strongest defense against this enemy is a strong educational system. As a first step, I believe that the Federal Government must establish a position of Secretary of Education, separating it from Health and Welfare, paralleling that of the Secretary of Defense. Such Secretary should have as a support an advisory council of approximately 20 outstanding citizens from all walks of life, who have a deep and sincere interest in the national welfare and who also have a knowledge of the crucial place that education must play in the defense of our Nation.

Such a move, I believe would tend to draw the attention of all those in the field of education toward a centralized point in our Government. Educational leaders can no longer limit their sights to the boundaries of the community in which they live; they must adopt an educational philosophy which spells out in no uncertain terms the needs of the Federal Government, and instruction in the classrooms must be pointed to such needs. Our teachers must become alerted to the problems that America is facing, for it is only when they have the proper information on hand that they will be able to introduce such knowledge into their subject matter and their classroom discussion.

America needs a Secretary of Education, for education is now a vital factor in the preservation of our freedom and our economy. The United States can no more depend upon isolated, unattached systems of education to perpetuate freedom any more than the Defense Department could depend solely upon the State militia or National Guard to defend our country in the face of an invasion of an enemy.

The demands that have been made on the Secretary of Defense, the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of State in the past decade have been staggering. And many of their problems hinge upon American education. So great are the demands upon education, as on the various other agencies of National Government, that no longer can education be limited by State boundaries.

We must perish the thought that in the face of today's national and international problems that education is the function of the State alone. We must free ourselves from such antiquated ideas and face the facts of modern life realistically. Our educational system, if we are to face the critical issues in a critical age, must be nationalized. There must be established in Washington a strong, vigorous, and progressive Department of Education, which will be held responsible for strengthening American education on all levels, kindergarten through the university. There must be a rebirth of loyalty and dedication to those American principles that are the foundation rock of a free society. And a free society can only be maintained and made more secure by the complete education of all its citizens. A strong and vigorous educational system stemming from the National Government could well be the instrument whereby peace is retained and the principles of American philosophy spread throughout the world.

I do not mean to suggest that the Federal Government control the educational systems in the respective States. I do mean, however, that there should be a binding together of all our efforts toward the commonwealth—the development of a triumverate composed

of the Federal Government, the State, and the local community.

This leads to the next crucial step, and that is the problem of financing. Local communities and States have reached a breaking point in their attempts to provide adequate and challenging education, well-trained and dedicated teachers, and modern and efficient schoolbuildings for their children. I believe that the education of American citizens, young and old, is a responsibility of the Federal Government, and I believe that the Federal Government, should develop a formula, so that it could share the cost of education in every State. Such a formula should be based on the willingness of the communities and the State to share the cost. For example, the more money a community would pay for education, the more it would receive from the State; the more the State would pay, the more it would receive from the Federal Government.

All piecemeal contributions from the Federal Government for specific purposes, as is now the case, should be brought to an end, and a single appropriation should be channeled through the State departments of education to the local communities, dependent upon the educational needs of said States. The Secretary of Education, together with his advisory council, should make periodic reports to the States expressly pointing out the educational needs of the Nation, and each State should tailor these reports to fit the educational program of the community. Such a procedure would help tremendously in bringing all the facets of education together and would make for a united front that would give educational leaders and teachers a psychological lift. It would also focus their attention on the national goals and create an atmosphere at home that would place education in its proper place in relationship to the needs of the country.

With this thought in mind our attention must be turned toward the secondary school. The secondary school provides the last opportunity for school systems to establish in the minds and hearts of their youth the sound principles of loyalty and responsibility that will make for intelligent and constructive citizenship. For the large majority of our youth the years at high school mean the end of formal education. For this reason I believe that the secondary schools should be subjected to a reevaluation for the purpose of determining the part that it must play in the defense of the Nation.

I believe that if the high schools are to do their part effectively the school day must be lengthened, if for no other reason than to impress upon the minds of our citizens that the formative years of high school students are vitally important and that a vigorous and intelligent program on this level makes a contribution to our national defense.

Knowledge is power. It is imperative then that we take advantage of these years to strengthen the minds of the youth in understanding what problems the Nation faces. Every effort should be made to keep our young people in school until they have completed their high school education. In order for school administrators to successfully do this they must accept the challenge of evaluation. The curriculum must be broadened to make it possible for every boy and girl to develop his or her talents.

In order to provide such an opportunity it stands to reason that an intelligent guidance and testing system must be established in the school system. Each child should have a permanent record card on which is reported his mental, physical, and social attitudes. It must be on the lower level that we attack the problem of dropouts, for the first act of truancy is the first indication

of a potential dropout. How do dropouts affect the Nation?

Large numbers of dropouts flood the unemployment rolls and challenge the Government to establish some other agency besides the schools to take over this responsibility, such as it had to do during depression days in the establishment of the NYA and the CCC. I believe that the schools should accept the challenge and exert all their efforts to set up programs that will help to keep the youth in school. For example, meetings should be arranged with the business and industrial leaders in the community to determine where potential dropouts might be placed and where a combination educational-work relationship might be developed.

No boy or girl should be permitted to leave school before a conference is held with the parents and the guidance counselor. There should be in each high school a work clearance department in which the needs of business and industry might be reported and to which potential dropouts might be referred. The counselors should make every effort to keep our youth in school. It is possible too, to visualize the school authorities setting up classrooms in the shops of business and industry. Here is another place where the Federal Government and industry could play a vital role in assisting to defray the expense of such a program.

At no other time in our history has there been such critical need for the careful husbandry of our intellectual resources. The need for unskilled workers grows smaller, while the demands for skilled and professional people increase. Even now our Nation finds itself short of the talent needed to maintain and control our civilization. Add to this shortage the fact that less than half the youth of the highest 10 percent in intelligence graduate from college and that each year there are about 50,000 students with ability to finish college who do not even graduate from high school. This situation is worsening at a time when our very survival may hinge upon the better management of the educational enterprise.

Our greatest natural resource is our youth and each September thousands upon thousands are placed in the hands of school administrators and teachers for processing. The ultimate goal of this processing is good and intelligent citizenship. This great army of youth enters school not alone to study, but also to be studied. Each one is the possessor of some talent. This talent might not be found in the intellectual powers of the individual, but it might well be found in his physical, spiritual, or social powers. The great job of the schools is to study the individual and to determine in which category the latent power rests, and to make provision for its natural growth. As big industry takes raw material and processes it to its greatest potential, allowing for no waste, or as little waste as possible, so the schools must take our youth and process them to their highest degree of refinement so that they can play an active part in the great machinery of social living in a free society.

Constantly, therefore, we must be ever alert to the discovery of talented youth which, properly nurtured and guided, will develop a stockpile of intellectual resource from which the leaders of tomorrow might come. This element in our social life must be challenged to the limit in order that intellectual desires might be satisfied. The challenge for a longer schoolday is not enough. There is also the challenge of readjustment of the curriculum to present-day needs and fitting subject matter into the course of studies, so that our youth will know firsthand what is happening in the world outside. A high school diploma must represent the cult of intelligence and not the cult of mediocrity. Thomas Jefferson,

the great American leader, based his program of education on the selection of the best—the aristos. Today, we must still cling to Jefferson's idea and make every provision for the talented to reach the ultimate of their natural abilities and at the same time to provide an educational system that will test the abilities of the average and provide for them a course of study that will assist them in cutting their niche in a free society—or education for good citizenship.

For this reason, there must be introduced into the curriculum—so that all who attend our secondary schools might know—those subjects that are playing a vital part in the world of affairs today. If the Federal Government can support programs in science, language, and mathematics, it can certainly afford to spend millions in giving financial support to the development of a strong and challenging socioeconomic program of studies. Science, math, and languages are not shaping world thought today, either on the national or international level, and although a knowledge of these subjects is important and desirable, it cannot be overlooked that the socioeconomic factors of the national and international scene are as equally important, if not more so. We have only to think for a moment of the impact the Common Market will play on the economy of the Nation, together with the 35-hour week, automation, early retirements, leisure time, and the ever-present threat of communism.

About 75 percent of our students now in high school will soon emerge into the highways and byways of our respective cities and towns as citizens. Will they be able to cope with the problems of citizenship? Will they have the skills to help shape the course of democratic events? We ask ourselves the question, "Are we who are responsible for the education of youth doing our very best to provide for them the type of training and understanding that will equip them to meet the challenges of American society on all levels—city, State, and Nation?"

Toward this end I believe that our secondary school curriculum should be broadened and deepened so that those subjects which are playing so important a role in the affairs of the world be presented realistically and enthusiastically.

In this realistic presentation, I would encourage the daily use of the newspaper and, where possible, the use of TV and the radio. I believe that our youth should be presented firsthand the factors, international and national, that are shaping the world in which they live, as well as the problems that will confront them as adults. It should be graphically pointed out that the news reports, the editorials, the columnists that appear in the daily life of a community form the everyday library for the everyday man. Citizens of a free society must continue to grow in knowledge and to keep abreast of the tide of current events. The turn of events in the world has been so rapid that what was true yesterday is no longer true. Look how the map of the world has changed since 1960; look at the explosive developments in the world of science and economics.

This brings us then to another critical issue—the challenge of adult education.

This area on the educational ladder of a community might well turn out to be equally crucial.

Much emphasis is being placed on the dropout and ways and means are being studied whereby this army of youth might be kept in school. What about the youth of yesterday who were, because of some circumstances, forced to leave school, or having finished high school did not possess the means to go beyond for further study. They are being challenged by more free and leisure time; they are being challenged by the entrance of automation; they are middle-aged

heads of families, threatened with the loss of a job because the skill that they learned is now antiquated. It is toward this group of citizens that our attention must be directed. It is only through adult educational programs in the cities and towns, geared to the needs of these citizens that these men and women can make a readjustment of their lives. The adult educational program on the local level should be a part of free education. It is nothing more than high school life extended into the later lives of our citizens to help them to know that American education does not end at the age of 16 or with high school graduation. If the Federal Government can afford scholarships and loans to those who wish to enter college it can certainly afford to assist those citizens who are faced with many problems and who wish to keep abreast of the times. This is the area of American life that needs help, for it is the adult population of a nation and not the youth that shape its destiny. That we must educate our youth to the fullest there can be no doubt, but we cannot wait for present-day youth to grow up to make an impact upon the Nation. The time is now and the more we do to assist the adult population to a knowledge of changing times, of providing counselor and guidance services for those who need direction, the more we will strengthen the Nation.

Last of all, our schools must come face to face with the problem of communism. There is no need to hide our heads with the hope that it will pass us by unnoticed. It is here and here to stay. It will always be a factor in our political, economic, and social life. The youth of today who will have to live with it during their lives should know all there is to know about communism. They should be taught the goals of this ism and be alerted to its techniques. Our youth, if they are to be properly prepared to meet the challenge, should be taught all that can be taught about it. It is only by knowing it that one can discern the propaganda that is used to promote its cause. Ignorance of communism will lead our future citizens into many traps and embarrassing situations. Knowledge of communism will prepare our future citizens to meet the issues as they arrive and prevent innocent men and women from being deceived by its philosophy.

We are educating for the maintenance of a free society, not only for America, but for the other peoples of the world. We each can do our part by being a more loyal, more intelligent, a more vigorous citizen in our own community. For, as we strengthen ourselves, we strengthen our society. In the words of Oliver Goldsmith there is much wisdom and truth, as well as a direct challenge to all of us:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay,
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath has made,
But a bold peasantry, a nation's pride,
When once destroyed can never be supplied."

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the word "automation" may have little meaning to someone presently secure in his job. But to one whose job is eliminated by automation, the meaning is stark and clear: out of work and often out of hope.

We read articles about the automation problem, but I am afraid that until there is broad understanding about what automation is doing now and is expected to

do in the future, we will not as a nation take the variety of steps necessary to insure that automation will be a great benefit to us all instead of a great burden.

I realize that a Presidential Commission on Automation has been proposed. I am happy to support this idea. But I do not think that this approach is enough. I am afraid that it misses the vital point of encouraging and promoting widespread understanding about the problem, understanding at the grass-roots level in particular.

Automation, after all, deals with individuals—individuals who are in school, who are choosing jobs, or who are in the work force. Regardless of what governments and businesses may do to alleviate automation's impact, essentially the problem boils down to individual decisions by the persons affected.

These individuals can make reasonable decisions only to the extent that they are informed.

Widespread information about automation is the greatest single good which would come from the White House Conference on Automation which I propose in S. 185, introduced last January. Delegates would meet in Washington to pool their best ideas only after the question had been thoroughly explored on local and State levels. I have confidence that the final Conference itself would produce valuable guides for action, but I am even more concerned about the fact that the local attention given the problem would result in a widespread understanding of automation—an understanding which does not now exist.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to refer to a letter of support for the White House Conference on Automation which I have received from the executive board of the Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania. The letter explains that the Pennsylvania Federation had presented the White House Conference plan to the Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions at its quarterly conference in New York City, and that the alliance had gone on record as supporting it.

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

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

FEDERATION OF TELEPHONE WORKERS OF PENNSYLVANIA, EXECUTIVE BOARD,
Philadelphia, Pa., December 9, 1963.

Hon. J. CALIE BOGGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BOGGS: On December 5, 1963, the Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania presented your proposal, S. 185, providing for a White House Conference on Automation to the Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions at quarterly conference in New York City.

The alliance represents about 100,000 telephone workers in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, the five New England States, and Canada.

That organization went on record as supporting your proposal and is preparing an appropriate resolution to that effect for general

distribution to other unions, the public, and Congress.

Your efforts to get the automation problem "off the ground" are most appreciated and represent progressive thinking of a type which we need more of these days.

Respectfully yours,
I. C. GLENDENNING,
Vice President and Chief Negotiator.

DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT OSWALD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Victor Riesel is a nationally respected columnist not given to sensationalism or gossip. His widely syndicated observations appear in the many newspapers served by the Hall Syndicate. In his column for December 3, Mr. Riesel raises some questions which he states the Soviets have refused to answer about Lee Harvey Oswald's sojourn in Communist Russia. Oswald's Communist connections are becoming increasingly recognized and emphasized. The questions raised by the Riesel column should provide some significant answers if they were to become obtainable.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Riesel column be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOME QUESTIONS THE SOVIETS REFUSE TO ANSWER ON LEE HARVEY OSWALD'S STAY INSIDE RUSSIA

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It would have been impolite and impolitic in the past few days to ask Soviet authorities some pertinent questions about Lee Harvey Oswald. The White House has been desperately and understandably eager to avoid an international incident by appearing to give even the slightest insinuation of an international plot to assassinate John Kennedy.

But now the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R., has changed the rules. It has authorized its newspaper, Pravda, to insinuate that Oswald was a Central Intelligence agent under President Eisenhower and under the late President Kennedy. Therefore, it is time to ask the Soviets some questions which are being discussed in international intelligence circles.

The Russians have said officially they denied Oswald Soviet citizenship because he was a Trotskyite.

This means he was declared an enemy of the state—a few days ago. But why was he permitted, back in 1959, to travel freely inside the Soviet Union. This is a coveted privilege. Official permission is needed by foreigners for bus and train travel. Yet he went some 420 miles from Moscow to Minsk.

Why did the Soviet employment services direct him to a job? This must have happened. He spoke no Russian then, he read no Russian. He had insufficient funds for such travel. He must have been directed to Minsk. He must have been assigned a job. Employment is under rigid state control. In the Soviet Union an applicant does not exactly get the Sunday papers and run through a list of want ads.

Who vouched for his identity card? Who got him his "rabochaya knizhka"—work permit? Such documents are absolutely necessary—especially for foreign workers. Without such papers he could not have been hired. He could not have drawn his wages and social benefits. He could not have participated in cultural affairs.

And who approved Oswald's membership in a Russian union? Joining is mandatory, so that central discipline can be exerted. That's why the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions can claim 26 million members.

If the Soviet authorities believed Oswald to be a Trotskyite and an American spy, why did they permit him to associate freely with his fellow factory workers? Such activity might have eluded the secret police for a few weeks but not for over 2 years.

Why did the KGB (state security secret police) permit him to marry an attractive Russian girl? A few words to her and that romance would have ended quicker than you can say "Siberia."

Why was he permitted to quit his job and then travel freely from Minsk to Moscow? True, workers are not yet absolutely frozen to their jobs inside Russia. But few just pick themselves up and leave. Fewer, especially spies and enemies of the state, could blithely get travel accommodations for such a long haul. And this time, one must envision such a trip being taken by an ex-U.S. Marine and his Russian wife and child.

How did the attractive and sturdy Mrs. Oswald get permission to abandon her job in a land starved for workers. The Oswalds had no money when they got to Moscow. Where did they get the bus or train fare for the journey from the interior?

Finally, how did the alleged assassin get his wife and child out of the Soviet Union? Mighty few have accomplished this. I checked this out with an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. He could not recall more than four or five such instances. In some of these cases it took years to get an exit permit. Yet Oswald simply put in his request and got immediate approval.

What compounds the mystery even more is that Oswald had no skills. Once back in the United States, he lost every job he held. He was simply incompetent. What could he have done inside the Soviet Union for 2½ years which would be worth their paying for? Why don't they make his work record public?

True, President Johnson has been told that Oswald was a misfit, a loner, a desperate seeker of prominence and publicity. True, the State Department has him down in its records as a "fuzzy Marxist."

True, the most authentic reports have it that there was no international plot. But why were the Soviets so kind and why did they offer so many privileges to a Trotskyite?

HANUKAH CELEBRATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with warm personal pleasure that I extend my good wishes to our Jewish citizens on the occasion of the Hanukkah celebration. The "Festival of Lights" began at sunset last Tuesday and is to continue for 8 days.

This ancient holiday dates back to the days when the Jews, led by Judah Maccabee and his brothers, successfully revolted against Antiochus Epiphanes, the Syrian tyrant who, in an attempt to gain complete loyalty to Greek culture, forbade Jews to practice their religion. The Maccabee army recaptured the temple at Jerusalem and rededicated it to God. Within the temple, they found a cruse with only enough oil to light the candelabrum of the temple for a night—but instead, and miraculously, the candelabrum remained lit for 8 successive days. Significantly, today, during this celebration of the "Festival of Lights," a candle is lit every night for 8 days.

Hanukah, meaning "rededication," is a solemn commemoration of the struggle for religious freedom. By openly defying their Syrian tyrant for a cause they so deeply felt and commonly believed in, the Jews are among history's first martyrs of religious freedom.

Mr. President, America's birthright in a free society sometimes makes it hard for us to comprehend the hardships of religious intolerance—intolerance which is unfortunately practiced in some areas of the globe today. Nearly every day, we hear reports of social ostracism and economic discrimination in the Soviet Union. The Jewish minority in Russia has and is suffering severely—synagogues have been closed, depriving persons of a place to worship, economic opportunism—deemed crimes particularly when Jews are involved—is in some cases punished by capital punishment. The Soviet's active campaign against and maltreatment of the Jewish religion deserves the condemnation of free peoples throughout the world. I have spoken out on this matter many, many times—both in public and on the Senate floor—and I am presently cosponsoring a resolution condemning this despicable prejudice on the part of the Soviets.

Mr. President, Hanukah is a time of dedication—a time for free citizens throughout the world to be grateful for the freedom they enjoy—and also a time to hope and pray that those less fortunate than they in other parts of the globe may someday soon be released from the persecution of intolerant political leaders.

Mr. President, I extend my heartfelt best wishes to our Jewish citizens during this deep spiritual celebration.

COMMITTEE OF 100 ON THE FEDERAL CITY SUPPORTS JAMES MADISON LIBRARY ON SQUARE 732

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter I have received from Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, the chairman of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association. Admiral Phillips, on behalf of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, expresses his support for S. 1920, the bill which proposes construction of the third Library of Congress building on the site, known as square 732, just south of the present Library and across Independence Avenue from the Main Library Building.

For reasons of economy and efficiency, as well as of fairness to the residents of Capitol Hill, the Congress should move quickly to authorize construction of the third Library building on this site already owned by the Government. It would be thoroughly appropriate to honor President James Madison by designating the third Library building as the President James Madison Memorial Library. I hope very much that the Congress will act quickly so that the Library of Congress does not continue to be penalized by our indecision.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter of December 3 from the chairman of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City

of the American Planning and Civic Association be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 3, 1963.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The Committee of 100 on the Federal City wishes to express its strong support of this bill and to commend your wisdom in introducing it.

This bill would authorize construction of an annex to the Library of Congress on a Government-owned site just south of the present Library, which already has been cleared and which previously has been proposed as the location of a monolithic James Madison Memorial. Meanwhile it is understood that the Architect of the Capitol is proposing to build the Library Annex on a site (to be condemned and bought with taxpayer's money) just to the east of the Library.

The Committee of 100 wishes to bring out these points:

1. Selection of the east site for a Library Annex would be a further act of extravagant destruction on Capitol Hill and would mean tearing down four blocks of restored houses, and St. Mark's Church.

2. The proposed Madison Memorial, while having some basement book space allotted to the Library of Congress, would not be a proper or efficient annex.

3. The plans for the memorial are considered to have little taste, imagination, or purpose. Furthermore, the site to the south of the Library is entirely unsuitable for a memorial, since it provides no focal point and would be lined up in a phalanx of massive office buildings. Furthermore, it would cost an estimated \$39 million, or about the cost of the Cultural Center which our Nation's Capital so badly needs.

4. Apparently the construction developments on Capitol Hill are under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol with little, if any, reference to the Commissioners, the Planning Commission, or the Fine Arts Commission.

This is a matter of urgent concern.

There is a continuing and piecemeal proliferation of monstrous Federal buildings, with no apparent overall plan and with great destruction to the homes of taxpayers who have been doing a splendid job to restore this fine old section.

It is urgently hoped that something will be done to check the tendency to extravagant outlay for monolithic memorials and to bring some order and plan into Federal construction on Capitol Hill.

Yours sincerely,

NEILL PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Committee of 100 on the
Federal City.

JEWISH COMMUNITY TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on Monday night, November 25, the day of the funeral services for our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, I attended a Jewish community memorial service for President Kennedy, conducted under the auspices of the Greater Washington Rabbinate and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. Among the 4,000 persons in the overflow crowd was the President of Israel, Shneur Zalman Shazar. Rabbis Norman Gerstenfeld, Martin S. Halpern, Eugene J. Lipman, Stanley Rabinowitz, and Lewis A. Weintraub led the assembly in reading

the order of the service; tributes were presented by Mr. Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, of the U.S. Supreme Court, and by the Honorable Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to the President. Cantor Raphael Edgar chanted the memorial prayer.

The contents of this memorial were so meaningful and so moving, that I ask unanimous consent to have the order of the service and the texts of the tributes printed in the RECORD.

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

A JEWISH COMMUNITY TRIBUTE FOR OUR MARTYRED PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

(Under the auspices of the Greater Washington Rabbinate and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, November 25, 1963, 8:30 p.m., at the temple of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Massachusetts Avenue and Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.)

RESPONSIVELY

Lord, what is man, that Thou hast regard for him?

Or the son of man, that Thou takest account of him?

Man is like a breath,
His days are as a fleeting shadow.

In the morning he flourishes and grows up like grass,

In the evening he is cut down and withers.
So teach us to number our days,
That we may get us a heart of wisdom.

Mark the man of integrity, and behold the upright,

For there is a future for the man of peace.

PSALM 23—A PSALM OF DAVID

The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul;
He guideth me in straight paths for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death,

I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me;
Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies;

Thou hast anointed my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life;

And I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

AMERICA—FOUNDED ON BIBLICAL PRECEPTS

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Have we not all one Father?
Hath not one God created us?
Why do we deal treacherously, a man against his brother?

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish a constitution for the United States of America.

Justice, justice shalt thou pursue,
That thou mayest live in the land which God giveth thee.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the free-

dom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Proclaim liberty throughout the land,
Unto all the inhabitants thereof.

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.

It hath been told thee, O man, what is good,
And what the Lord doth require of thee:
Only to do justly and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God.

For happily the Government of the United States which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

Righteousness maketh a nation great,
But sin is a reproach to any people.

We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Behold, how good and pleasant it is
For brethren to dwell together in unity.

With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Let justice well up as the waters,
And righteousness as a mighty stream.

In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms: freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world; freedom from want which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world; freedom from fear, which means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—everywhere in the world.

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,

And their spears into pruning-hooks,
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.

But they shall sit every man under his vine
And under his fig tree;
And none shall make them afraid.

WORLD PEACE

It shall come to pass at the end of days,
That the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established

As the top of the mountains;
It shall be exalted above the hills;
All the nations shall flow unto it.

And many peoples shall go and say,
"Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord."

God will teach us His ways,
And we will walk in His paths;
God shall judge between the nations;
He shall decide for many peoples.

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
And their spears into pruning forks.

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation;

Neither shall they learn war any more.

The Lord will break the bow and the sword
And the battle out of the land;
He will make the people to lie down in safety.

Violence shall no more be heard in your land,

Neither desolation nor destruction within your borders.

All your children shall be taught of the Lord,

And great shall be the peace of your children.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain,

For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord,
As the waters cover the sea.

The work of the righteous shall be peace,
And the result of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever.

Then shall they sit every man under his vine

And under his fig tree,
And none shall make them afraid,

For the Lord Himself hath spoken it.

FOR A REDEDICATION OF AMERICA TO HER TRADITIONAL IDEALS

Let America be America again.
Let it be the dream it used to be.

Let it be the pioneer on the plain
Seeking a home where he himself is free.

Let America be the dream the dreamers dreamed—

Let it be that great strong land of love,
Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme

That any man be crushed by one above.

O, let my land be a land where Liberty
Is crowned with no false patriotic wreath,
But opportunity is real, and life is free,
Equality is in the air we breathe.

O, let America be America again—
The land that never has been yet—
And yet must be—the land where every man
is free,

The land that's mine—the poor man's, Indian's, Negro's—we

Who made America,
Whose sweat and blood, whose faith and pain,

Whose hand at the foundry, whose plow in the rain,
Must bring back our mighty dream again.

And yet this oath I swear—
America will be!

Out of the rack and ruin of our gangster death,
The rape and rot of graft, and stealth, and lies,

We, the people, must redeem America.

We, the people, must redeem
The land, the mines, the plants, the rivers,
The mountains and the endless plain—
All, all the stretch of these great green states—

And make America America again!

—LANGSTON HUGHES.

VII. TRIBUTE BY HON. MYER FELDMAN, DEPUTY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

I do not intend to eulogize him; others far more articulate than I have done it during the past 2 days and will do it in the future.

Nor do I intend to ask the question which must trouble all of us at times like this: "Why?" The rabbis in their wisdom should answer that for us.

Nor do I intend to answer the question of his place in history. Historians have already begun to make these judgments, and I leave to their mercies this task.

But there is a custom common among learned Jews that I should like to pursue. After one whose life has touched them has passed away they gather together and exchange recollections of that person. John F. Kennedy touched the lives of all of us, and I should like to share with you some of my memories.

I saw truckloads of flowers delivered to the White House yesterday, and I saw beautiful floral pieces decorating the hillside at Arlington Cemetery when he was laid to rest. But I thought of his joy as he looked out the French doors of his office and delighted in the beauty of the flower garden, the pride that he took in its reconstruction, and his pleasure in the beauties of nature. I saw John-John walk down the aisle of St. Matthew's Cathedral. But I remembered a morning only 2 or 3 weeks ago when John-John appeared at a business breakfast in the White House and sat in the chair that was reserved for the Secretary of State. The President, who had just decided upon the transfer of thousands of men thousands of miles, was unable to move John-John out of that chair.

I saw the silent crowds along the route we drove in a motorcade to the cemetery. But I thought of a hundred other motorcades, and of the impossibility of restraining John F. Kennedy from leaving his seat and walking along so that he could meet the people along the way. I thought of how, when arriving at an airport, he insisted upon walking to the barriers to shake hands, in spite of the pleas of Secret Service men. He felt that those who took the trouble to come to the airport were entitled to more than a fleeting glimpse of their President.

I saw the Negro pallbearers carrying the casket. But I remembered that day a little less than 3 years ago when he asked why there were no Negroes in the Coast Guard unit in the inaugural parade. This was quickly corrected.

I saw the preoccupations all around me, both in the funeral procession and in the airplane flying over the Pacific, where I learned the news. But I thought of the many preoccupations engendered by times of crisis. In the midst of one of the most severe, he was told of a letter from the widow of a postal employee who had died of cancer, leaving several small children. He learned that the husband had been so active in helping others he had been unable to accumulate any resources. President Kennedy dictated a response which assured her that a cold Government had a warm heart.

I saw the forlorn dogs on the White House lawn. And I thought of the kind manner in which he would call to them and bring them inside so that he could feed them a delicacy and send them on their way.

I thought of his flashes of wit and how these lightened the burden of everyone around him.

These were all random thoughts. They came to mind in connection with almost every incident during the past 2 days. They represented a man so full of compassion and understanding, so creative in mind, so courageous in spirit, that no one his life has touched, be it ever so lightly, will ever be the same. We are all the better for his having been with us.

Now it is up to us to pick up the torch which he lighted and follow along the way which he charted.

VIII. TRIBUTE BY MR. JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. SUPREME COURT

In the Book of Ecclesiastes, chapter 9: 12, it is said, "For man also knoweth not his time, as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare, so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falleth suddenly upon them." Friday was an evil time. Sunday

was an evil time. Today our country has engaged in a day of national mourning; it has also endured a day of national shame.

It is a cardinal principle of our democracy derived from Biblical teachings that it is an inalienable right of man, as a child of God, to have human dignity. The assassination of our great President on Friday was a supreme violation of human dignity; the killing of the man charged with the assassination Sunday was a violation of human dignity too, for on Friday life was taken, the great commandment "Thou shalt not kill" was violated; and on Sunday a life was taken too without due process of law. Human dignity on both occasions was violated.

Today's day of mourning was different from that day of mourning when we buried our great President Franklin Roosevelt, because while our grief today was equally great, it was compounded by humiliation—humiliation lacking when Franklin Roosevelt was buried. If, in a new country in a remote corner of the world, the head of state was assassinated and if the man charged with the killing was himself assassinated a few days later while in the custody of the police, we would say to ourselves, in all self-righteousness, that the country was not fit to govern; that it was uncivilized. What are we to say to ourselves as a nation?

John F. Kennedy, 2 weeks before his inauguration, stood in the assembly of his native State of Massachusetts, and gave a speech in which he quoted Pericles' statement of the Athenians, "We do not imitate, but are a model to others." John F. Kennedy proudly said of our country, "We are a model to others, we do not imitate." An assassination is not an act of a people, another killing is not an act of a people, but in a very significant sense, we are all responsible for these terrible happenings—all of mankind is responsible. The dominant characteristic of our modern times is the cheapness of human life. The dominant characteristic of the present age is the lack of respect for the human being—our forgetfulness of the human dignity with which God endowed every human being. More people have been killed, more exterminations have taken place, more massive barbarism has occurred in the world since the beginning of World War II than has ever been recorded in the history of civilization.

There is another saying from Ecclesiastes, "Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better." Let us use the occasion of the sad, sad passing of our great President to make the heart better, to make the heart more responsive to what is needed in the world. And what is needed in the world more than any other thing is love and not hatred, because in a real sense, hatred is what caused the terrible events of the last few days.

Our late President, John F. Kennedy, was a man of love; he was not a man of hatred. He devoted himself in the international affairs to the elimination of hatred between nations, to the cause of world peace and world justice. He devoted himself, in domestic affairs, to the elimination of hatred between the people of this country, to the cause of equality and brotherhood. The President is a victim of the unfinished tasks of his own administration. Would that he had lived out his full days and his full time, so that he could have witnessed a more peaceful world and, in the words of our Constitution, a more perfect union. But he was snared in an evil time, and he knew not his time as indeed we know not our time.

We owe it to the memory of our martyred President to rid our Nation of the evil forces of hate and bigotry and violence. In the book of President Kennedy's speeches, which he called "To Turn the Tide" he wrote, "Neither wind nor tide is always with us.

Our course on a dark and stormy sea cannot always be clear, but we have set sail, and the horizon, however cloudy, is also full of hope." Today, our course is on a dark and stormy sea, and the horizon is cloudy. We must make it full of hope, full of hope for a better world, full of hope, for freedom, for justice, for order, for peace. These are the ends of organized society, these are the ends for which President Kennedy gave his life, these are the ends to which we must all rededicate ourselves anew.

IX. MEMORIAL PRAYER—"EL MOLEI RAHAMIM" [Translation]

O merciful God who dwellest on high and art full of compassion, grant perfect rest beneath the shelter of Thy divine presence among the holy and pure who shine as the brightness of the firmament, to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, who gave his life for his country and for humanity. May his soul be bound up in the bonds of eternal life. Grant that his memory ever inspire us to noble and consecrated living. Amen.

AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL

O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!
America! America!

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

O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
Whose stern, impassioned stress,
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness!
America! America!

God mend thine every flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control,
Thy liberty in law!

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam,
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!

JOHN F. KENNEDY STUDENT MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, each of us is seeking in his own way to honor our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. One of the most appropriate memorials that has been brought to my attention has been initiated by the students of Yale University in Connecticut.

This is a student-sponsored scholarship, to be called the John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship. Funds for the memorial, solicited from the students themselves, will be awarded to those Yale undergraduates who are interested in politics or public service as a career.

I can think of nothing that would have pleased this eminent Harvard man more. Deeply interested in education, and convinced of the value and excitement of public service, President Kennedy constantly sought to interest fine students in politics as an honorable and rewarding career. His own devotion to such a career is legend—now Yale's students have enhanced it with their own.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the article from the Yale Daily News announcing the

John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship.

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

YALE STUDENTS PLAN SCHOLARSHIP IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY—REQUEST INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS; FUND DRIVE STARTS WEDNESDAY

Yale students will be asked to contribute to a student-sponsored scholarship in honor of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The scholarship, the John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship Fund, will be awarded to those Yale undergraduates who are interested in politics or public service as a career.

Donations will be collected in door-to-door solicitations Wednesday night and the drive will continue for a week. Students can charge donations to their bursar's bill.

AWARDED ANNUALLY

According to Michael K. Lewis, 1965, chairman of the collection committee, no official goal for the drive has been set but it is hoped that enough money will be collected to enable the scholarship to be awarded annually to students taking an active interest in politics.

Students participating in the Washington summer internship program, foreign students who are interested in political careers in their own countries, or students showing concrete evidence of political interest will, says University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., be especially considered for the scholarship. The scholarship will be kept flexible, however, to allow for a change in endowment policy.

BREWSTER LENDS SUPPORT

Mr. Brewster has given his support to the scholarship aims. He issued the following statement last night: "Although the university did not initiate or sponsor this effort, we welcome the student initiative to create a fund in honor of President Kennedy. The suggested purposes for which it might be used seem most appropriate to the memory of the late President."

The fact that door-to-door soliciting privileges were officially granted demonstrates the support that the scholarship drive is receiving from university officials. This is the first time since the Hungarian revolution of 1956 that this privilege has been granted for any other drive other than the Yale Charities Drive.

Charles A. Walker, chairman of the Council of Masters, the body that granted the privilege, said yesterday, "The members of the Council of Masters feel this drive gives the students a way to express themselves in view of the tragic death of the President."

LIVING MEMORIAL

The right to charge donations on the bursar's bill was granted in order to aid students who wish to contribute to the scholarship fund, but do not have ready amounts of cash to give.

Bursar George F. Williams said, "Normally we would not allow paid employees to work on these projects, however, this one is of enough scope to warrant this support."

Yale alumni, according to President Brewster, will not be directly solicited, but are encouraged to donate money for the drive.

Lewis said, "The fund will establish a living memorial for a man whose life embodied the ideals valued here at Yale."

He added, "President Kennedy gave his life while in the act of public service and a scholarship to encourage students to enter public service would be a fitting way for Yale students to honor the late President."

"Yale University is officially planning no memorials for the President," he continued, "and this will be the only chance for Yale

students as Yale students, to honor the dead President."

Dwight Hall is aiding the scholarship fund by granting the use of its facilities for the duration of the drive.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD A. SUISMAN AND FRANCIS J. BRACELAND

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, two close personal friends have recently received significant honors. Ed Suisman and Frank Braceland of the Greater Hartford community are decent human beings, modest and self-effacing. Their good deeds have brought so much good to so many.

Dr. Francis J. Braceland, one of the world's leading psychiatrists, has been named a knight commander of the Knights of St. Gregory by Pope Paul VI.

Edward A. Suisman has been given the Yale-in-Hartford Nathan Hale Award.

Day in and day out both men continuously give of themselves for their fellow men and the community. Connecticut is proud of both of them. I am honored and fortunate to have each one of them as a friend. I join in congratulating them on their new honors and wish for each one a long and happy life in continued service to mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Hartford Courant, dated December 10, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOR THEIR FELLOW MEN

During an age when it becomes increasingly easy for the misanthrope to take his melancholy view of human nature, it is comforting to look about and find men of great worth right here in the community. Not that the qualities which distinguish Dr. Francis J. Braceland or Edward A. Suisman have gone unnoticed up to now. If they were so minded, each man by now could have a series of scrapbooks dwarfing Dr. Elliot's famous Five Foot Bookshelf. But last week both achieved additional honors preeminently deserved because they represented continuing work for the benefit of their fellow men.

Dr. Braceland is perhaps best known in this community as psychiatrist in chief of the Institute of Living. Actually he has an international reputation as physician, educator, writer and lecturer. He has made significant contributions to the public welfare of this State, and served the Nation with distinction. When last year he received the University of Notre Dame's Laetare Medal, this observation was made: "In these times of prolonged anxiety and tensions, he symbolizes the concern of psychiatry and the church for those who are troubled in mind and spirit." Already in 1951, Dr. Braceland had been made a Knight of St. Gregory by the late Pope Pius XII. Now this week, Pope Paul VI has named him a knight commander of the order.

In a different field, Mr. Suisman has also worked incessantly for the mind and spirit of mankind. He has engaged in a large number and wide variety of philanthropies, and served on the boards of institutions for the public weal. Though not a medical man—some of these institutions, like those served by Dr. Braceland, are medical institutions—St. Francis and Hartford hospitals are among them—possibly he plays no favorites among these community activities. But one cannot

help especially remarking that as establisher of the Suisman Foundation, he has been instrumental in giving more than 125 college and preparatory scholarships in the last 25 years. This certainly must have been remembered by Yale-in-Hartford which has now given Mr. Suisman its Nathan Hale Award for distinguishing himself and Yale through work, interest and activities.

Honors cannot help following men like Dr. Braceland and Mr. Suisman. But both already must feel in their hearts a kind of reward that public acclaim will never quite catch up with.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, it was my privilege to attend the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award Dinner here in Washington. The dinner honored Edward G. Robinson, the distinguished American actor and humanitarian, who received the first Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award for his contribution to humane causes, in philanthropy and in the arts. Elliott Roosevelt, son of the late President, made the presentation. Our distinguished colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, delivered a moving tribute to our beloved fallen President, John Kennedy.

In accepting the award, Mr. Robinson delivered a moving tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt:

We are not here to memorialize Eleanor Roosevelt, but rather to celebrate her, to rejoice that she lived. In that life she ignited a flame that will keep burning in the hearts of mankind around the globe.

Mr. President, those of us who heard Mr. Robinson's address were so inspired by its beautiful eloquence, that I would like to share it with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY EDWARD G. ROBINSON

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel deeply honored. It is a source of great personal satisfaction to me to be in such distinguished company tonight, and I truly appreciate the very kind messages that were read here this evening.

In acknowledging this award and your very generous introduction, may I say that to be linked in this fashion with the name and lifework of one of the greatest and most beloved personalities of our time is far more than I deserve. I accept this award not as a token of recognition, but rather as a symbol of our common interest in the ideals for which she stood.

We are not here to memorialize Eleanor Roosevelt, but rather to celebrate her, to rejoice that she lived. In that life she ignited a flame that will keep burning in the hearts of mankind around the globe.

Her selfless dedication not only placed her on a pedestal of greatness, but helped elevate the entire Nation in the eyes of the world.

Where the dollar was pursued as the ultimate goal of happiness, she dealt in the currency of humanity. Where the American people were pictured as worshipers at the shrine of materialism, she extolled the values of human dignity and freedom.

She had the vision and the courage to crusade for ideas even when they provoked controversy. She possessed the spirit of a true leader, for she was not deterred by criticism or opposition.

All her life she was blessed because she gave so much to so many. To a nation

grappling with the challenge of totalitarianism from without, whether Nazi or Communist, she gave a fresh sense of America's passionate dedication to freedom. She stoutly defended the rights of the individual against the special groups that sought to suppress them. She practiced the philosophy of Thomas Paine who said that "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigues of supporting it." And she regarded this as a sacred duty.

She gave a tired world a fresh sense of the meaning of freedom. She gave mankind a fresh sense of the importance of peace. She gave the underprivileged peoples of the world, black, brown or yellow, a renewed faith in the ideals of equality and liberty, long before they achieved their independence. To the youth of our country, whom she saw as the guardians of the future, she gave a new sense of the challenge of leadership in a free world. To every group of every creed and of every color she was the voice of justice and mercy.

Eleanor Roosevelt knew no boundaries or dividing lines. In the greatness of her vision it was all one world, one human race.

I can see her now, standing before a huge map of the world, and saying—and these are her own words:

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere."

As I look back on my own life, I realize that Eleanor Roosevelt's constant warning against indifference, her plea for an alert citizenry to protect the bastions of liberty had a special appeal to me because I was not born to it. Freedom was not part of my heritage when I was a child in Bucharest. It did not belong to me as of right. It did not belong to my fellow Jews in Rumania. In those early years of my childhood, I could know the meaning of freedom only because it was denied to me. This was the general position of the Jewish people in almost every part of Europe. Many years have passed since I, together with my family, came to the United States.

But I have never ceased to remember my debt to this land of opportunity, and I shall never forget the deep inner feeling of gratitude to Eleanor Roosevelt for helping me to relive that first exhilarating introduction to freedom.

Throughout the past quarter century Mrs. Roosevelt was my guide in the sphere of public service. Whenever I would receive an invitation to support a cause, I would never hesitate to say yes if her name was associated with it.

I have always felt that her example of self-sacrificing effort was like a clarion call to those who enjoyed the limelight, those whose profession enabled them to reach a world audience, a call to utilize that position for the well-being of the country and of humanity. Mrs. Roosevelt made me realize that an actor who has achieved a degree of prominence, can make a significant contribution in behalf of the public good. I am happy to say that many members of my profession have understood this and have become involved in civic and humanitarian causes.

Eleanor Roosevelt believed that politics was not the exclusive property of the politicians. She believed that it was not the proverbially smoke-filled room, but every village, town and hamlet, every home was the place for the formulation and discussion

of the policies of government and for the expression of the will of the people.

This, too, I learned from her, that the ivory tower cannot withstand the pressure of the social, economic, and political forces of our day.

You and I know that few of us who feel keenly the problems of our country can insulate ourselves from the world of reality. I for one cannot imagine an actor seeking out the shelter of the stage to escape the slings and arrows of life in the 20th century. It is the very nature of our times that demands that every citizen share in the democratic process to the best of his ability.

She made clear her creed when she said: "One must never turn one's back on life. There is so much to do, so many engrossing challenges, so many heartbreaking and pressing needs." The challenges she met with forthright enlightenment—the heartbreaking and pressing needs became less heartbreaking and less pressing when this great lady contributed to their solutions. Every cause which ennobled men was her cause.

One of the pressing needs in her always crowded life was Israel, and she gave of her time and her physical presence and her influence to help Israel become the nation which all of us here, and many more in America, view with such personal pride.

Israel struck deep roots in her heart and mind. The spectacle of a people bravely going about the business of rebuilding its ancient homeland after it had suffered the loss of one-third of its total population stirred her admiration. In that small land she could see many striking parallels to our own country—a courageous spirit of pioneering—a fierce and strong sense of human liberty—a fearless determination to succeed against all obstacles. Israel offered her a bright confirmation of her faith in the power of democracy. She found in Israel the promise of success for other undeveloped lands, for other small nations. She saw in Israel a firm and strongly reliable ally of the free world in the unstable region of the Middle East.

In many respects she acted as the eyes and ears of the American people. Her travels brought the faraway places of the world into the living room of almost every home. What she saw in Europe of the plight of the survivors and refugees of Hitlerism, what she saw in Israel of the herculean accomplishments of these same men and women in restoring the land of the Bible to life, she translated into the universal language of the family of man. To her the rebirth of the Jewish people in its ancient homeland was a challenge and a problem for all mankind. Its success was not only a triumph of the Jewish spirit but a victory for the concept of human justice. Freedom and dignity are not divisible, whether in Israel or in our own great democracy. Phrases like "separate but equal" are nonsense and here in this capital city of the world, nobody knows it better than our lawmakers. Freedom is the birthright of every American. Yet, as Mrs. Roosevelt so often said, it is like some delicate plant that must be watered and tended with care and with love. Freedom will prevail and grow and the walls of prejudice will be torn down, if we recognize our duty to keep it alive.

The Passover Haggadah commands each generation of Jews to regard the Exodus from Egypt as as if it happened in its own time. Not so long ago the world witnessed the martyrdom of the Jewish people and its miraculous return to the land of Israel. If we put ourselves in the shoes of these soldiers and martyrs on the battlefronts of freedom, we shall more fully appreciate our responsibility as free men.

Science has scaled the peaks of knowledge to fashion terrible instruments of destruction. We must build up sufficient moral and spiritual strength to avert total human disaster. Eleanor Roosevelt clearly saw the

dangers confronting a world balanced precariously on the edge of annihilation. What force shall freemen draw upon to restore the equilibrium of our civilization? What price are we prepared to pay?

In America we know the value of freedom. Our danger is that we sometimes take freedom for granted. Every once in a while when a crisis arises, we brush the dust off it, shine it up, and bask in its strong radiance.

But as we all know, freedom is not a commodity you can pay for all at once. You can only get it on a permanent installment plan—the terms of which are constant sacrifice and vigilance. If these terms are not fully met and on time, the whole deal can be canceled.

Citizenship cannot be expressed passively—democracy is not a spectator sport. It is a serious way of life that requires our daily involvement, our daily watchfulness, our daily faith and devotion.

In recent days we suffered the grievous loss of a young and brilliant President who made the supreme sacrifice for freedom and for peace. Yet this is not a time for despair. In this new crisis, the American system has provided a pattern of continuity of leadership that gives us hope and comfort for the future. The grim hour commands us to close ranks behind President Johnson, who has made such an auspicious beginning in preserving those ideals and those policies that will keep our Nation strong and free.

The teachings and philosophy of the great lady whose spirit is with us tonight can be a valuable source of strength to all of us in these trying times. The urgency of the moment summons us to examine the magnitude of the job ahead of us. When we search for the key to human understanding, when perplexing issues block our path, when momentary lapses in business and public life damage our moral fiber, when the values of democracy are threatened, when basic human rights are in jeopardy, we know that we can draw on the lifework of Mrs. Roosevelt to show us the way. For her spirit is like an eternal light, like a pillar of fire by night. It leads and comforts us and strengthens our will to fight for what is right and what is just.

To emulate her, to try to duplicate her missions, to try to copy her activities, would be a futile attempt for most of us. But we can try. We must try.

Today we all have to be greater and bigger than is normally possible, for this may be our last chance to preserve our Nation and civilization itself.

This is what this Eleanor Roosevelt award means to me. You have honored me tonight more than I have ever been honored before in my life. And so—thank you from the depths of my heart.

HOPE FOR COTTON

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly hopeful of remedial cotton legislation. And, I am extremely pleased that there appears to be growing public sentiment for a meaningful and economical cotton program such as that proposed by myself and the Senator from Minnesota.

The cotton bill recently passed by the House of Representatives would give the American textile manufacturers some relief from the inequitable two-priced cotton system, but it would at the same time complicate the present overall problem by adding still another subsidy to the national cotton program.

In addition to greatly increasing the cost to the taxpayer of the present cotton program, the House bill falls short of solving the total problem now facing

the textile industries and the cotton farmer, and it does nothing to take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling and giving away cotton.

This was ably pointed out in an editorial in the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer on December 8, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Two excellent editorials also appeared this week in the Atlanta Journal and the Washington Post, both of which point to the Talmadge-Humphrey bill as the only real solution to the cotton problem. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TALMADGE BILL

The specter of Government subsidy may cast a long and menacing shadow in the Senate when that body gets to the House-passed cotton bill, calling for a \$200-million program of Federal handouts to salvage the textile industry.

Washington reports indicate there's no assurance this bill will get the blessings of the Senate, and once more hope is revived for a measure by Senator TALMADGE which would provide for direct price support payments to farmers and eliminate all other Government participation in the cotton business.

This, as we have insisted all along, is a much better approach to the cotton and textile dilemma than piling on the back of the Government another giant subsidy program.

How, we keep wondering, can the textile giants, oriented as they are to the system of private enterprise, betray that cause by willingly going along with a Federal handout plan?

While it may serve their interests now, aren't they tying their hands about expressing future opposition to huge Government spending programs?

It's hard to believe the textile manufacturers are yet ready to resort to this desperate route.

They deserve a better break in the purchase of American cotton although they might argue, with some justification, that the Government has put them in their present position. To be sure there's no logical basis for forcing them to pay more for their domestic raw material than their foreign competitors. That could put them out of business.

But the whole point is that Senator TALMADGE has a plan that would eliminate two-price cotton, while at the same time saving them from the humiliation of accepting Federal subsidies. Why can't the textile people and the public demand its resurrection?

HOPE FOR COTTON

The saving grace of the cotton bill passed by the House is that it paves the way for action in the Senate, thus raising the hope that a far better piece of legislation may emerge from a conference committee.

The principal purpose of the heavily amended Cooley bill approved by the House was the elimination of the two-price system under which foreign mills purchase American cotton at the world price while American textile manufacturers are compelled to pay higher supported prices in the domestic market. But while the House was willing to eliminate a patent inequity by agreeing to subsidize the cotton mills with payments in kind from the accumulated cotton stocks, it gave the textile manufacturers far less than either they or Mr. COOLEY wanted.

In the original version of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture was instructed to make

payments in kind in the amount necessary to make cotton available to domestic mills at the same price that American cotton is offered for export. This would amount to a subsidy of 8½ cents per pound, a sum greater than that necessary to place American mills on an equal footing with their foreign competitors whose advantage must be calculated as net of transport charges. But the House accepted the amendment offered by Representative PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri, which provides only that the payments be sufficiently large to remove the inequity.

At the same time the House indicated its dissatisfaction with the high price-support level by adopting the McIntire amendment which would reduce it from the present 32.47 cents a pound to 29 cents a pound over a 3-year period.

Neither the Jones nor the McIntire amendment make the Cooley bill an acceptable piece of legislation and it is fortunate that it stands virtually no chance of Senate passage as it is. But the fact that the amendments were adopted indicates that some form of Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE's benefit-payment plan might find favor in the House. Under the Talmadge proposal the price-support program would be replaced by income subsidies to farmers, thus taking the Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton and eliminating the need for subsidies to exporters and manufacturers.

The transition from the amended Cooley bill to the Talmadge benefit-payments plan involves a host of issues, but none will impose an insuperable barrier if the House members of the conference committee are disposed to take a broad and enlightened view. Therein lies the hope for the most rational solution of the cotton problem that now seems available.

[From the Sunday Ledger-Enquirer,
Dec. 8, 1963]

TALMADGE BILL BEST SOLUTION

A legislative solution for two-price cotton passed a significant test this past week when the House of Representatives gave it a 216 to 182 vote of approval.

But the bill's chances of surviving a similar test in the Senate are practically nonexistent.

First off, Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee does not like the bill. "I can't support a cotton bill which would greatly increase costs of the farm program after refusing to do this on wheat and dairy programs," he said last week.

Implementation of the House-passed bill would increase the farm program's cost an average of \$200 million a year for the next 3 years.

The money would be used as an indirect subsidy to domestic textile mills, allowing them to obtain American-grown cotton at the same price foreign textile mills pay. At present, American mills pay 8½ cents a pound more for American cotton than foreign competitors do.

President Johnson exerted the full influence of his administration to win passage of the bill in the House. Republicans and some big-city Democrats opposed it. In the Senate, it faces the additional opposition of a number of southern Democrats such as Senator ELLENDER.

Senator AIKEN, a Republican, of Vermont, sounded a note that will probably be dominant in his party. "This is not an agriculture measure," he said. "It's a bill for the relief of textile mills. It's not the first time farmers have been soaked for something that did not benefit them."

Most discouraging was the statement from Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, assistant majority leader. "I cannot support the bill," HUMPHREY said. "It is unnecessarily costly and will be utterly impossible to police fully."

However, Senator HUMPHREY does support a plan drawn by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. TALMADGE has already expressed opposition to the House-passed bill, another sign that it stands little chance in the Senate.

As a Georgian, Senator TALMADGE is naturally concerned about domestic textile interests but he regards the House bill as the "wrong answer." His own plan for alleviating the two-price system would change the whole concept of cotton support prices, with all cotton being sold at the world price.

The House bill boasts merit only in the fact that it would give relief to domestic textilers in their uneven competition with low-priced imports. Otherwise, the bill complicates the already complex burden of subsidies, offsetting one subsidy by adding another, and in the process, raising the cost for the taxpayer.

Since the Senate appears unlikely to accept such a solution, the best course for textile-State Congressmen might be to get behind Senator TALMADGE's bill, which the House would probably also pass.

PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS AGGRAVATE RATHER THAN AID RACIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at a time when there is a great hue and cry for so-called civil rights legislation, and when demonstrators take to the streets in total disregard for law and order, it is refreshing indeed to hear a voice calling for the application of practical commonsense in the racial controversy which now has hold of the country.

Such a voice is that of a retired U.S. Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, a Negro who was until last June a professor at Fort Valley, Ga., State College. Major Robinson's views have a great deal of merit, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter he wrote to the Macon, Ga., Telegraph and an editorial written in the Albany, Ga., Herald be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Macon Telegraph, Nov. 15, 1963]
NEGROES' CAUSE IS HURT BY PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS

EDITOR, THE TELEGRAPH: During the past 4 weeks I made a survey of areas in which demonstrations were sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress of Racial Equality. The results of the survey indicate without doubt that race relations in Albany, Ga., Danville, Va., and Birmingham, Ala., were seriously hurt by the activities of the groups named above. The real pity is that all persons of importance, except those connected with the demonstrations, expressed the view that much more progress would have been made toward granting Negroes more rights had not the radical elements from elsewhere gone into the communities in which they were not a part.

Responsible citizens of both racial groups had been working for months on grievances advanced by Negroes in various sections of the country. In time it is possible that the Negroes would have been given many of the things they desired had not the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., inflamed the situation with ultimatums.

It appears to be the consensus among Negroes in all sections that civil rights is an issue for politicians and for those who exploit the ignorance of the Negroes for their

own economic advantages, influence, prestige, and power. It is felt among the masses of the Negroes themselves that the civil right leaders would not associate themselves with other Negroes except those of the elite.

Ninety percent of the Negroes feel that mass agitation is the wrong method to go about improving the Negroes lot. Demonstrations are usually in the form of intimidation which will not be accepted by constitutional authorities, regardless of the positions they may hold.

Aside from special areas in which demonstrations were held, I visited every community in Georgia with a population of 4,000 inhabitants or more. Nowhere did I find Negroes interested in participation in demonstration except those who received compensations for their activities. What the Negroes desire and want most of all is a job, and otherwise be left to himself to live and enjoy happiness one among the other of his own group. The Southern Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress of Racial Equality would deprive the Negroes of this inalienable right.

If the incentive of individualism is permitted to be destroyed, free enterprise will disappear.

Certain self-appointed leaders today pretend that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or lie-down and sit-ins demonstrations which interfere forcibly with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business. Our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through the television, through the radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the public is ignored by the racial elements who sponsor demonstrations. Have not all these facilities been made available to minority groups as well as all other groups?

Maj. H. A. ROBINSON.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1963]

THE VOICE OF NEGRO INTEGRITY

It is indeed unfortunate that an American Negro of widespread respect and integrity cannot voice a moderate viewpoint without being assailed by the radicals within his own race as an "Uncle Tom" and worse. But that, apparently, is the price he must pay for asserting values long cherished in the American tradition. The radicals will not have it otherwise because they cannot afford for their self-appointed authority to be questioned in the slightest degree lest it vanish altogether.

Nevertheless, a great many individual Negroes, viewing the racial crisis askance, continue to make a great deal of sense. One such is a retired Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, who was attached to the faculty of Fort Valley State College until last June. A self-made man who lived on a Florida farm until he was 19, entered school at the age of 20 and received a bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Massachusetts, later studying at six other institutions of higher learning. Major Robinson served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist.

Interviewed by the Washington Post, he said he strongly opposes the Martin Luther King-type racial demonstrations. He applauded his students at Fort Valley for not participating in them. A far better course, he feels, is embraced by the difficult but rewarding improvement of self by the individual, by service to the Nation, by sharing in full citizenship through obeying laws, by more respect for constitutional authority and by criticizing other racial groups far less.

In the opinion of the major, those Negroes who create civil disturbances miss the whole point of the basic needs of their race in

American society. Obviously, the cry of "freedom now" as devised by the Reverend Dr. King is catchy and compelling, but the undeniable fact is that every American, Negro or not, has freedom. What he does not have is unfettered license. That he will never possess in a democratic society. No truly responsible man desires this questionable quality, for to possess it he must rob his neighbor of some portion of the latter's liberty. This Major Robinson understands full well.

His entire thesis is that the Negro should make of himself whatever he wills. Implicit in his belief is that the Negro can do so under the American system, just as the Irish have done so, the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, the Chinese and other racial minorities. As he says, human nature is such that "certain ones will go ahead, even if the schoolhouse was a log cabin, while others may be assigned to the best schools and the best environment and still either drop out or fail to measure up to accepted standards."

In this respect, and others, Major Robinson reminds us strongly of the late great, Dr. J. W. Holley, founder and president of what is now Albany State College and easily the finest mind the local Negro community has produced. Dr. Holley, too, was labeled "old-fashioned" and "Uncle Tom" by the racial militants. But he was infinitely wiser. He knew instinctively, as well as by experience, that the color of a man's skin is not as important as the color of his character as measured by his contribution to the general good of the community. That was why Dr. Holley was adjudged by the white and Negro community alike to be a splendid man and a model citizen. He gave so much more than he ever received to his city, his school and his race. His memory is revered, not as a Negro, but as an outstanding human being.

DR. JOHN BARCLAY OF CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH, AUSTIN, TEX., SAYS GOOD INFLUENCE OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WILL LIVE ON FOREVER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. John Barclay, minister of the Central Christian Church of Austin, Tex., a devout and scholarly man, delivered an invocation at the inauguration of President John F. Kennedy in January 1961.

After the cruel assassination of President Kennedy occurred November 22, this distinguished clergyman delivered a moving sermon of November 24, 1963. I agree with Dr. Barclay's estimate that "We would not see President Kennedy's like again in this century." It is a thoughtful message, voiced in sorrow, but filled with love and understanding. I ask unanimous consent that the inauguration invocation and the sermon of November 24, entitled, "A Vital, Living Memory," be printed in the RECORD.

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

INVOCATION AT PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INAUGURATION, JANUARY 1961

(By Rev. Dr. John Barclay, pastor of the Central Christian Church, Austin, Tex.)

Eternal God, our Father, we pause again to acknowledge that in Thy presence we are living and moving and in Thee alone we have our being.

We are thankful for the great and good men raised up by Thee to lead us in the past. Bless these leaders of recent decades, still with us, who have led us through these tumultuous times, to live out their years

with the consciousness of the admiration and appreciation of a grateful people.

We thank Thee for our country, for the manner in which Thou didst lead our fathers to establish this Nation in which all men have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Help us to so unite duties and rights that there may develop in all our people a new maturity that will continually produce life more abundant, liberty more responsible, and spiritual satisfactions more abiding.

Our Father, we pray for the Congress and the courts and all public servants, that there may come from their deep dedication and high patriotism a new inspiration for all Americans.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the two men whom we have elected to lead us, who today assume the almost unbearable responsibilities of their exalted offices. We thank Thee for their high intelligence and their characters made great by hard work and devoted services to their country in war and in peace.

Bless them with vigorous health, great strength, and courageous boldness to lead our Nation out into a new era and into a new frontier. Help them to lead us to return to the virtues of our fathers: industry, honesty, and frugality.

Under their leadership may we recapture the faith of our fathers and their spiritual optimism that problems are soluble, that what ought to be can be, that neighborly potential is inherent in mankind.

FAMILY SUPPORT SOUGHT

Our Father, we pray Thou will bless Lyndon B. Johnson and add Thy strength to his strength as he continues to lead men of divergent views to reconcile their differences in the interest of the common good of our Nation and of all mankind. Add Thy wisdom, grace, and power to his great abilities, and may his willingness to serve bring strength and help to the President.

May the beauty, understanding, and spiritual support of his family continue to bless his life all his years.

We pray, Our Father, for John F. Kennedy as he assumes the heavy burden of great leadership in these ominous times. Bless his family that in all the turmoil of his public life they may be for him an oasis of quiet peace and rest.

When he faces great and solemn hours of decision, decisions upon which may hang the fate of all mankind, when he must ascend the lonely pinnacle, help him then to know that he is not alone; that Thou art with him to guide him in making decisions of wisdom and righteousness for his Nation and the whole world.

May the magnitude of his leadership inspire tens of millions of Americans into a dedicated involvement in their country's progress. And may peace crown his years.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

A VITAL, LIVING MEMORY

(By John Barclay)

Friends, we come this morning to worship God and to remember in sorrow and grief our slain President. I am sure we all deplore the increase in violence in these postwar years. Much of it is motivated by economic greed as in bank robberies, and in various types of stickup jobs. Political hatred as a motivation for violence has been greatly increased in this generation. This type of hatred has now climaxed in the assassination of President Kennedy. This happens because the Nation is being brainwashed by certain newspapers and by radio and TV commentators and as these editorials and other approaches are poured into people's minds day after day, there builds up a sense of hatred that may turn into violence. This situation marks out clearly the task of the pulpit and the church generally for years

to come. It is simply this, we must reach, and preach, and practice this great principle that the law of love must become our way of life. We must continually preach against the sin of hate.

The New Testament is very clear on this. It says, "he that hateth his brother is a murderer." This we must remember. We can become mad, I mean literally unbalanced, through hatred. If we hate Lyndon Johnson; if we hate Ralph Yarborough; if we hate John Tower, if we hate John Connally, we are doubly sinners. It is a sin to hate any person, for every person in the world is the child of God. It is a sin to hate anybody, because it may lead to murder. It is a particular sin to hate people whom we have elected to lead us in public office, for this is a sin against democracy, and both are sins against God. If we have not learned yet how to be good citizens in a democracy where we speak with our votes, and change governments with our votes, then we are still children, in government. This has led to the assassination of other Presidents—three others, and two other attempts. This country went for nearly 75 years without an attempt to assassinate a President; then at the close of the Civil War, it began. Since Alfred the Great was crowned King of England in 871—and he was the first person ever to speak of England as one country, as a single land—and from then until now, nearly 1100 years, there has been no assassination of a British sovereign.

Friends, we must learn the deeper meaning of democracy that politics is the way of life in America. It is the art of the possible. The people elect their Governors, their Presidents, their Congressmen, their Senators, their city councilmen. We elect those that lead us. The very fact that we elect them puts us under a peculiar obligation to respect their leadership and most of all to respect and admire the offices which they fill. We must respect the office of authority in government and the way of dissent must be by nonviolence and voting.

There seems to me there is a double tragedy in the death of John F. Kennedy. First, his youth, his ability, his almost perfect preparation for the Presidency, the great fulfillment of his task: now goes unfinished. This is the first tragedy.

The second tragedy is his depth of greatness in a new worldwide setting of opportunity; this was lost to our world. I sat and listened to him on that blustery, cold day as he gave his inaugural address, and there he pictured his vision of our country in a new frame of reference, in the world setting of tomorrow. I sat there and thought of two great men who were sitting on the platform. These men I had admired; men that I had often saluted in my heart because they were courageous men. I am speaking, of course, of General Eisenhower and ex-President Truman. These men had to make terrible decisions and they made them. They were great leaders and great Americans. But Mr. Kennedy was the first man to be President who was born in this century and as he finished this address, it seemed to me that his mind and his plans and his vision, were in the history of the future. Here was the stream of time into which his leadership and genius would be poured. This man in his 3 short years in the Presidency gave an image of America to the world that I believe will be an image in fulfillment for the rest of this century.

First, he wanted to talk about peace, like his predecessors, from the standpoint of strength. This we have. But it was a peace of reason that he wanted, and he was reasonable, in seeking it. His representatives at the peace conference have published now the "American Blueprint for the Peace Race," which is one of the most intelligent and forward-looking and hopeful documents that has ever come from the State Department. I

hope you will read it word for word. It is a 35-page booklet. This is the dream of the future for mankind—to get out from under this nuclear cloud of fear and dread. That was first; that in our generation we begin to secure the peace for mankind. And his second great ideal was prosperity; to get the economy going; to lift up every year more hundreds of thousands of people who will live on a comfort level of life where they enjoy the good things that are created in our land. And the third was like unto it; namely, national sharing. He said to the Congress just the other day that "I cannot do my duty as President of this land if you are going to cut foreign aid, and cut and cut and cut." This was part of his program. This is a part of his ideal of life that he knew first in his family—simply, that if you have wealth, you must match it with responsibility. This is not just for persons; this is for nations. No rich nation in a poor world can ever be secure and safe, and this was a great, new ideal begun in the days of Mr. Truman and continued in the days of his successor and continued also by Mr. Kennedy. But this was his ideal to see not only our land lifted up, but also the whole world to a new level of prosperity, and mutual helpfulness.

And then he had a fourth very great ideal upon which he staked his very life, his political life; namely, that every citizen's rights should be respected by the people and protected by the government. Friends, this image of his country was personified in his own life. The flowers in the baptistry this morning are red roses because we want to symbolize his courage and his love and his sacrifice. His was a pure life, with a certain mature innocence. He knew that if somebody wanted to kill him, he could. There is no way to completely protect a President. But he never could make up his mind that anybody wanted to kill him. So he traveled more freely probably at times than he should have. His was a simple but strong and sincere faith in God; his religion was expressed by his churchmanship. The record shows that in nearly 3 years in the Presidency he never missed a Sunday going to church. Wherever he was in the world, he arranged to be close enough to a church to attend it, when Sunday came.

However difficult was his life, and however heavy the burdens of responsibility of his office, he felt that there was a duty that he had to his God, to his family, and to himself that he needed to worship; that he needed to go to church and experience again, as all Catholics do at the mass, the crucifixion of our Lord. In this he gave an example to all of us, to all of his citizens. He was just not satisfied to give his money to his church; he gave it his personal attention and his time. You have probably heard on the television what people have thought all over the country. I have this quotation from an Austin high school boy—which moved me deeply. He said, "Somehow I felt so safe while he was alive." He probably had never thought this before he died. He just went along taking things for granted and then when this tragedy struck—quickly—here in our own Texas, it stunned him, and then as he thought back, he felt that this man could lead us in ways of peace and mutual helpfulness.

And questions are being asked—not just by high school students and children, or college students, but by all of us. They are asking the question: Is there really anything to the doctrine of divine providence? Does God care? Does He care whether this man was protected; whether this other man with evil thoughts should kill him like that [snaps fingers]—and probably a second after the bullet hit, he was never aware of anything. Does God care about these things? And, of course, we answer: God does care. God cares about us all, whether it is the President of the United States or a nameless

and an unknown peasant, that falls; God cares. Jesus went into this with such infinite detail, that He said: "The very hairs of your head are numbered. Not a sparrow falls without the Father's concern." This is the very basis of our religion. Then why does it happen? This is the price of freedom. When God divided His sovereignty with mankind and gave us freedom, then we help make the decisions about life and what happens in life.

What is left of John F. Kennedy? Tomorrow in a great formal ceremony before members of almost all the nations of the world they will inter his body among the immortal dead of this Nation there in Arlington. I know many of you have gone over there into the cemetery and paused on the front porch of Robert E. Lee's home. There many of the great and immortal dead of our country lie buried. And there they will inter his mortal remains, and that is what goes. But what stays—what remains? What is left? And this is the important thing. This is the thing that every preacher tries to say to people who are sorrowing at a funeral—this is difficult at times, because the spiritual atmosphere is not thrown around funerals as much as we would like, but what we are saying is that his vital, living memory continues to live. The glory of his life, his high purposes, his courage, his sacrifice, his high sense of duty, his great vision live on in all the people that loved him and followed him.

Thirty years ago I heard a story of a man who had come back from China. He had gone way out in the western province of China, Sikiang, and he said he saw there on the semidesert a little hut and way in the distance there was something shining on the top of the roof. When he got there he saw "Standard Oil" on the piece of tin that was on the roof, that was what was shining. But this herdsman asked him in; they had language difficulty but one thing he understood—there on the wall of this hut way out in western China was a picture of Abraham Lincoln, who had been slain 70 years before by an assassin.

This man and his family who were destined to live in poverty and squalor all their lives had some touch of dignity put into their souls by the fact that they could admire and get some inspiration from this man that came up from poverty, came up from the people, and yet became one of the great and dynamic men of history. The deathless quality of love and honorable character, and service to others live on. Indeed these are released by death. This we have always known about Jesus. As long as He was Jesus of Nazareth, He could be in only one place at a time; He could talk only to one group; He could heal only one person at a time; He had the limitations of the flesh, the limitations of time and space; but as soon as He rose from the dead, and became an immortal soul, He was freed from these limitations and Jesus could dwell in a hundred million minds at the same moment and He could bring healing and health and inspiration to millions around the world at the same time. And this is what is released in death—the limitations of the flesh. And we take this as the perfect case in the world. But there is no reason why we should limit this truth and not take this same ideal and apply it, take this same truth and apply it to the good and the great of all generations. Because out of this outpouring of life into the stream of humanity there goes this spiritual food, this mental lift, this guidance of the spirit for people not only who knew him, of people who were present, not only his contemporaries but if he is great enough, if he lifts his soul high enough in life, he lives on forever in other lives made better by his presence.

This morning as we close this memorial to our fallen President, I want to carry on a tradition that has been in this church since its beginning, 116½ years ago, we have never

closed a worship hour in this church without opening the doors of the church to any who would come in and join us, either by letter or statement or the simple confession of Christ's saviourhood. Come and walk with us in this high tradition of our Saviour.

DETROIT MAYOR JEROME P. CAVANAGH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 2 years ago, a political newcomer staged a spectacular upset in winning the post of mayor of Detroit. Harper's magazine this month carries an interesting report of how this man—Jerome P. Cavanagh—has taken hold of the reins of government and capably dealt with some of the most difficult and explosive problems which ever faced a mayor.

I ask unanimous consent that much of this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks. I make this request with the thought that my colleagues and the country will enjoy the story of accomplishments of this man, young in years but mature in leadership skills. It is good to be reminded that such men and women are engaged in public business in this Nation.

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

DETROIT'S SURPRISING MAYOR (By Tom Nicholson)

On a steamy Sunday afternoon last summer, some 125,000 citizens, most of them Negroes, paraded calmly on a freedom march through the downtown section of Detroit. The only untoward incident—quickly quelled—was caused by a lone American Nazi among the spectators. Around the same time, across the country, police were hauling civil-rights demonstrators to jails and in Chicago Mayor Richard Daley was shouted down when addressing an NAACP convention.

The relative tranquillity of the Detroit scene was startling; the city has a long history of turbulent race relations dating back to the bloody riots that took place there 20 years ago. Significantly, a prominent figure in the orderly June freedom march was a husky, blue-eyed, 35-year-old Irishman, Jerome Patrick Cavanagh. Unknown to most Detroiters 2 years ago, he was elected mayor in 1961 in the most spectacular upset in recent Michigan political history.

His victory was to a large degree the result of an explosive racial situation which a recent economic upturn has somewhat ameliorated. But to a considerable degree the easing of racial tension must be credited to the bold and realistic steps Cavanagh has taken in the field of civil rights. He has rammed through equally direct—and often unpopular—measures to replenish a bankrupt municipal treasury and, though he is an outspoken liberal on virtually all issues, he has also cracked down vigorously on the obstructionist tactics of craft-union leaders.

"You've got to have a definite philosophy and work at it," he told me recently, "even if it means that once in a while you get clobbered."

So far this has not happened, even though Cavanagh has handled an extraordinary number of political hot potatoes. Instead, during his brief term of office he has become the object of nearly constant worship by the city's newspapers as well as by civic, business, and labor leaders—most of whom

supported his opponent, then-incumbent Louis C. Miriani, in the 1961 race.

Not long ago Cavanagh was guest of honor at a luncheon sponsored by Civic Searchlight, Inc., a respected local "good government" group: "It's a pleasant experience to be the focus of the Civic Searchlight today," he amiably told the assembled burghers. "It wasn't always this way. In November 1961, I was searching eagerly for the light but it was shining on someone else."

"We all know a lot more about our mayor now," said Searchlight's president by way of apology.

Detroit's municipal elections are nonpartisan. To win, Cavanagh had to outdistance eight other contenders all running in the August primary without party label. He then went on to trounce Mayor Miriani, an old pro who was supported by every branch of the Detroit establishment. At the height of the campaign, Henry Ford II, whose home is in Grosse Pointe, took the unusual step of announcing that if he lived in the city he would vote for the distinguished incumbent. Though Cavanagh had been active in the Young Democrats, even the stanchly Democratic AFL-CIO Council endorsed Miriani—unions, like other practical citizens, prefer to back a winner.

Certainly few people—except possibly his wife Mary and the seven little Cavanaghs—thought Jerry had any chance back in the summer of 1961 when he decided to enter the primary. A lawyer with a moderately lucrative practice, he is blessed with the Irish love of politics, an engaging presence on the platform or TV, and a sensitive ear for public opinion. This was, however, his first try for elective office. The campaign was run, says one of his aides, on "nickels and novenas." The former were supplied by personal friends, by the Detroit Fire Fighters Association, and by some Negro trade unionists. The prayers—plus plenty of sweat and shoe leather—were offered by the friends of his college days at the University of Detroit, a Jesuit school where he earned both his AB and his law degree.

Cavanagh finds the current adulation slightly embarrassing. "When the papers are too nice to you people begin to wonder," he told me recently.

Unanimity on any subject is a rare phenomenon in a city noted for its harsh social and economic cleavages and periodically racked by bitter collective-bargaining contests. Often called an overgrown small town, Detroit has shallow cultural roots. Its traditions and aristocracy date only from the birth of the automobile, and the wealthier citizens have never reached a comfortable accommodation with the United Auto Workers. Since the late 1940's, however, the union has become a major political force. Detroit's population has grown from 285,000 in 1900 to nearly 1,700,000. Nearly one-third are factory hands, who have little contact with white-collar workers or the other groups identified with management.

Physically, too, this is a divided city. Its 140 flat square miles start on the shores of the bustling Detroit River, clogged with ice in winter and churned during the summer months by hundreds of iron-ore freighters making the rounds between Duluth on Lake Superior and ports on the southern shore of Lake Erie. Sprawling north and west from the river bank, like spokes of a giant half wheel, are five wide avenues—Jefferson, Gratiot, Woodward, Michigan, and Grand River. Most of the city's half-million Negroes make their homes in two huge public housing projects or in a teeming tumble-down area called, ironically, "Paradise Valley." The Negroes, along with other working-class families, including a large sprinkling of Mexicans and white south-

erners, live within Grand Boulevard, a half-circle surrounding the city some 3 miles from downtown. The luckier Negroes are pushing out beyond the boulevard but have as yet made no inroads into Palmer Woods, Rose-dale, and other sections where middle-class whites, in pleasant, tree-shaded houses, warily watch the dark-skinned out-migration. The really rich don't stay in Detroit but move to such elegant suburbs as Grosse Pointe, Birmingham, and Bloomfield Hills.

Tied to a single industry, Detroit is particularly vulnerable to fluctuations in national prosperity. "When the economy sneezes, Michigan catches pneumonia," goes a local saw; in fact, recent recessions have thrown 18 percent of the city's labor force out of work. Even apart from major economic swings, Detroit is a moody town. Spirits sag each summer as the auto production curve slopes off. Hopes rise in the fall when the new models are introduced and their very newness seems to promise big sales. If they fail to materialize, Detroit people don't buy homes and refrigerators, they stop going to ball games or concerts. They're saving against the ever-present threat of a layoff at Ford, GM, and Chrysler.

BRIDGING THE RIVER OF HATE

Two years ago, a kind of chronic chin-in-the-chest despair had settled over the city. It was compounded of nagging concern about continued unemployment, labor-management bickering, the inability or unwillingness of the legislature in Lansing to take action about the State's acute fiscal problems, and the platitudes of a mayor who seemed to understand everything about city government except how to make it work.

In late 1960, several white women were brutally murdered in one of the city's Negro ghettos. Mayor Miriani reacted by ordering a crackdown on crime, which was carried out by his police commissioner, Herbert W. Hart, a dapper millionaire food-distributor. Negroes were indiscriminately picked up on the streets, frisked, searched, and subjected to humiliating questioning. Overzealous policemen booked those deemed to be acting suspiciously on flimsy charges and held them overnight at precinct stations.

The Miriani-Hart dragnet captured a number of purse-snatchers, vandals, muggers, and petty thieves; a lethal-looking array of switchblade knives, zip guns, chains, and pipes was collected. But none of the murders was solved. Thousands of innocent Negroes were outraged and the entire Negro community seethed. This was the stage on which Jerry Cavanagh, unknown, untried, and uninhibited, made his political debut.

Campaigning from door to door, in supermarket parking lots, at small meetings in homes, he promised to end police harassment, to attack unemployment and the other social ills that were at the root of the crime problem, to deal justly with all citizens irrespective of color.

His message was heard in Paradise Valley and in the other areas where unemployed Negroes and whites patched the windows of their ramshackle frame homes with cardboard. In one such area on the west side the vote went 86 percent for Cavanagh. Across town, near the shells of the abandoned Hudson and Packard plants where Miriani in 1957 had polled 88 percent of the vote, Cavanagh won 77 percent. He did even better in a bleak 2-mile stretch on the city's northern outskirts, known as the "slave market." Here hundreds of Negro men regularly waited on the highway, shivering in the blustery fall morning, hoping that someone in a passing car or truck would stop and offer a day's odd job.

Immediately after his election, Cavanagh set about making good his campaign prom-

ises in a fashion that was both practical and dramatic. As his controller and the city's chief financial officer, he named a highly respected Negro, Alfred M. Pelham, a former member of the Wayne State University political science faculty who had previously been county budget director. Theodore Morgan, a Negro UAW official, was appointed secretary of the Department of Public Works Commission. To head the Mayor's Commission on Children and Youth he chose another Negro, Mrs. Esther LaMarr, a former probation officer of the juvenile court. Anticipating by a good 20 months the steps other cities have since taken under pressure of civil-rights demonstrations, he ordered a survey of employment in all city departments and instructed them, wherever feasible, to raise the ratio of Negroes to 30 percent—to reflect approximately the racial balance of the city's population. His first executive order was for fair employment practices in city hiring. Shortly afterward, he ruled that no city contracts go to firms practicing discrimination.

To deal with the critical issue of "police brutality" he named as Police Commissioner George Edwards, a 49-year-old Michigan Supreme Court justice who was once an organizer for the UAW. A sensitive man, well known for his liberal political and social views, Edwards was much esteemed by the Negro community. Under his direction random arrests for investigation were ended, and policemen were required to observe constitutional guarantees against illegal search and seizure. Edwards set out to "build a bridge over the river of hate" in Detroit. For this purpose he took to the streets, and three or four evenings a week he attended meetings in Negro neighborhoods, urging his listeners to forget their traditional distrust of all cops and to help them catch the muggers, racketeers, and narcotics peddlers who threaten both Negroes and whites.

These efforts bore fruit, even though Paradise Valley is still not a place for carefree strolling late at night. There has been some grumbling among policemen who accuse Edwards of being soft on Negro wrongdoers. But the salient fact is that excruciating tensions have been eased and a serious racial crisis has been averted. (Edwards was recently named by President Kennedy as a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati.)

THE MESS IN COBO HALL

Meanwhile, Cavanagh has moved briskly ahead in dealing with some of the other municipal messes he inherited.

One of these dates back to 1960 when the city completed a new \$54 million complex on the Detroit River known as Cobo Hall and Convention Arena. Intended as a magnet for badly needed convention business, it became instead a private preserve to be milked by building-trades union stewards and business agents. Exhibitors, for example, were forced to hire a \$4.50-an-hour electrician to screw in a light bulb or insert a plug. The simplest display had to be assembled by a three-man carpenter crew, some working at over-time rates. Even the UAW, which held a special convention here in 1961, was the victim of a jurisdictional dispute between Teamsters and Carpenters, both claiming the right to set up delegates' chairs. Several conventions canceled their plans; others vowed never to return unless the labor problem was straightened out. Cavanagh's predecessor, Miriani, made a few half-hearted attempts to iron out the difficulties. He was, however, in no position to take a firm stand since many of the recalcitrant union leaders were his cronies and regular Saturday afternoon companions at the Clique Lounge Bar, a midtown saloon favored by

contractors, union leaders, and friendly politicians.

Cavanagh came into office with no debts or commitments to organized labor and a determination to clean up the Cobo Hall mess. As his chief troubleshooter on this front he appointed John D. McGillis, a tough, able administrator with considerable experience in city government. Under his direction a civic center commission drew up new work rules requiring that all job assignments be handled through a single labor contractor, with a city representative present during negotiations. Union officials were to have no direct dealings with any individual exhibitor. Since Cobo Hall is a public facility, Cavanagh announced that city employees would run it if the building trades unions would not accept the new rules.

When one union leader begged off from a conference with the mayor, on the grounds that he was not in the city, Cavanagh had him tailed.

"This guy," Cavanagh said to the president of the Detroit Building Trades Council, a close friend of the former mayor "out and out lied to us. He said he was out of town and we know damn well he wasn't. If you guys don't want to cooperate with us we'll get some people in the hall who will."

Jolted by such tough talk, the building trades leaders, in due course, bowed to the new rules.

GRAND OPERA AND BAGELS

The mayor has been no milder in deed—though somewhat more urbane in manner—in his treatment of Detroit's genteel suburbanites who have not been happy about the steps taken to restore the city's fiscal integrity. In January 1962 the municipal treasury was bare; a budget deficit of \$19 million was destined to climb to \$34 million by June. Determined to find \$40 million in new money, Cavanagh argued, first, for a State income tax. He hammered on this theme at meetings, press conferences, and on TV, and traveled to Lansing to plead his cause. Though responsible leaders of both parties agreed with him, the rural-dominated legislature said "no."

Defeated on this front, Cavanagh persuaded his city council to enact an unprecedented 1-percent city income tax—to be levied not merely on Detroiters but on suburbanites who work in the city. The outcry from the split levels was predictable. Suburban mayors banded together in a vigilance tax committee which collected a war chest from commuters to fight the new tax in the courts. A "tea party" to protest taxation without representation was organized. But in due course the courts upheld the tax; the budget, which expired June 30 of this year, was in balance, and the general fund deficit has been cut in half. Thanks to improved economic conditions, the yield has exceeded expectations and Cavanagh may be in the happy position of cutting taxes when his term ends in 1965.

"This is a hard, punishing job," Cavanagh said to me recently at the end of a day that had included 6 or 7 hours of conferences with his staff on juvenile delinquency, city planning, street resurfacing, and assorted municipal problems, sandwiched between an unending procession of citizen visitors, ranging from a delegation of schoolchildren to a police sergeant who wanted the mayor to meet his wife. However, he shows no signs of wear, except for thinning hair and an expanding waistline (the price of too much official dining). His workday normally starts at 8:30 a.m., when a police department driver arrives in a city-owned black Imperial Le Baron limousine at the six-bedroom Cavanagh home at 18055 Parkside. Before leaving he helps get four of the seven children ready for school.

"Mary doesn't like all the publicity and pressure surrounding the office," he told me. "But happily, the kids don't feel it. To them, my being mayor just means a chance to meet Al Kaline (a Detroit Tiger star) or Gordie Howe (of the Detroit Red Wing hockey club). At night, our kids still watch Popeye on television instead of the news."

His office is on the 11th floor of the marble and glass city-county building on Detroit's waterfront. When he arrives, Cavanagh generally heads for the basement cafeteria, picks up a cup of coffee and a bagel, and then tries to down them as he chats with the many people who like to say good morning to the mayor.

He greets most of them by name and asks appropriately about ailing aunts, uncles, or children. There is a disarming genuineness to these classic political gestures, as executed by Cavanagh—that quality which Madison Avenue calls "sincerity" but which reflects, in fact, a real concern for his fellow members of the human race. He has, in addition, what might be called style. He is quite at home, for example, at the opening of the Metropolitan Opera's 2-week Detroit season where he does the honors with Mrs. Edsel Ford, grand dame of the auto colony. And he is an equally warm and witty companion at a newspaper reporters' party upstairs in Jacoby's saloon. With his head cocked to one side, he has the knack of making the individual he is talking to feel important and respected.

No politician, of course, is without detractors. Billy Rogell, a cantankerous former Tiger shortstop (Detroit is peculiarly blessed with athletes turned politicians) is Cavanagh's most vocal critic on the eight-member common council. He customarily refers to His Honor as "our boy mayor."

Cavanagh's most palpable fault is ducking tough decisions on key personnel. For instance, the Detroit Street Railways, badly in need of capable executive leadership, had to wait 20 months for the mayor to name a permanent general manager. The Detroit House of Correction, which handles all of Detroit's minor criminal offenders, was poorly run for many months—primarily because Cavanagh appointees on the institution's governing commission were too busy fighting among themselves to attend to their job.

Though he has been dilatory in some respects, Cavanagh's administration has been marked by notable acts of political courage, including the income tax and the cleanup at Cobo Hall. More recently, he boldly vetoed a tax cut of 22 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation, passed by the common council. "I thought long and hard about it," he told me, "but I finally decided that if I didn't veto it, we'd be back on the same old road we were on when I took office."

Thanks to near-record car production, unemployment in Detroit has dropped from 118,000 to below 70,000 since Cavanagh took office.

"The economic improvement has been of incalculable aid," he concedes. "But this could have happened to anybody in office. The important thing is that we have taken advantage of it."

Cavanagh has seen to it that Detroit received the full benefit of available Federal funds. Currently, the city has on the planning boards or in progress a \$5,500,000 accelerated water and sewer program, partly financed by Federal money; a \$200,000 city-Federal juvenile-delinquency study; a \$500,000 pilot program, financed by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, to provide a shelter for homeless men, and a \$500,000 city-U.S. Labor Department program to train school dropouts for jobs in government and industry.

With programs started under the Miriani administration and carried forward under Cavanagh, downtown Detroit is being revamped. Hundreds of acres on Skid Row, which started at the doorstep of the Sheraton-Cadillac, the city's best hotel, and ran west along Michigan Avenue for 10 blocks, have been razed. This area will eventually be an International Village, a cluster of shops, restaurants, and cultural attractions.

Eighteen urban-renewal projects are also in the works, ranging from port development to luxury apartments. In addition, 4,000 acres have been blocked out for neighborhood conservation programs—the government supplies the money for street repairs, parks, and general civic improvements, while the homeowner, with guidance from government experts, rehabilitates his home. Three new privately built skyscrapers downtown are the recently-completed 32-story Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. building, the 26-story Detroit Bank & Trust Co., and the 25-story Pontchartrain Hotel, now under construction.

PLATEAU OF OPTIMISM

As a fresh, attractive, and—so far—successful young politician, Cavanagh is inevitably compared with George Romney, whose election ended 14 years of Democratic control of the Michigan governorship last year. A direct contest between the two is probable—perhaps for Governor in 1964. Or, if Senator McNAMARA decides not to run again in 1966, as is rumored, the two might vie for the Senate. A Cavanagh-Romney race would be a lively encounter. Publicly the two men have cooperated amiably, in such matters as trying to persuade the American Olympic Committee to make Detroit rather than Los Angeles the site of the 1968 games. But privately Cavanagh has a deep antipathy for Romney whose self-righteousness, particularly, irks him.

"Romney is so much the creature of an overwrought press that it's difficult to divine what lies beneath all those newspaper clippings," Cavanagh said to me not long ago when we were talking about his political future.

In a Romney-Cavanagh race, the "wise men" of the community—the editorial writers, businessmen, and civic leaders—would probably put their money on the former. He has, certainly, the advantages of wealth, prestige, and a massive press buildup. There are several X factors, however. One is Cavanagh's hypersensitive political antennae which enabled him—alone among the city's leaders—to sense the intensity and power of the Negro revolt in 1961. The physical improvements in the city are also among his tangible assets. Hardest to measure, but perhaps most important, is the change in the city's emotional climate during his administration.

I've lived in Detroit since 1951—through the ebullience of high production during the Korean war, the 1955 boom, and the bad years which started in 1957 and lasted through most of 1961. Now, for the first time, we seem not so much to be climbing out of a valley of trouble as to have reached a plateau of confidence and even optimism. A friend of mine who has decided to buy a home here after many postponements put it this way: "This city, with its unemployment and despair, seemed old before its time," he said. "Now, somehow, it seems young again."

TARIFF RATES FOR IMPORTATION OF BEEF AND LAMB

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have been following with interest the hearings

before the U.S. Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee which began on December 2 on tariff schedules which are under consideration for modification or continuance. I feel very strongly that further reductions in tariff rates for either lamb or beef would only compound an already unfair and difficult situation.

A particularly effective statement of the position of the National Wool Growers Association was made by its executive secretary, Edwin E. Marsh. I ask unanimous consent that his presentation which contains both excellent factual material and tables be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

This statement is presented on behalf of the National Wool Growers Association which in 1965 will be commemorating its 100th anniversary as the recognized spokesman of the sheep farming and ranching industry of the United States. Our principal membership consists of the following 19 affiliated producer organizations: Arizona Wool Growers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Colorado Wool Growers Association, Idaho Wool Growers Association, Indiana Sheep Breeders Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders Association, Mississippi Sheep Producers Association, Montana Wool Growers Association, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New Mexico Wool Growers, Inc., Oregon Wool Growers Association, Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Utah Wool Growers, Inc., Washington Wool Growers Association, Western South Dakota Sheep Growers Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Wisconsin Cooperative Wool Growers Association, Midwest Wool Marketing Cooperative, Inc., and North Central Wool Marketing Corp. In the area covered by these organizations approximately 75 percent of the Nation's sheep, lambs, and wool are produced. We are the national organization which speaks for the approximately 300,000 sheep producers of the United States.

Imports of lamb and mutton continue to threaten the existence of our domestic sheep industry. Further tariff reductions would only cause additional economic distress to an industry already struggling for survival. Here are the facts:

1. Poundage of dressed lamb imports has increased 89 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962.

2. Poundage of dressed lamb imports is up 1,000 percent for the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1957.

3. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 13 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962.

4. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 7,264 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1957.

5. Total lamb and mutton imports in 1962, converted to a live animal basis, equal 3,144,800 head of sheep—compared to our federally inspected domestic sheep and lamb slaughter in 1962 of 14,691,800 head.

6. Lamb and mutton imports on a carcass equivalent basis amounted to approximately 22 percent of domestic production during the first 9 months of 1963.

7. During the past 2 years foreign lamb carcasses have been landed at our east coast ports, with freight, tariff and all other charges paid at from 5.22 to 19.70 cents per pound below average domestic wholesale prices at New York.

8. The rapid increase in imports would not indicate by any stretch of the imagination that present low tariff levels are trade barriers.

9. Packers and retailers have stated to us that the price variation between foreign and domestic lamb exerts a continual downward pressure on the market.

Costs of production in the domestic sheep industry are constantly rising. On the other hand U.S. live lamb prices as of October 15, 1963, averaged only 70 percent of parity; live sheep prices only 68 percent of parity. Certainly one of the important factors responsible for this is the constantly increasing lamb and mutton imports at tariff rates 50 percent below those in existence prior to 1948. Further duty reductions would only compound an already unfair and difficult situation.

Foreign lamb imports continue to rise and are running considerably ahead of last year. During the first 9 months of 1963, 14,927,000 pounds of dressed lamb have been imported compared to 7,904,000 pounds during the same period of 1962—an 89-percent increase.

In March 1960 we appeared before the Tariff Commission in the escape-clause investigation on lamb and mutton imports. At that time we used import data for the year 1959. Imports of lamb today are almost double the 1959 volume. It is interesting to note that we predicted before the Tariff Commission at that time that this increase would take place under the present low tariff rate. Under present conditions we predict another doubling in 3 years—probably sooner.

One of our major problems with foreign imports of lamb is the price differential compared to the domestic product. The price U.S. wholesalers have to pay for foreign lamb is frequently considerably below the price domestic producers must receive to meet their costs of production. In recent years many domestic producers have not been meeting their production costs and have progressively gone further in debt. As we have already pointed out, USDA reports for 1962 and 1963 show a difference between the cost of foreign lamb landed at east coast ports and domestic lamb prices at New York of from 5.22 cents to 19.70 cents per pound. Without the slightest doubt this price differential does create an adverse influence on our domestic lamb market which would only be further aggravated if present low duties on lamb were reduced.

In order to bring before you the latest data available, we made a check of the New York City area to obtain a current comparison between prices of foreign and domestic lamb. These are prices which we were able to obtain for the recent week ending November 25, 1963:

Domestic U.S. Choice carcasses in New York City that week were averaging 38 cents per pound with comparable New Zealand carcasses listed at 29½ cents per pound in New York and Australian lamb carcasses listed at 28½ cents per pound.

Even though the foreign carcasses are listed at 8½ to 9½ cents per pound below the domestic price, we would like to emphasize that the U.S. price is averaged from actual sales while in the case of the foreign lamb these are quotations and we are advised that brokers do not always adhere to these prices, but if they have to sell the imported lamb below the list price in order to move it, they will do so. Again we call your attention to the fact that this 8½-to-9½-per-pound differential is after payment of tariff and other charges.

The New York City area together with the New England States and the west coast consumes approximately 70 percent of the lamb sold in the United States. Our situation is different from that of beef and pork in that

we must depend on these three areas for over two-thirds of our consumption. One carload of lambs too many for the demand in the New York City area frequently breaks that market. And when the dressed market in New York City breaks it can very easily and usually does break the live-lamb market all over the United States. New York City is the sensitive price-basing point. It is also the port through which a substantial volume of our imports arrive.

In the year 1940 choice 40- to 50-pound domestic lamb carcasses sold in the United States at an average price of 16.49 cents per pound. The 7-cents-per-pound tariff then applying on imported dressed lamb represented 42.4 percent of the domestic price.

In 1961, the latest complete yearly figure issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for this particular series, the average domestic price was 38.99 cents per pound. The 3.5-cents tariff represented only 8.9 percent of the domestic price.

Dressed mutton imports for the first 9 months of 1963 total 53,443,000 pounds compared to 47,341,000 pounds for the same period of 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period of 1957, mutton imports are up 7,364 percent.

If mutton imports, coming into the United States in boneless form, were converted to a carcass weight basis, which is the only fair comparison with domestic production, the imported product for the first 9 months of this year would amount to approximately 190 percent of the domestic mutton production for the same period.

When the Tariff Commission held hearings in March 1960 with regard to our urgent request that some control be placed on lamb and mutton imports, a statement was made by a representative of the importing countries that the sale by domestic sheepmen of older ewes is not an important factor in our sheep production. While the sale of older ewes which are no longer suitable for use on the range is not the most important part of domestic sheep operations, it is nevertheless a factor in returns to the sheep producer. It is highly essential that a domestic sheep producer secure every possible source of income from his operation in order to stay in business today. The

sale of older ewes provides one necessary source of income. Certainly imports of boneless mutton, constantly increasing, reduce the outlet for domestic mutton. A further reduction in the already extremely low tariff of 2.5 per pound on dressed mutton would further aggravate the already unfair competition which domestic producers face from foreign countries in the imports of mutton.

In an agreement with Canada effective June 6, 1951, the duty on live sheep and lambs was reduced to its present rate of 75 cents per head, only one-fourth of the former \$3 per head duty. This 75 cents per head would not begin to meet the differences in domestic and foreign production costs. That was very evident in the 1959-60 importation of live lambs from Australia. While imports of live sheep and lambs are not heavy at this time, they could again increase as they did during the 1959-60 period and it is therefore essential that the 75 cents per head duty now in effect be retained to render at least partial assistance in offsetting higher production costs in this country.

In 1954 the Tariff Commission recommended a 10 cents per pound increase in the tariff on imported raw wool. That recommendation was not carried out but in its place the National Wool Act was passed, through which tariff duties on raw wool were held at existing levels and 70 percent of these duties were applied to make incentive payments to domestic producers whenever the average domestic price fell below a level to be established by the Secretary of Agriculture. The purpose of this incentive level, as stated by the Congress, is to encourage production annually of three hundred million pounds of shorn wool as necessary for our defense needs and for the welfare of the Nation. It seems entirely indefensible to have the Wool Act on the one hand to encourage production and then to have tariff duties on lamb and mutton that are encouraging liquidation in our industry. It is even more indefensible to consider further cuts in these duties.

There are several bills before Congress which are patterned after the recommendations of the minority of the Tariff Commission in the 1960 lamb and mutton import

investigation. These bills call for tariff quotas. At our annual convention next month we will discuss further activation of these bills and will also consider requesting even more effective controls—such as straight quotas—because the problem has become even more serious since 1960.

The large increase in imports of dressed lamb and mutton since 1957 and the other problems we face from imports, are vividly portrayed in the six tables which follow this brief. They contain data furnished to us by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and I would appreciate their being made a part of the record.

In summary, we submit the following:

1. Present low tariffs on live lambs and on dressed lamb and mutton do not meet differences in costs of production here and abroad. Additional reductions in duties at this time would further aggravate the present serious economic situation of the domestic sheep industry, already growing worse each day as imports of dressed lamb and mutton continue to increase.

2. Dressed lamb imports have increased from 1,796,000 pounds in 1957 to 13,127,000 pounds in 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 they total 14,927,000 pounds. Dressed mutton imports have increased from 1,747,000 pounds in 1957 to 63,942,000 pounds in 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 they total 53,443,000 pounds. Present extremely low tariffs are in no sense a trade barrier but have highly encouraged a constantly increasing flow of lamb and mutton imports to this country.

3. While importing countries may feel they should take advantage of this hearing to request further cuts in duties, we have not up to this time heard or seen any statements from importing countries or importers to the effect that present duties are unfair, oppressive, or in any sense a trade barrier.

Avoiding further injury to an already economically depressed sheep industry is much more important than the uncertain possibility of gaining some temporary trade advantage through further uncalled for duty reductions. In view of the foregoing considerations we urgently request that the items named in this statement be removed from the negotiation list issued on October 22, 1963.

TABLE 1.—U.S. imports of lamb (1,000 pounds)

Country	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	9 months of 1963
Australia.....	959	326	3,009	6,207	4,342	2,275	5,153
New Zealand.....	370	4,703	3,397	4,756	6,426	10,282	9,586
Canada.....	447	929	576	26	63	465	149
Iceland.....	20	843	2,473	1,445	109	35	10
Others.....		1		80		70	29
Total.....	1,796	6,802	9,455	12,514	10,940	13,127	14,927

Source: Livestock and Meat Production Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

TABLE 2.—U.S. imports of mutton (1,000 pounds)

Country	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	9 months of 1963
Australia.....	441	12,250	37,615	32,297	40,306	62,612	50,864
New Zealand.....	1,287	2,310	9,432	4,360	4,384	793	2,196
Canada.....	16	302	188		69	44	3
Argentina.....						94	
Iceland.....		303	93	576	95	163	291
Others.....	3	9	21	73	49	234	89
Total.....	1,747	15,174	47,849	37,306	44,903	63,940	53,443

Source: Livestock and Meat Production Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

TABLE 3. Lamb and mutton: Australian production and exports to the United States and other countries, average 1936-40, 1951-55, and annual 1955-63 (carcass weight basis)

Year	Production			Total exports ¹			Exports to United States			Percent of exports to United States		
	Lamb	Mutton	Total	Lamb	Mutton	Total	Lamb	Mutton	Total	Lamb	Mutton	Total
	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Million pounds	Percent	Percent	Percent
1936-40 ²	245	462	708	59.1	66.1	125.2	0.7	0.4	1.1	1	1	1
1951-55	234	477	711	93.4	62.5	155.9	1.9	1.4	3.3	2	1	1
1956	326	524	850	82.7	66.5	149.2	1.0	0.3	1.3	2	1	1
1957	320	502	822	54.2	45.0	99.2	1.0	0.3	1.3	2	1	1
1958	340	582	922	65.4	95.9	161.3	2.4	16.8	17.0	(7)	18	11
1959	408	695	1,103	91.2	145.4	236.6	2.4	54.6	57.0	2	38	24
1960	455	830	1,285	60.3	166.2	226.5	6.1	50.5	56.6	10	30	25
1961	463	823	1,286	64.7	165.1	229.8	5.3	55.2	60.5	8	37	26
1962	490	824	1,314	38.5	230.7	269.2	2.1	77.4	79.5	5	34	30
1963	512	819	1,331	57.1	275.0	332.1	8.5	103.9	112.4	15	38	34

¹ Includes canned.² Year ending Mar. 31, 1936-40; other years ending June 30.³ Less than 1 percent.

Source: Australian Meat Board and Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics; and Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 4.—Comparison of the cost of frozen New Zealand lamb and domestic chilled carcasses

(In cents per pound)

	New Zealand price ¹	Costs				Total costs ²	Domestic fresh lamb prices New York ³
		Freezing charges	Freight	Duty	Miscellaneous costs		
1962-63							
1962							
Oct. 27	19.26	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	33.75	45.04
Dec. 1	19.26	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	33.75	42.46
Dec. 15	19.26	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	33.75	42.46
1963							
Feb. 2	19.84	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	34.33	40.34
Mar. 2	19.84	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	34.33	39.55
Apr. 6	18.67	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	33.16	42.90
May 4	20.13	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	34.62	47.31
May 25	21.59	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	36.08	50.85
July 6	21.59	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	36.08	46.98
July 22	21.59	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	36.08	46.98
1963-64							
1963							
Oct. 1	22.17	3.49	6	3.50	1.50	36.66	42.40

¹ Schedule price, South Island (except Southland) 29 to 36 pounds.² East coast ports.³ Choice carcass 45 to 55 pounds, monthly average price.

Source: Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 5.—Comparative costs fresh dressed lamb, New York, and frozen Australian lamb, New York, monthly 1960-63

(In cents per pound)

	Imported frozen Australian lamb					Domestic fresh lamb, New York ¹	Difference
	Price ¹	Freight	Duty	Miscellaneous costs	Net cost, east coast		
1960							
January	17.27	6	3.50	1.50	28.27	41.02	12.75
February	19.13	6	3.50	1.50	0.13	38.96	8.83
March	16.80	6	3.50	1.50	27.80	38.26	10.46
April	18.20	6	3.50	1.50	29.20	39.55	10.35
May	20.07	6	3.50	1.50	31.07	41.82	10.75
June	27.06	6	3.50	1.50	38.06	51.32	13.26
July	25.20	6	3.50	1.50	36.20	49.20	13.00
August	23.33	6	3.50	1.50	34.33	49.02	14.69
September	17.55	6	3.50	1.50	28.55	48.25	19.70
October	15.17	6	3.50	1.50	26.17	45.04	18.87
November	14.84	6	3.50	1.50	25.84	43.24	17.43
December	16.24	6	3.50	1.50	27.24	42.46	15.22
1965							
January	19.32	6	3.50	1.50	20.32	42.10	11.78
February	22.96	6	3.50	1.50	33.96	40.34	6.38
March	21.84	6	3.50	1.50	32.84	39.55	6.71
April	21.84	6	3.50	1.50	32.84	42.90	10.06
May	22.96	6	3.50	1.50	33.96	47.31	13.35
June	26.88	6	3.50	1.50	37.88	50.85	12.97
July	26.69	6	3.50	1.50	37.69	46.98	9.29
August	22.59	6	3.50	1.50	33.59	44.85	11.26
September						43.91	
October						42.40	

¹ 1st and 2d export quality at Newmarket, Melbourne, 29 to 36 pound lamb.² Choice carcass 45 to 55 pounds, 1960-62; Prime and Choice, 1957-59.

Source: Australian Meat Board, New York prices: USDA Livestock Market News; Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 6.—Comparative costs, fresh dressed domestic lamb, New York, and frozen Australian lamb, New York, annual 1951-63

[In dollars per 100 pounds]

Year	Cost of imported Australian lamb (frozen)					Domestic fresh lamb, New York ³	Differences	Cost of imported as percent of domestic
	Price ¹	Freight ²	Tariff duty	Miscellaneous costs	Total cost, New York			
1951	\$20.89	\$5.66	\$3.50	\$1.50	\$31.55	\$60.85	\$29.30	51.8
1952	18.78	5.66	3.50	1.50	29.44	57.00	27.56	51.6
1953	23.94	5.66	3.50	1.50	34.60	46.23	11.63	74.8
1954	21.60	5.66	3.50	1.50	32.26	45.58	13.32	70.8
1955	23.01	5.66	3.50	1.50	33.67	43.40	9.73	77.6
1956	25.35	5.66	3.50	1.50	36.01	44.09	8.08	81.7
1957	23.71	5.66	3.50	1.50	34.37	47.08	12.71	73.0
1958	19.25	5.66	3.50	1.50	29.91	48.42	18.51	61.8
1959	17.97	5.66	3.50	1.50	28.63	47.41	18.78	60.4
1960	20.99	5.74	3.50	1.50	31.73	43.64	11.91	72.7
1961	18.20	6.00	3.50	1.50	29.20	39.88	10.68	73.2
1962	19.24	6.00	3.50	1.50	30.24	44.01	13.77	68.7
1963 ⁴	23.13	6.00	3.50	1.50	34.13	44.36	10.23	76.9

¹ 1st and 2d export quality at Newmarket, Melbourne, 29 to 36 pound lamb.

² Net freight cost to U.S. east coast.

³ Prime and choice carcass.

⁴ Choice carcass, 45 to 55 pounds.

⁵ Preliminary: January-August.

Source: Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

Description and TSUS item number of commodities to which brief pertains

Item	Rates of duty
Live animals: Sheep.....	100.81 75 cents per head.
Meats, fresh, chilled, or frozen:	
Goats and sheep.....	106.20 2.5 cents per pound.
Lambs.....	106.30 3.5 cents per pounds.

SIR ROBERT PLATT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Sir Robert Platt is one of England's most distinguished physicians. A president of the Royal College of Physicians of London for 5 years, he has long led his nation's physicians along the paths of social responsibility. To Americans, he is best known—and justly known—for his role as president of the Royal College's Committee on Smoking and Atmospheric Pollution and as a prime mover of the now famous March 1962, Royal College report on smoking and health.

I was therefore greatly honored when invited to introduce Sir Robert at the 20th anniversary celebration of the Cancer Prevention Clinic in Chicago—honored, and delighted as well, because I knew that I was to hear the subject of smoking and health treated with rare wit and perception. But I did not suspect that Sir Robert would have for us, in addition, word of a fundamental breakthrough in smoking research. Nor did I suspect that he would aid us, though unintentionally, in diagnosing the aberrations of our own American Medical Association.

Thus, last week in Chicago, Sir Robert revealed hitherto unpublished evidence, collected by Sir Austin Bradford Hill and Dr. Richard Doll, of the smoking habits and health histories of 25,000 English doctors. Ten years ago approximately 60 percent of the doctors in the Doll-Hill survey were cigarette smokers. Today, only 20 percent continue to smoke cigarettes. This is in sharp contrast to the 75 percent of male cigarette smokers in the general public.

Sir Robert reported:

Comparing the deaths in the two 5-year periods 1952-56 and 1957-61, Doll and Hill have found that the lung-cancer death rate

had fallen by 7 percent in the doctors and risen by 23 percent in the general population.

This demonstration, tragic in its significance for it conclusively proves that lung cancer is a preventable disease, should put an end to all further argument.

Sir Robert chastised medical scientists for treating the relationship between smoking and health as an intellectual controversy of little public significance:

They have gone out of their way to look for every possible fallacy in their arguments, and given serious consideration to every counterargument, however absurd, thus leaving the ignorant with the impression that there is a lot to be said on both sides. So that they snatch at the straw so welcome to their addiction: it isn't proved. The time has come when we should have the courage of our convictions and speak of the evidence as being already accepted by all who have taken the trouble to read and understand.

Unhappily, almost as Sir Robert was speaking, the AMA in Portland was losing track of the time. Instead of resolving "to speak of the evidence as already accepted" the AMA instead called for a "long-range research program." The AMA action, if it can be called action, followed sharply on the heels of a stunning report from Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, of the American Cancer Society, which had immeasurably strengthened and confirmed the results of previous studies defining smoking as the cause of premature death from a variety of diseases.

Although the AMA delegates in June had adopted a resolution identifying tobacco as a "toxic material," Dr. Charles L. Hudson, chairman of the three-man AMA committee which had sponsored the "long-range research program," now disavows the earlier resolution.

We haven't stated that we know there is a relationship. (Between smoking and health.) We are trying to find out if there is a problem.

By these words and acts the AMA spread its mantle of respectability over the cigarette manufacturing industry, which has ritualistically—for the last 15 years—called for more research—and no action.

To answer the manufacturers and others who may fall for the lure of ever more research, Sir Robert cited the words of Lord Hailsham, then Minister of

Health, delivered during the House of Lords debate on smoking:

I do not want to say anything against research. By all means let us research on all these questions, but do not let us delude ourselves that research will buy us out of action now. Or out of the belief and conclusion that has now been established.

I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled, "Cancer of the Lung—The Facts are Known—What Next?" by Sir Robert Platt may be printed at the close of my remarks.

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

CANCER OF THE LUNG—THE FACTS ARE KNOWN—WHAT NEXT?

(By Sir Robert Platt)

Perhaps I should start by explaining how I come to be here. I am not engaged in cancer research and I am not one of those responsible for the important discovery that cigarette smoking is the main cause of cancer of the lung. I am a physician who all too often sees patients suffering from and dying from this very dreadful disease, which has become so much more common during my lifetime, and who realizes that almost the whole of it could be prevented, not in our generation, but in a future generation. And as president of the Royal College of Physicians of London for 5 years I found myself in an almost unique position to influence public opinion on this subject. To Dr. Charles Fletcher should go the credit for suggesting to me that the Royal College of Physicians should issue a report on smoking and health and for doing a great deal of the work of compiling it. It seemed to us that the evidence was quite clear but that governments were doing nothing, and the public who were not inclined to listen to scientists and research workers might understand a clear message from physicians.

We, that is the Royal College of Physicians, set up a committee to examine the evidence, and produced a report which, as you know, has been widely read all over the world. There is no doubt that our report has had an important effect on our own Government and its attitude toward this very urgent question of the public health, and it has brought the facts to the notice of thinking people all over the world. No longer is it possible to shrug off the facts and say "I do not believe them." As a Sunday newspaper in Britain said immediately after the report was published: "The evidence is now so overwhelming that only a tobacco manufacturer could deny it." It is far stronger evidence than the kind on which

we are usually accustomed to make scientific, industrial and medical decisions, and if evidence half as strong had incriminated a canned food as a cause of cancer it would have been off the market in a week. As soon as it became known that there was a connection between the birth of a deformed baby and the taking of the drug thalidomide, all future sales of the drug were stopped by the manufacturers.

Why then has the knowledge that cigarettes cause lung cancer had comparatively little effect on the smoking habits of the general public? I say the general public advisedly because there is no doubt that in intellectual and medical circles in Britain people are smoking far fewer cigarettes than before. The difference in medical meetings in Britain is very noticeable. A striking consequence of this to which I shall later refer is that lung cancer amongst British doctors is now actually declining, while its incidence continues to rise in the general population.

The reasons for the comparatively small effect on the general public I intend to examine shortly, but first let me remind you very briefly of what the evidence is.

Preliminary inquiries showed that patients with lung cancer were, in general, heavy cigarette smokers. Scientific experiments were then done in America and in Britain on hundreds of thousands of human beings—the only animal that smokes cigarettes and therefore the only available animal for a satisfactory experiment. The main studies have been by Wynder and by Hammond and Horn and by Dorn in the United States, and by Doll and Hill in Britain. So that there should be no bias the studies were what we call prospective. The smoking habits of several hundred thousand normal people were recorded and the people were then observed over a number of years, and in all those who died the cause of death was noted. Heavy smokers died more often from all causes put together. This was one of the most striking facts. At 35 a heavy cigarette smoker has increased almost fourfold his chance of dying within the next 10 years. Mostly they die from coronary thrombosis, lung cancer, and bronchitis. The lung cancer statistics are the most striking because it is a very rare disease in nonsmokers and its incidence rises perfectly with the number of cigarettes smoked so that heavy cigarette smokers have about 30 times or more the chance of dying from lung cancer than nonsmokers have. Nevertheless, the increased death rate from coronary thrombosis in cigarette smokers is very important, and these two causes together go a long way to account for the large number of widows in the United States, for heavy cigarette smoking is still much commoner in men than in women. There is far more evidence than this from all kinds of sources and none of the objections put up will hold water. Nevertheless we might consider some of them, especially as they are so dear to the hearts of the cigarette manufacturers. The first is that because lung cancer is commoner in cities than in the country it is all due to atmospheric pollution. This turns out to be a two-edged argument, and it is worth drawing them out on this. What is atmospheric pollution? A smoky atmosphere? Is there any better way of exposing your lungs to a polluted atmosphere than inhaling 20 or 30 cigarettes a day? No doubt this explains why, even in the most polluted atmosphere of our cities, the incidence of lung cancer is enormously greater in the cigarette smokers. The argument can be put another way: If you arrived from a country where cigarettes were never smoked and found millions of people inhaling two or three hundred lungfuls per day of smoke which was known to contain cancer-producing chemicals the first thing you would say is, "but surely thousands of

them must die of lung cancer?" The answer would be "yes, they do."

Then there is the argument that animal experiments have failed to reproduce the situation, but here you can point out, as I have already done, that the experiment has been done on the only suitable animal available—the only animal which smokes cigarettes—namely on man, and it has now been done on hundreds of thousands of specimens many of them now dead of cancer.

Then there is the rather more subtle argument that there is some hereditary factor that both makes you smoke cigarettes and also causes lung cancer. Apart from the inherent unlikelihood of this, and that there is no evidence to support it, it fails to account for the enormous increase of lung cancer in the last 40 years and for the fact that if you give up smoking your chances of dying from it get rapidly less. That the increase of lung cancer is real and not merely due to improved diagnostic measures is proved in a variety of ways. The most striking fact is that it has doubled in Britain in the last 10 years during which time no notable improvement in diagnostic methods has been made.

But the final test which makes all other considerations of secondary importance is this: Can you prevent lung cancer by not smoking cigarettes? This is now proved by two vitally important facts: (1) That in the carefully collected series which I have mentioned those who had given up smoking showed a gradually decreasing liability to lung cancer until after about 10 years they were nearly back to the level of nonsmokers; (2) Doll and Hill in Britain did their experiment with 25,000 British doctors. Now British doctors have materially changed their smoking habits in the last 10 years so that only about 20 percent of them now smoke cigarettes where in the general male public about 75 percent do. Comparing the deaths in the two 5-year periods 1952-56 and 1957-61 Doll and Hill have found that the lung cancer death rate had fallen by 7 percent in the doctors and risen by 23 percent in the general population. This demonstration, tragic in its significance for it conclusively proves that lung cancer is a preventable disease, should put an end to all further argument.

And now let us turn to the question of why the general public are so reluctant to accept the facts. The reasons in my view are twofold. First there is the enormous vested interest, financial potential and advertising power of the cigarette manufacturers, whose expenditure on advertising has steeply increased as the evidence that cigarettes cause lung cancer has strengthened. In Britain their expenditure on advertising is now about \$40 million (£14 million) per year. Nevertheless I would put the cigarette manufacturers second in importance as a cause of continued smoking. The plain fact is that smoking is an addiction and a very powerful one, and from now onwards I am bound to run the risk of offending the cigarette smokers in the audience, so I ask not only their indulgence, but their cooperation as test subjects in an experiment in public persuasion. Do not fear, I am not going to paint a horrific picture of dying cancer patients though I could easily do so. I am going to commit the even worse indiscretion of examining cigarette smoking as a social habit. Cigarette smoking is an addiction; not every smoker gets the addiction, but probably at least three-quarters of them do. You can, in fact, divide cigarette smokers into two groups. The first group are the dilettante smokers who toy with not more than a half a dozen cigarettes in the course of the day and don't usually inhale the smoke; they are not addicted and they tell you quite truthfully that they could easily give it up but that they enjoy the occasional cigarette and they don't see why they

shouldn't. Herein is the very big difference between smoking and drinking. The great majority of drinkers are able to remain in the category of drinking in moderation, most of them not until the day's work is done. But the majority of smokers belong to the second group, the addicts who are compelled to inhale 20 or more cigarettes a day. A large number of them would like to give up but they know they can't. Knowing myself how strong the addiction is, and the absolute compulsion to seize and light a cigarette when you have been without one for about an hour one cannot expect the majority of people to be able to make the necessary effort of will. Like all addicts, they will seize on every possible excuse for not giving up their addiction, and will try to turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to any kind of argument or propaganda which appeals to their reason, because addicts are not reasonable where their addiction is concerned.

(At this stage I can already sense the cigarette smokers putting up their defenses—but there is worse to come.) Are we then to admit defeat and say that lung cancer must go on increasing, just as road accidents will be with us as long as there are motor cars? I don't think so. History shows that the human race got on very well without tobacco for thousands of years, and that the habit of filling your hostess' beautifully appointed and fragrant drawing room with a pall of smoke, and leaving behind a rather revolting series of ashtrays, has only recently been socially acceptable. Without the petrol engine, man would be unable to do many of the things he can do today but there is not the slightest evidence that the industrial and scientific progress of the 19th century was in any way impaired by the fact that cigarette smoking had not become a universal habit. The fact is that if you don't develop the addiction you don't miss it. Alternatively, if you have given it up long enough, which I can assure you can be a long time, to get rid of the craving, you find your efficiency improved, and since many smokers cannot be expected to give up cigarettes the really important thing is to prevent, as far as possible, the next generation from developing the habit. This is extremely difficult, and unfortunately leads us to a vicious circle for it has been clearly shown that the tendency for children to smoke is greatly increased if their parents smoke too—so perhaps it is the adults who must give up first.

Appeals based solely on health and reason are unlikely to succeed. The main channels must be through social acceptability. Without being too obvious, we must subtly build up the superior status of the nonsmoker, for instance, whose superb self-confidence puts him immediately at an advantage on all social and business occasions while the cigarette addict nervously fumbles for his cigarette case. We must insinuate that the smoker is not a very welcome visitor to the drawing rooms of the best houses, and ask if he really likes making a substantial weekly contribution to the profits of the tobacco manufacturers. We must let the news circulate amongst teenagers that it is in their lower social and intelligence groups that cigarette smoking is commonest—indeed recent figures from Britain show it to be twice as common in 15-year-old sons of the so-called working classes than in middle class boys of the same age.

And finally one must of course appeal to sex. All the techniques are well-known to the American advertising corporations and I suggest that instead of governments giving their main attention to propaganda on lung cancer, they should study the techniques of the hidden persuaders, and employ at any cost the services of those who have studied the psychology and techniques of influencing the public. It might be a relief to some of them to be using their skills for the benefit of the community. If you could get glamor-

ous young ladies objecting to the stale tobacco smell of their boy friends you would change the habits of a nation more quickly than all the cancer statistics in the world. Nevertheless cancer and the other health risks should remain our chief motivation for trying to bring this social change about.

Up to now two major mistakes have been made. Most of the talking has been at the intellectual level, and the scientists concerned in it have been writing as if they were writing in a scientific journal with no popular appeal. They have gone out of their way to look for every possible fallacy in their arguments, and given serious consideration to every counterargument put up, however absurd, thus leaving the ignorant public with the impression that there is a lot to be said on both sides so that they snatch at the straw, so welcome to their addiction: "It isn't proved." The time has come when we should have the courage of our convictions and speak of the evidence as being already accepted by all who have taken the trouble to read and understand.

The other major mistake is that propaganda both with adults and young people, has mostly relied on fear. Yet it has been shown by planned experiments that an appeal through fear is much more liable to arouse denial and rejection in the human mind than an appeal which gives some positive advantage to the action to be taken. This has been well shown in regard to cancer and other questions of health, and is the main reason why I think we should play down the admonitions on health, though still keeping the facts well before the public, and concentrate more on changing social attitudes toward smoking. I was interested to note that Senator NEUBERGER in her recent book "Smoke Screen" after examining the evidence comes to similar conclusions. The health reasons should be made known in a matter of fact way but final success can only come through changing social habits.

I do not think that antismoking clinics are going to make a very big dent in the statistics of cigarette smoking, but I do think that experiments with them should be continued and encouraged because those who want to give up smoking should be able to get the best advice, and support and because further research into the techniques of nicotine withdrawal is very necessary. I have been collecting up-to-date information on the clinics which have been established in Britain to put at the disposal of the Cancer Prevention Center of Chicago. Unfortunately, those who seek the help of antismoking clinics are liable to withdraw when they find that there is no magic pill and no easy way which does not require an effort on their part. It is therefore important that clinics should not seem to promise too much and should remain experimental at this stage. Most clinics report a success rate of 20 to 30 percent who stop smoking altogether but of course this is a selected group who genuinely want to stop.

In attempting to combat the cigarette habit is there any point at which compulsion should be used? Prohibition of alcohol did not work in the United States and I don't think prohibition of cigarettes would be more successful. There are however three fields in which I would be very tempted to use legal sanctions. The first is in the advertising of cigarettes and especially in sales promotion amongst young people which in the face of the present evidence might well be made an indictable offense. On a par with this is the avowed intention of some of the manufacturers to spread the habit in African countries where cigarette smoking is at present at a low level. The second point at which I would like to see some control is in the public appearance of leading personalities, be they pop singers, athletes, politicians or intellectuals. It would seem to

me at least reasonable to ask if not to insist that in view of the enormous and rising death rate from cigarette smoking and the importance of not spreading the habit amongst young people they should not appear on television or on the stage smoking cigarettes. Third, there should be more widespread prohibition of smoking in public places, especially enclosed ones such as theaters, conference halls, and airplanes, where some rather dingy quarters might be provided for the smokers to retire to at intervals, leaving the remaining space sweet and clean for those who prefer it so. If authorities would take these actions, the general undesirability of smoking would be emphasized.

I have throughout been speaking of cigarette smoking as this is by far the greatest hazard to health. Indeed this is one of the strongest answers to the tobacco manufacturers who profess not to believe the statistics. If they are not due to cigarettes but to some other factor why do the figures for cigar and pipe smoking differ so very materially from those for cigarette smoking? To switch to cigars and pipes would undoubtedly cause a reversal of the lung cancer trend, but it is my personal hope that smokers of these even more pervasive varieties of tobacco would keep to their own enclosures as far as possible.

Finally I quote from Lord Hallsham in the debate in the House of Lords which followed our report. He was referring particularly to the tobacco manufacturers' delaying plea that more research was necessary before any action was taken. Hallsham said: "I do not want to say anything against research, by all means let us research on all these questions, but do not let us delude ourselves that research will buy us out of action now, or out of the belief in the conclusion which has now been established. * * * The impression that tobacco manufacturers now make on public opinion * * * will largely depend on the extent to which they prove themselves able to recognize as facts propositions which are accepted by impartial scientists everywhere. I believe it is to their interest to recognize the truth before and not after they are compelled to do so. The first class man is a man who recognizes and accepts compelling evidence, and not one that fights against it."

CAUSE OF NEGROES INJURED BY PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a distinguished Negro citizen of my State, has undertaken a significant and detailed study of the effect on good race relations of demonstrations, disorder, threats, and intimidation employed by various groups and agitators.

The conclusions reached by Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, U.S. Army—retired—were made after careful investigation into communities where these demonstrations had occurred and following conversations and meetings with average citizens, both Negro and white, in the areas affected.

Major Robinson is peculiarly qualified to undertake this research. He recently retired from the faculty at Fort Valley State College at Fort Valley, Ga. His record in the Army is one of honor. He served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist. Highly educated, he received the bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Mass., and later studied at six other institutions of higher learning.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief synopsis of Major Robinson's findings, published in the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph together with an editorial from the Albany (Ga.) Herald be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, Nov. 15, 1963]

NEGROES' CAUSE IS HURT BY PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS

Editor, the Telegraph: During the past 4 weeks I made a survey of areas in which demonstrations were sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress of Racial Equality. The results of the survey indicate without doubt that race relations in Albany, Ga., Danville, Va., and Birmingham, Ala., were seriously hurt by the activities of the groups named above. The real pity is that all persons of importance, except those connected with the demonstrations, expressed the view that much more progress would have been made toward granting Negroes more rights had not the radical elements from elsewhere gone into the communities in which they were not a part.

Responsible citizens of both racial groups had been working for months on grievances advanced by Negroes in various sections of the country. In time it is possible that the Negroes would have been given many of the things they desired had not the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., inflamed the situation with ultimatums.

It appears to be the consensus among Negroes in all sections that civil rights is an issue for politicians and for those who exploit the ignorance of the Negroes for their own economic advantages, influence, prestige, and power. It is felt among the masses of the Negroes themselves that the civil right leaders would not associate themselves with other Negroes except those of the "elite."

Ninety percent of the Negroes feel that mass agitation is the wrong method to go about improving the Negroes' lot. Demonstrations are usually in the form of intimidation which will not be accepted by constitutional authorities, regardless of the positions they may hold.

Aside from special areas in which demonstrations were held, I visited every community in Georgia with a population of 4,000 inhabitants or more. Nowhere did I find Negroes interested in participation in demonstrations except those who received compensations for their activities. What the Negroes desire and want most of all is a job, and otherwise be left to himself to live and enjoy happiness one among the other of his own group. The Southern Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress of Racial Equality would deprive the Negroes of this inalienable right.

If the incentive of individualism is permitted to be destroyed, free enterprise will disappear.

Certain self-appointed leaders today pretend that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or lie-down and sit-in demonstrations which interfere forcibly with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business. Our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through the television, through the radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the pulpit is ignored by the racial elements who sponsor demonstrations. Have not all these facilities been made available to minority groups as well as all other groups?

FORT VALLEY.

Maj. H. A. ROBINSON.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1963]

THE VOICE OF NEGRO INTEGRITY

It is indeed unfortunate that an American Negro of widespread respect and integrity cannot voice a moderate viewpoint without being assailed by the radicals within his own race as an "Uncle Tom" and worse. But that, apparently, is the price he must pay for asserting values long cherished in the American tradition. The radicals will not have it otherwise because they cannot afford for their self-appointed authority to be questioned in the slightest degree lest it vanish altogether.

Nevertheless, a great many individual Negroes, viewing the racial crisis askance, continue to make a great deal of sense. One such is a retired Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, who was attached to the faculty of Fort Valley State College until last June. A self-made man who lived on a Florida farm until he was 19, entered school at the age of 20 and received a bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Massachusetts, later studying at six other institutions of higher learning. Major Robinson served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist.

Interviewed by the Washington Post, he said he strongly opposes the Martin Luther King-type racial demonstrations. He applauded his students at Fort Valley for not participating in them. A far better course, he feels, is embraced by the difficult but rewarding improvement of self by the individual, by service to the nation, by sharing in full citizenship through obeying laws, by more respect for constitutional authority and by criticizing other racial groups far less.

In the opinion of the major, those Negroes who create civil disturbances miss the whole point of the basic needs of their race in American society. Obviously, the cry of "freedom now!" as devised by the Reverend Dr. King is catchy and compelling, but the undeniable fact is that every American, Negro or not, has "freedom." What he does not have is unfettered license. That he will never possess in a democratic society. No truly responsible man desires this questionable quality, for to possess it he must rob his neighbor of some portion of the latter's liberty. This Major Robinson understands full well.

His entire thesis is that the Negro should make of himself whatever he wills. Implicit in his belief is that the Negro can do so under the American system, just as the Irish have done so, the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, the Chinese and other racial minorities. As he says, human nature is such that "certain ones will go ahead, even if the schoolhouse was a log cabin, while others may be assigned to the best schools and the best environment and still either drop out or fail to measure up to accepted standards."

In this respect, and others, Major Robinson reminds us strongly of the late, great Dr. J. W. Holley, founder and president of what is now Albany State College and easily the finest mind the local Negro community has produced. Dr. Holley, too, was labeled "old-fashioned" and "Uncle Tom" by the racial militants. But he was infinitely wiser. He knew instinctively, as well as by experience, that the color of a man's skin is not as important as the color of his character as measured by his contribution to the general good of the community. That was why Dr. Holley was adjudged by the white and Negro community alike to be a splendid man and a model citizen. He gave so much more than he ever received to his city, his school and his race. His memory is revered, not as a Negro, but as an outstanding human being.

A LUNCHEON WITH A COURAGEOUS MAN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, approximately a year ago it was my distinct privilege to have been able to arrange a luncheon with the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and Martin Andersen, Editor and Publisher of the Orlando Sentinel.

Martin Andersen is a prominent civic leader in middle Florida, as well as a courageous, forthright and highly respected editor and publisher. Though we have differed on occasions, he is my friend of many years standing.

Upon the death of our late and great President, Martin Andersen wrote a remarkable editorial entitled "A Luncheon With a Courageous Man" in which he captured with the precision of words the true essence of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as he really was.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial placed in the body of the RECORD, because of its unique insight into the characteristics of our late President that have won the hearts of the American people and the countless millions throughout the world.

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

A LUNCHEON WITH A COURAGEOUS MAN

(By Martin Andersen)

No matter whether you agreed with him on all his policies or not, you had to admire John F. Kennedy.

He had a certain tough courage which is difficult to define, because it was a sort of courage which carried him forward in behalf of his beliefs in the face of great criticism from a large segment of the public and a large segment of the country.

He was a controversial figure, as he had to be, because he was bold enough to step up and stand out for his new and revolutionary concept of government and rights for all the people—with no thought to creed or color.

And yet, when the cowardly assassin's bullet cut him down from ambush yesterday, the Nation was shocked in its grief. Strong men and strong women wept after exposing themselves to hour after hour of the TV exposure of the tragic story. Others, too stunned to cry, thought of this young man's widow, his children, his mother, father, brothers, sisters and thought mostly of his great and sincere ordeal for his country.

President Kennedy was not a strong man physically. He was at death's door during World War II, after a Jap destroyer had cut his PT boat in half and left him for dead in an ocean of sharks. Ever since that time his back gave him trouble. There were times when he could hardly walk, so great was the pain in his repaired and wounded spine. But he did walk and he did travel and he did work and he did speak and argue and fight for his program and he courageously kept his suffering mostly his own secret.

We sat to the immediate right of the President one day at a luncheon in the White House some 2 years ago, with a group of six or seven other Florida publishers.

We occupied that seat of honor because our name came up first alphabetically. Greater publishers with larger newspapers, more circulation and more money were scattered around the table farther away. But President Kennedy followed the protocol of the alphabet and there we were not only in the White House for the first time in our life but we were having lunch with a President

for the first time in our life and we were also closer to him than anybody else—except the man on his left.

The group of us arrived ahead of the President and were in a sitting room when he arrived. Senator SMATHERS introduced all of us to the President and as he gave us a firm, warm handclasp he called our names as they were announced by Senator SMATHERS. A waiter brought around cocktails. Martinis and scotch and bourbon and sherry. Most of us had a cocktail of strong liquor but the President took a small glass of sherry wine.

He never finished his drink, even though several minutes of conversation passed and some of the crowd took a second cocktail.

This was a busy man. There was trouble in Vietnam. There was trouble in Berlin. There was trouble in Africa and the Cuban thing and the Bay of Pigs fiasco had just passed. The President had plenty on his mind. But he appeared calm and collected and talked first to one and then to another of us, just about like a district governor of a Rotary Club would do. There was, of course, a certain austerity about the scene. There is no denying that we all held him and the high office he represented in awe. And we all addressed him, with care, as "Mr. President."

When I speak of the President's certain tough courage, I refer to his stand on Cuba.

We began asking him questions about his next move on that island, shortly after we were seated at the round table.

I am not going to quote the President because Senator SMATHERS announced before the luncheon that this was just an informal social gathering and not a press conference in any sense of the word.

But the President gave us to understand that he did not give air protection or an air offensive to the invading Cuban fighters at the Bay of Pigs for the simple reason that he did not dare risk a counter military move in Berlin or elsewhere or in "ten other spots" which Russia was able to initiate and which possibly would wind up in the last world war to be fought by modern man.

The popular thing before him of course was a marine landing on the island of Cuba and the elimination of Castro.

He admitted that this could be done—at that time—in 10 days of fighting.

He seemed to think that Castro, if given plenty of rope, would hang himself. And we would have been saved all the lives of several thousands Marines in Cuba plus the lives of perhaps several hundred thousand of Americans in "local wars" or incidents in a dozen different spots all over the universe.

At the time I disagreed with his plan, but later on, as I began to mull his program over in my mind. I realized the chance he would have been taking to invade Cuba. Not a personal risk, but a risk of many thousands of others. And we understood, as we thought over the situation months later, that the President was willing and able to let the Castro crisis ride for awhile and perhaps erase this problem in some other manner.

Right or wrong, such a move demanded a strange sort of courage. The country, and Florida in particular, was crying for action and hollering about the Reds being just 90 miles away. But the President was able to ride with the punches as he understood there is more to the problem of running our country and keeping the peace than teaching this bearded upstart a lesson. He had more information than I had and more information than any of us around that table had. He also had a program and his program was aimed at peace and survival and the prevention of unnecessary killing of American boys in a dozen little wars all around the world.

We looked down at the President's shoes as we sat there and listened to him banter questions put to him by the publishers.

The shoes looked old to us. They were brown and had not been shined, it appeared, for several days. They must have been comfortable shoes and we surmised that he must have argued with his butler or valet about wearing them day after day as any ordinary American will wear his favorite shoes and, being the busiest man in the country, he just didn't have the time nor the inclination to get them shined.

I think he had on a brown suit. Neat enough but it did not appear any more expensive than our own. He wore a shirt with a slight pinstripe and a blue necktie.

He appeared to be not in too good health. And shortly after our visit, he did go to bed with a cold or some other slight illness.

He was a bundle of nerves and as he talked, he played with a piece of toast with his right hand, breaking it in small bits there on the table. He drank milk and after his lunch he pulled out a small cigar, little longer and a little fatter than a cigarette. He did not offer anybody a cigar, but a little later, the waiter passed cigars and cigarettes.

After the luncheon he guided us into the elevator and we got off on a higher floor and there was his beautiful wife.

"Why didn't you come down and have lunch with us?" he asked her.

"I would have, if I had known about it," she replied.

Then the two of them paraded us through the various rooms of the White House, Jackie explained each room and each piece of furniture and each picture.

There was no hurry.

The President and his wife appeared to have all the time in the world. Just like your next-door neighbor. We wound up on a portico looking out over what I would call the spacious backyard of the White House. Workmen were putting up collapsible seats for some affair scheduled for the next day.

There seemed to be no end to the job of being President—either for John Fitzgerald Kennedy or his wife.

He belonged to the people.

One may disagree with some of his policies, but he had the size and the touch of greatness. He cared naught for money and on most occasions carried none with him. Lyndon Johnson used to chide him during the campaign that he, Lyndon, always had to pay for the drugstore lunch they would eat on the fly.

He belonged to the people and the people loved him as an individual, because he was a warm, charming human being with a beautiful wife and two wonderful children. And because he was fundamentally a great American who believed in rights for all of the people.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. William E. Bradley, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County, Oreg., has brought to my attention a resolution adopted unanimously by the committee on December 5.

Because of the very fine sentiments expressed in the resolution concerning our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and the resolution's endorsement of the forward-looking legislative program President Kennedy sought on behalf of the people of the United States, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bradley's letter of December 6, containing the central committee's resolution, be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., December 6, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County at its meeting last night. I thought that you might be interested in it.

Whereas the late great President Kennedy had dedicated his life to the establishment of conditions of peace and dignity for human existence everywhere, and

Whereas President Kennedy, preoccupied with international relations, had only partially accomplished his aims to secure these objectives on the home front, and

Whereas President Johnson has emphasized his purpose to carry forward the same tradition of our late President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact into law as a memorial to our late great President, those programs—such as civil rights, aid to education, tax reduction, medical care for the aged—for which he fought so valiantly; and be it further

Resolved, That like-minded Americans everywhere be urged to write their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to erect this memorial to a great American.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. BRADLEY,
Chairman.

SENATOR HARTKE PRAISES REMARKS OF INDIANA NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy deeply moved the people of this country and expressions of sympathy continue to be voiced throughout the land. Many of my fellow Hoosiers have sent their condolences through my office.

Few of the tributes which have reached my desk are as poignant and meaningful as that embodied in a newspaper column written by Mrs. Mary D'Andrea, society editor of the Logansport (Ind.) Pharos-Tribune. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this column be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEWS AND VIEWS
(By Mary D'Andrea)

Words are inadequate in a time of great sorrow.

The loss of this Nation's President was one of inexpressible grief and frustration for the millions who considered him not a Republican or a Democrat, not a Catholic or a Protestant, but a leader of all men.

"Logan-land" residents expressed themselves in silent and solemn tribute, in special services in all churches, in a memorial service at Berry Bowl, in the display of the American flag at half mast or with black crepe, and in written words, lines of poetry.

Some of the poetic tributes to the late President, John F. Kennedy, are recorded here. Three of the local authors prefer to remain anonymous.

BLACK FRIDAY

From Washington to Dallas and back
This day for our Nation was very black
It was Nov. 22nd, the year 1963,
It will never be forgotten, but go down in history.

It started with a big parade
With our President in a motorcade
In the State of Texas, on a Dallas street
Never thinking his fate he'd meet,
When all of a sudden, above the cheers
A shot rang out that brought us tears.

And now he's gone, and left us sad
This youngest leader we ever had
But our Nation lives on and is stronger today,
Because we had him—J.F.K.

—SARA RIVERS.

TO KILL THIS NATION

How do you kill this Nation?
Murder its leader?
Oppress its people?
Purge its name?
Destroy its flag?

How do you kill this Nation?
Benedict Arnold tried betrayal.
John Booth tried murder.
Adolf Hitler tried war.
Nikita Khrushchev tried intimidation.

How do you kill this Nation
If it is loved?
If it is free?
If it is Christian?
If it is America?

How do you kill this Nation?
Only when you destroy peace.
Only when you destroy the last American.
Only when you destroy the world.
Only when you destroy God.

A SHOT WAS FIRED

A shot was fired
An irrational act of man
Upon mankind
And though it was but one
It pierced the hearts of millions
Slaying a part of each.

A shot was fired
Producing not the death desired
But giving life anew
Through grief
To build men's lives
With courage and with love.

A shot was fired
In death to martyr
But in life
To give
A hundredfold
That which it was meant to destroy.

IF DADDY HAD BEEN THERE

The day was gloomy in spite of the sun,
People crowded around everywhere
But John-John missed only one
His Daddy was not there.

"Why do all these people come?"
Was John-John's puzzled look.
It wasn't a day for fun; besides,
He'd rather look at a picture book.

Daddy always read to him
Before he went to bed
But last night all seemed grim
So he left the words unsaid.

John-John couldn't understand.
When Mommy wouldn't play his favorite game
Because Daddy wasn't home yet, and
Things just weren't quite the same.

"Daddy gone away?" he asked.
Recalling 'copter trips of the past
He always liked to watch for him
And be there when the "chopper" got in.

John-John knew something was wrong
When he didn't see Daddy in that throng
Even as Mommy held his hand tight
John-John knew something wasn't right.

The church was filled with people
But only sad tolling came from the steeple
And after Mass, the horses pranced in pairs,
Everything would have been just fine, if
Daddy had been there.

The tiny tears came slow, then fast,
And Mommy soothed him as in the past
Why he was crying he did not know
And when Daddy comes he would tell him
so.

The tears went away like Mommy said they
would,
He stood very tall and as straight as he
could,

He remembered the times on Daddy's knee
And he knew today was far from carefree.

The little hand went up to a youthful
brow

And unshed tears were forgotten now.
His salute was solemn and given with care,
He knew Daddy would be proud, had he only
been there.

From Twelve Mile we received a portion
of a letter from a former resident of that
town, Mrs. Myrna Kay Hoch, who wrote to
her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Castle G. Farley,
relating her reactions and impressions in
passing the bier of the late President Ken-
nedy. Her letter in part:

"I guess you are all interested in hearing
about the trip to Washington. I'll try to
explain the best I can. We got in line about
9 p.m. Sunday (November 24) walking 3 miles
to find the end of it. People were standing
from six to nine deep, all huddling together
to keep warm. Among those waiting were
babies a few months old and old timers
supporting themselves with canes; even two
or three were in wheelchairs.

"The majority of those waiting were middle
class (in a manner of speaking); a few were
wearing diamonds and mink and some were
very obviously poor.

"One man had his family of 13 children
there. The little boys were dressed in suits,
topcoats and snap-brim hats; the girls in
frilly Sunday dresses and hats. They all
waited throughout the night, the tiniest
sleeping in their parents' arms.

"There were people speaking languages
I've never heard spoken before. The wait-
ing itself was an education. People talked
and laughed during the early part of the
night while we were still out of sight of
the Capitol, but as we got closer and closer
they became quiet and orderly almost to
the point of being unbelievable.

"A few times a group of 20 persons or so
would try to break into the line and then
these people who were so quiet and orderly
became almost maniacs, pushing, shoving
and cursing. It frightened me—I just knew
someone would be hurt but fortunately no
one was.

"When we finally got on the steps of the
Capitol and were filing in, both men and
women were crying and no one was ashamed.
I've never before had the feeling that I had
as I walked by the casket. A hundred things
flashed through my mind, among them how
I jokingly referred to him as if he were a
personal friend, about Jackie, Caroline and
even Macarone.

"The flowers were beautiful although most
of them were in the corridors off of the
rotunda. I could write six more pages and
still the description of feelings wouldn't be
complete. It was one experience I'm sure
I shall never forget."

Mrs. Hoch is the wife of Capt. Virgil I.
Hoch, stationed at Dover Air Force Base in
Delaware, where the couple resides with their
three sons. Captain Hoch's parents are Mr.

and Mrs. Marshall Hoch, rural route 6,
Logansport.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. Is there further morning busi-
ness? If not, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I
ask unanimous consent that the unfin-
ished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H.R.
7063, making appropriations for the De-
partments of State, Justice, and Com-
merce, the Judiciary, and related agen-
cies for the fiscal year ending June 30,
1964.

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

There being no objection, the Senate
resumed the consideration of the bill
(H.R. 7063) making appropriations for
the Departments of State, Justice, and
Commerce, the Judiciary, and related
agencies for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I
suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. 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 may be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a
parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. The Senator from Arkansas will
state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the pend-
ing business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. The pending business is the bill
(H.R. 7063) making appropriations for
the Departments of State, Justice, and
Commerce, the Judiciary, and related
agencies for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. An editorial entitled
"Breakthrough" published in this morn-
ing's Washington Post states that Con-
gress has taken a giant stride forward
in education. Then it proceeds to speak
in a laudatory manner—and justifiably
so—about the great piece of work that
Congress did the other day in passing the
higher education bill.

I thank the Washington Post for its
editorial. I believe the American people
need to know what a great stride forward
has been taken on the subject of Federal
aid to education by the passage of the
higher education bill.

The Washington Post also points out
in the editorial the importance of Con-

gress passing the vocational education
bill before adjournment. I believe the
conference report is pending in the
House today. If the report is approved
by the House, the majority leader has
assured me that it will be taken up in
the Senate forthwith.

I sincerely hope and pray that the
House will pass the vocational education
bill, because it deals with what I consider
to be the No. 1 domestic economic issue
facing the country.

It deals with the problem of tens of
thousands of young people from the ages
of 15 to 21 who will be economically
drowned in an increasingly deep pool of
unemployability unless they are trained
for employment. In the vocational edu-
cation bill, we believed there have been
hammered out in conference fair and
equitable compromises in regard to the
differences that existed between the
House and Senate versions of the bill.

I thank the Washington Post for the
support it has given to both the higher
education bill and the vocational educa-
tion bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent that the editorial may be printed in
the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1963]

BREAKTHROUGH

Congress has taken a giant stride in edu-
cation. Final action by the Senate Tuesday
on the bill authorizing a 3-year program to
help finance construction of college facili-
ties, together with House-Senate conference
agreement on vocational education and im-
pacted area aid, constitutes a significant and
effective Federal aid program. President
Johnson had grounds for crediting the 88th
Congress with "doing more for education
than any Congress since the Land Grant
College Act was passed 100 years ago."

The difficulties in the way of this package
of aid-to-education bills were formidable.
The House and Senate for a while seemed
inextricably deadlocked. That the difficul-
ties were resolved at last and resolved
without any serious bloodletting, is a testi-
monial to the vitality of Capitol Hill's leg-
islative machinery. It is also, one surmises,
a testimonial to Lyndon Johnson's legendary
persuasiveness in situations of this sort.
He appears to have entered the conference
room as *deus ex machina*.

The college aid measure with its promise
of \$1,195 million for the construction of
classrooms, libraries, and laboratories in col-
leges and universities all over the country,
should give a major boost to higher learning.
It will open doors and enlarge opportunities
for many aspiring young men and women.
The vocational education measure with its
amendments extending the National Defense
Education Act should also be immensely
stimulating and helpful.

What remains, of course, is the most stub-
born and most important educational prob-
lem—to provide Federal aid for the Nation's
ailing public elementary and secondary
school system. The superstructure has been
strengthened; the foundation must now be
correspondingly enlarged. One may hope,
not unreasonably, that a Congress that suc-
ceeded in working out the racial and reli-
gious issues which lay in the way of aid to
higher education may succeed even in solv-
ing these issues as they impede aid to the
public schools at a lower level.

There are deep differences of opinion re-
specting the constitutionality and the wis-

dom of Federal aid to institutions which are church-related. The Catholic position has prevailed in higher education. Perhaps Catholics will now, in turn, despite the depth and conscientiousness of their conviction, recede from their demands regarding elementary and secondary schools. Perhaps they will abide by the wise and generous words of Cardinal Cushing 2 years ago: "While I am not convinced that the Constitution forbids all subsidies to private education, I feel that as long as the majority of the American people are against such use of taxes, Catholics should try to prove their right to such assistance but neither force such legislation through at the expense of national disunity or use their political influence in Congress to block other legislation of benefit to education because they do not get their own way."

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon saw fit to mention the editorial in the Washington Post on the Morse-Green bill.

I read that editorial with interest and approval. I support wholeheartedly every comment the distinguished Senator from Oregon just made. I express the hope, also, that it will be possible—some time today perhaps—to receive the vocational education bill, which is extremely important, and bring it up for consideration in this body.

In reading the editorial, I was struck with one omission, among others. I note that the name of the Senator who was in charge of the bill, who fought for it with great vigor, enthusiasm, and skill in conference, was not mentioned in the editorial.

I refer, of course, to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who made a great contribution, along with other members of the Committee on the Democratic side and all members on the Republican side—most especially the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVY]. On the Democratic side, the unfailing support given by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in support of this measure was outstanding.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his deep understanding in this and other important legislation reported out of his committee. It is indeed a great record and one which the Senate can be very proud of.

Although the editorial is excellent, it could have gone a little further and given credit where credit was due.

I wish publicly to give credit to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and his colleagues on the conference and in the committee who have performed outstandingly. So far as that committee is concerned, the hallmark of this session, in addition to the passing of the nuclear test ban treaty, may

well be what will be done in the field of education—not only in the field of higher education and vocational education, but also, perhaps most importantly, in the field of mental health and mental retardation as well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader has been extremely gracious, which is typical of him.

However, it is not important that my name be mentioned in an editorial. I do not expect my name ever to be mentioned favorably in most newspapers, but I have a sense of humor about that.

I could not have been thanked more symbolically or more significantly for anything I may have accomplished in connection with the higher education bill.

I was also thanked the other afternoon at the airport. After the bill was passed, I had to go to Boston immediately to make a speech. I rushed to the airport, hoping to catch a plane. While I was in line, I was taken out of the line to the office of one of the airline supervisors to receive a telephone call from the President of the United States. With typical graciousness, the President expressed what I thought were undeserved and flattering thanks to me and to my colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN, who sponsored the bill in the House.

The President graciously said that as far as he was concerned, the bill would always be referred to as the Morse-Green bill.

What more could one ask than such an expression of confidence from the President of the United States? I shall never forget it.

Nevertheless, I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. While I fully appreciate the gracious things said about me by the majority leader, as a conferee I should like to testify as a witness to the skill, forbearance, and deep devotion shown by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, my longtime friend and colleague in the conference. I am sure we would not have had a result without it.

I believe the President was correct. I should like to join in designating the bill as the Morse-Green bill. That is probably, for the Senator, much more historically important, much as I respect the Washington Post, than the fact that they did or did not refer to the bill's principal architect by name.

As we are recounting this little history, I add that the degree to which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, subordinated his deep convictions on this subject in order to arrive at a result—convictions which were superior to all others with him—is something quite admirable in showing the balance, equity, and openmindedness of one man. I know that he felt quite deeply on this subject, yet when he saw that in order to obtain a result he had to subordinate his feelings, which are long standing with him, he did so.

I hope the vocational education bill will come up today. I believe the two bills are parts of a scheme of legislation, and that they will go some distance toward dealing with the concrete underpinnings of which the Washington Post spoke.

I wish a bill dealing with primary and secondary education could be enacted. I voted for it. The Senator from Oregon is its outstanding leader. Obviously that cannot be done in this session of Congress.

We can bring the National Defense Education Act up to date. We can do something about the impacted areas legislation, for which many districts hunger. We can do something, in the field of labor, about automation. That is what the vocational education bill is all about. We can do something about school dropouts and the terrible rate of unemployment for youth, which is twice the rate for other segments of the population and, for many Negro youths, three times the rate for other elements of the population. I hope very much that there will be no haggling over that subject in this body and in the other body. I shall do my utmost, with whatever influence I have, to see that a bill is passed. A bill is far more important than any of the individual details, even the dollars involved, which I believe are quite modest.

Our fight is not over. I know of no man with whom I would rather be joined in that effort than the senior Senator from Oregon. All the tributes which have been paid to him today are well deserved. It is most important that the bill bear his name. I hope the bill will be called the Morse-Green bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New York has said. As the Senator knows, I have taken the position in both conferences, on higher education and vocational education, that we are all together on the need. I have previously stated, as I repeat now, my appreciation to every one of my colleagues in the two conferences, both Republicans and Democrats. We could not have had either bill had it not been for the complete cooperation of everyone in that conference, which was always extended to me as chairman of the conference.

As the Senator knows, we conducted a democratic conference. I took the position that the majority vote would prevail always with me, and that I would abide by the majority point of view. As a result, the conferees were almost unanimous.

I have already expressed my high regard and appreciation for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the full committee. We would have gotten nowhere with either bill, in my judgment, if it had not been for his forbearance, his understanding, and his cooperation.

There is a great deal of public interest in all three pieces of education legislation. The higher education bill has been passed, the vocational education bill is within hands' grip, and I hope that the wisdom of the House will cause it to

approve it. There will be no time between now and December 20 for any further modification. In my judgment, there could not be any, for it has been cut down to the bare bones, so to speak.

In the next session of Congress, as the Senator from New York said, we must proceed with all haste, but with careful deliberation at the same time, to see to it that something is done for the elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall make only a few brief remarks regarding the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1964.

The subcommittee held approximately 24 days of hearings on the bill. There is a record of some 2,500 pages of testimony.

As indicated in the report upon each Member's desk, the total amount of the bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$1,821,283,000. This amount is \$322,143,841 under the total appropriations for 1963, and is also \$338,608,900 below the total budget estimates submitted for fiscal year 1964. The reported bill is also \$29,986,900 below the total recommended by the House.

The bill also includes an additional \$3,249,650,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, which is derived from the highway trust fund.

In my judgment, we have a good bill and I have reason to believe it will provide sufficient funds to enable the various departments and activities to carry out satisfactorily their operations and essential programs this fiscal year.

For the Department of State, the committee recommends a net increase of \$19,982,000 over the amount allowed by the House. Included in this sum is the allowance of \$18,500,000 for the foreign buildings operations program, which the House had deleted because there was no substantive legislation for the program at that time.

For the regular educational and cultural exchange program, the committee recommended \$43 million. This sum, together with the dollars available from prior-year appropriations and other available foreign credits, will provide a total program level of about \$57 million—only slightly above the 1963 operating level. About one-half of the total expenditure recommended for 1964 will be made in hard dollars and approximately one-half in foreign currencies. This is about the same ratio followed in the program the past 2 fiscal years.

The committee also approved the revised additional request of \$979,000 for

expenses for the East-West Cultural and Technical Center in Hawaii. It was determined the additional sum was necessary to cover essential operating costs, scholarships and grants, and construction planning for additional buildings.

The committee also provided the full budget estimates, \$2,053,000, for the international fisheries commissions in order that the various commissions could carry out their planned programs this fiscal year.

For the United Nations mission in New York, \$45,000 was added to the allowance under the House bill. This sum will provide for three or four additional positions which are considered essential to help cope with the increased workload at the mission.

A reduction of \$1,500,000 was made from the House allowance of \$8 million in the construction appropriation of the International Water and Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, inasmuch as the Department advised that the lesser sum, \$6,500,000, would be sufficient to meet the obligations anticipated this fiscal year.

The committee concurred with the House allowance of \$153 million for the salaries and expenses appropriation of the Department. This sum was deemed sufficient not only to cover the ongoing rate costs of the many activities paid from this appropriation, but also to provide sufficient funds for so-called mandatory increases—grade promotions, oversea wage and price increases, and also the opening of new posts, elevation of posts, increased travel allowances, and other high-priority items of the Department.

For the Department of Justice, the committee recommended an increase of \$618,000 over the total House allowances of \$343,799,000 in the various appropriations for the Department. This increase is distributed in two items: namely, \$84,000 for general legal activities, which would provide for 10 more positions and related expenses in the tax division and civil division, where it was found there had been a marked increase in the workload; and \$534,000 for the Bureau of Prisons, where it was determined this additional amount was essential this fiscal year. Of this latter sum, \$84,000 would cover the costs of about 30 additional positions and related expenses needed in the various Federal institutions, and the balance—\$450,000—is required to provide \$250,000 for staff housing at the New Marion, Ill., Federal penitentiary and \$200,000 is required to cover the estimated costs for the preliminary design work proposed in connection with the replacement of the old National Training School.

For the Commerce Department, the committee recommends the total appropriation of \$798,300,100, instead of \$833,818,000 provided in the House allowance for the 48 appropriation items. As the report indicates, the committee recommended increases in five items totaling \$6,102,100, and six decreases from the House bill totaling \$41,620,000, leaving a net reduction of \$35,517,900. Testimony at the hearings revealed that decreases under the House allowances

could be made at this time in four appropriation items; namely, \$17 million in the ship operating differential subsidy program; \$2 million in the appropriation for control of outdoor advertising; \$4 million in the inter-American highway appropriation; and \$18 million in the Weather Bureau appropriation for the meteorological satellite operations program. In this latter case it was found there was a carryover balance of \$28 million, plus \$10,500,000 anticipated recovery from NASA which the committee considered ample to fund program needs this fiscal year. The recommended increases over the House bill will provide \$525,000 additional for the Patent Office promotion program; \$1,527,100 for additional costs in the salaries and expenses appropriation of the Weather Bureau, of which \$1,144,700 is needed to defray the ocean weather service costs which were previously funded by the Navy Department—it has asked, therefore, that this amount be transferred to this appropriation bill, and that accounts for a major part of the increase—and \$382,400 is required to improve the weather reporting services in various areas of the country; \$1,800,000 is for costs of weather data acquisition and processing work formerly done by the Federal Aviation Agency; \$1,500,000 is for additional costs in the research and technical services program of the National Bureau of Standards. For expenses relating to the transportation research program, the committee recommends a total appropriation of \$1,625,000, or \$750,000 more than allowed in the House bill.

For the judiciary branch, the committee concurred with the House recommendation which provided a total appropriation of \$65,927,900. Officials of the judiciary indicated their satisfaction with this allowance.

For the 10 related agencies included in title V of the bill, the committee has approved the sum of \$287,605,000. This is \$93,347,000 below the total budget estimates requested for fiscal 1964, and is \$15,069,000 below the total sum recommended in the House bill. This \$15,069,000 decrease is the difference between \$28,550,000, the total reductions or savings recommended in four appropriation items that had been allowed by the House, and \$13,481,000, the total increases that the committee considered justified in four other appropriations.

Specifically, the recommended decreases were: \$25 million in the revolving fund; \$3 million in the trade adjustment loan fund; \$200,000 in the salaries and expenses appropriation, of the Small Business Administration; and \$350,000 in the appropriation for the informational media guarantee fund of the U.S. Information Agency. Testimony at the hearing indicated the reductions could be made at this time without hindrance to the programs of the Small Business Administration. With respect to the informational media guarantee fund, it was the committee's opinion that \$650,000 should be appropriated to the fund this fiscal year instead of \$1 million allowed in the House bill and further that the Agency should take steps to

phase out the program. The \$650,000 allowance is for payment of the interest to the Treasury.

The agencies increases totaling \$13,481,000 would provide \$100,000 for settlement of general war damage and Philippine claims; \$50,000 for three additional employees and other costs essential to the operations of the special representative for trade negotiations; \$5,831,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which sum, added to the House allowance of \$1,669,000, would provide \$7,500,000 for this Agency, or three-fourths of the amount authorized; and \$7,500,000 for the operating expenses of the U.S. Information Agency. This latter increase, together with the House allowance of \$131 million, will provide a total salaries and expenses appropriation of \$138,500,000. The committee concluded that the additional allowance over the House recommendation would help defray the increased costs being incurred by the Agency at this time in connection with the various programs, particularly in the media services field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"ACQUISITION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

"For necessary expenses of carrying into effect the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292-300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); \$18,500,000, of which not less than \$13,500,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,300,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 5, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$3,900,000".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "chauffeurs", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,545,000".

On page 7, line 15, after the word "negotiations", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$365,000".

On page 9, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000".

On page 12, line 6, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$1,910,000" and insert "\$2,053,000".

On page 12, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$2,000"; on page 13, line 2, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$42,250,000" and insert "\$43,000,000", and in line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "\$14,515,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

On page 13, line 14, after the word "Hawaii", to strike out "\$4,460,000" and insert "\$5,439,000".

On page 16, line 2, after "(31 U.S.C. 529)", to strike out "\$18,573,000" and insert "\$18,657,000".

On page 21, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "\$53,000,000" and insert "\$53,084,000".

On page 22, line 8, after the word "account", to strike out "\$9,425,000" and insert "\$9,875,000".

On page 25, line 22, to strike out "\$14,000,000" and insert "\$13,650,000".

On page 27, line 22, after the word "abroad", to strike out "\$9,500,000" and insert "\$9,230,000", and in line 23, after the word "which", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,410,000".

On page 30, line 15, after the word "Patents", to strike out "\$29,000,000" and insert "\$29,525,000".

On page 30, line 24, after "(15 U.S.C. 278d)", to strike out "\$28,075,000" and insert "\$29,575,000, of which not to exceed \$550,000 shall be available for payments to the 'Working Capital Fund', National Bureau of Standards, for additional capital".

On page 32, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "\$63,000,000" and insert "\$64,527,100".

On page 33, line 7, after the word "equipment" to strike out "\$9,500,000" and insert "\$11,300,000".

On page 34, after line 4, to strike out:

"METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE OPERATIONS

"For expenses necessary to establish and operate a system for the continuous observation of worldwide meteorological conditions from space satellites and for the reporting and processing of the data obtained for use in weather forecasting, \$18,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for procurement, in accordance with the authority available to that Administration, of such equipment or facilities as may be necessary to establish and operate the aforesaid system."

On page 36, line 2, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$225,000,000" and insert "\$208,000,000".

On page 36, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$825,000".

On page 42, after line 17, to strike out:

"CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

"For incentive payments to the States for control of outdoor advertising, as authorized by law (23 U.S.C. 131), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 43, line 1, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$19,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

On page 43, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,250,000".

On page 53, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$37,000" and insert "\$79,000"; in line 17, after the word "aliens", to strike out "\$1,455,000" and insert "\$1,555,000", and in the same line, after the word "addition", to strike out "\$575,000" and insert "\$607,000".

On page 53, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$7,200,000" and insert "\$7,000,000"; on page 54, line 2, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$30,000", and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$27,800,000" and insert "\$27,300,000".

On page 54, line 22, after "(Public Law 87-550)", to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$1,500,000".

On page 55, line 4, after the word "limitations", to strike out "\$115,000,000" and insert "\$90,000,000".

On page 55, line 12, to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$500,000".

On page 57, line 1, after "(75 Stat. 631)", to strike out "\$1,669,000" and insert "\$7,500,000".

On page 58, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,500", and on page 59, line 10, after the word "organizations", to strike out "\$131,000,000" and insert "\$138,500,000".

On page 62, line 16, after "(22 U.S.C. 1442)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$650,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as ranking minority member on the subcommittee, I address my remarks to H.R. 7063, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

First, Mr. President, I want to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], for the excellent manner in which he carried out his assignment and duties in reporting this bill. His sincerity and dedication in conducting the hearings on this bill were of the highest order. The chairman and I joined together after the hearings were completed, going over each and every item in the bill in an effort to arrive at equitable recommendations to the subcommittee in its consideration of the bill before you. I believe that the chairman will agree that we always tried to keep a balance of perspective between the departments' requests and the interests of the taxpayer, who, at a later date, will be called upon to pay the bill.

I would not want to imply to the Senate today that I am against some of the program increases in this bill. What I do want to convey is that it is always popular and nice to allow all increases, but the fact of the matter is that even with the desire to do all of these things, one has to keep well in mind "the people" who will be called upon to pay the bills—and to determine whether or not all of the programs, though probably desirable, are wholly justified.

I would further point out for the record that many of the dollar reductions recommended in this bill are due to the fact that new positions which have been authorized, have now lapsed 50 percent. However, the additional positions recommended in this bill will have to be annualized in the next fiscal year. There are some program increases in this bill that are due to new authorizations which were not enacted until after the House had acted on this appropriation bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee has very thoroughly gone over the amounts of money in the bill so I will not take the time of the Senate to explain further. Mr. President, I would suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that they have a good bill before them, and hope that the Senate will support the committee recommendations.

In closing, I commend the members of the staff, specifically Mr. Harold Merrick, John Witeck, and most especially "Bill" Kennedy who has given me such invaluable assistance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed by the

distinguished Senator from Maine with respect to the staff. The service they render to us on the Appropriations Committee is absolutely invaluable. Senators could not possibly do this work without their services. That is true with respect to committees generally in the Congress, but I believe it is especially true with respect to the Appropriations Committee—and I serve on a number of subcommittees of that committee. It is absolutely essential that there be a trained and competent staff to guide and counsel Senators as they undertake to go through the myriad appropriation items, in trying to eliminate what can be eliminated without doing injury or violence, in order to carry out the essential functions of Government.

I wish also to express my appreciation for the excellent cooperation given to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill by Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle.

We have tried to write what we believe is a good bill, taking into account the fiscal situation which confronts the country, and taking into account the need for services that we feel should be performed, making increases in some cases where we think they are required, and reductions in other cases where we believe they can be made.

I hope that the Senate will sustain the committee in its recommendations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

It is my pleasure to serve with Senator McCLELLAN on the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and to salute him for so ably directing this bill through a long and arduous course of hearings and discussions. This is a lengthy and complicated bill and I think the Senator from Arkansas has done an excellent job on it.

I also compliment the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for her excellent leadership and characteristically thorough study given each request and line item of appropriation.

I support the statement of the Senator from Arkansas and I urge the adoption of this bill in its present form. Because of my membership on the Judiciary Committee, I have a natural affinity for certain provisions of this bill—particularly those relating to the judiciary and the Justice Department. Therefore, I would like to stress the importance of two particular provisions of the bill.

The first item is the restoration of \$200,000 for completion of the preliminary design work on the new National Training School to be located at Morgantown, W. Va. As a member of the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee, I have had many opportunities to visit and work with Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons. He has done an outstanding job in directing the Federal prison system. However, there is only so much that he can do with existing facilities. Frequently, his already difficult problems are intensified by them.

The present National Training School located here in the District of Columbia is a very old and totally inadequate institution. It can no longer be operated efficiently or effectively no matter how hard the Bureau may try.

For a number of years, Congress has recognized the deplorable conditions existing at the Training School. However, until recently it has not faced up to the only solution that exists if the Bureau of Prisons is to give the youngsters—most of them teenagers—committed to its custody—the help and care they need. This involves abandoning the present institution and building a properly designed facility in a more desirable location. By stepping up the construction of the new National Training School, as these appropriated funds allow, we will be taking an important step in redeeming our obligation to those whom our Federal courts have entrusted to our care.

The other matter of importance is set forth on page 19 of the Senate report which accompanies this bill. Under the heading "Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses" the committee directs that up to \$156,000 of this appropriation be used to purchase sets of West Publishing Co.'s Modern Federal Practice Digest.

The West Digest System is the handiest tool that a judge has. However, the old digest has been discontinued for 3 years. For the past 2 years, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts has been trying to get funds to purchase the new system but with no success.

On one occasion, the request for these funds passed both bodies, and then failed because of a technicality. Earlier this year, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts requested funds for this item in the 1963 supplemental appropriations bill. Again, the request was rejected for reasons which did not touch the merit of the request.

At that time, it was too late to have the item placed in the 1964 budget so they have not requested additional funds to purchase these books. However, they need authority to use \$156,000 of the funds provided for "Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses" to purchase these books, and we can no longer delay getting them into the courts' hands.

At the conclusion of fiscal year 1963, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts turned back approximately \$200,000 to the Treasury. Therefore, it seems entirely appropriate that they have the authority to use \$156,000 of this year's funds for a very worthy purpose.

If this is not granted, many of the judges of our Federal court system will have to go through another year without the aid of this very important set of books. This situation would be as shocking as it is now ridiculous.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish again to compliment the chairman on striking a fair and prudent balance between the requests and needs of those Departments coming within the coverage of this bill. In my judgment, the action of the committee evidences a faithful discharge of its responsibilities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is any money provided in the bill to meet the

increased cost which might result from the passage of a bill which would increase the salaries of Supreme Court, appellate court, and district court judges?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; there is no money in the bill to pay the increased cost of salaries for Members of Congress, judges, Cabinet members, or anyone else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is any money provided in the bill to finance increased salaries in any of those offices?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Only where the increase has already been authorized by law and where it is now mandatory. No anticipated increases are included.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if this is a convenient time so far as the Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I should like to call up my amendment No. 349. However, several Senators have evidenced an interest in the amendment, and I therefore first suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE REA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on July 24, I introduced S. 1926, which would require the Rural Electrification Administration to increase interest rates on loans to their electric cooperatives from the present unrealistic figure of 2 percent to a rate comparable to the amount the Treasury has to pay for its borrowings. The bill also would more clearly define the areas and services for which loans to cooperatives could be made. Subsequently, I have spoken on the floor of the Senate pointing out some of the questionable practices in which the REA has engaged and also that some of the loans made were contrary to the intent of the Congress when the law was enacted in 1936. I pointed out that the original intent of the REA was to help to bring to our Nation's farmers the comforts and economic benefits of electric power. Today, with 98 percent of the Nation's farms receiving the benefits of electric power, REA's mission has been substantially fulfilled. Nevertheless, the REA continues to grow and grow by forcing itself through arbitrary decisions into new fields and services.

Mr. President, I now wish to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues an official document from the Comptroller General, entitled "Report to the Congress of the United States—Possibilities for Reducing Federal Expenditures Under the Electric Loan Program and Other Matters Pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture." This report is dated November 1963. The report substantiates my contention that the REA has in numerous

cases been negligent, used poor judgment, and did not exercise prudence in loaning the taxpayers' money.

In his letter of transmittal, the Comptroller General pointed out that on the basis of his examination he believed that in certain circumstances Federal expenditures under the electric loan program could be reduced without adversely affecting the accomplishment of the program objectives. The Comptroller General cited one case where a loan was approved in May 1962 for \$6.7 million to a cooperative for the construction of generation facilities while it appeared that the borrower's financial needs could have been readily satisfied without the \$6.7 million loan at that time and without detriment to the rural electrification program objectives.

On a basis of the difference between the interest cost incurred by the Treasury around the time of loan approval from money obtained from outside sources for long-term marketable obligations, and the 2 percent interest paid to the Rural Electrification Administration by its borrowers, the Comptroller General estimated that in this one case the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on this 35-year loan will be about \$3.6 million.

The Comptroller General in his letter of transmittal recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture institute appropriate action to provide that the agency impose a requirement upon borrowers to prepare and submit long-range financial plans and forecasts in support of loan applications. The recommendation includes a provision for careful analysis by the agency of such plans and forecasts before approving loans or granting loans for the maximum authorized 35-year repayment period, giving particular attention to the availability of funds expected to be generated by borrowers' income-producing operations and to the financial policies governing the planned disposition of borrowers' expected operating margins.

Mr. President, I will now refer specifically to some of the findings and recommendations that appear in the Comptroller General's 92-page report to the Congress.

REA DOES NOT REQUIRE BORROWERS TO ADEQUATELY DEMONSTRATE A FINANCIAL NEED FOR LOAN FUNDS

On pages 13 through 17, the report reads:

In arriving at its decision to approve or disapprove requests for loans, REA considers the amount of general funds (cash and investments) which borrowers have on hand at the time of the loan application. However, REA does not consider the funds expected to be generated by the borrowers' income-producing operations except to determine whether the borrowers will be able to repay the proposed loans within the required periods. Therefore, it is possible for borrowers to obtain REA loans even though it appears that their financial needs could be satisfied from funds expected to be generated by their income-producing operations in ensuing years.

At hearings before the House Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1963, members of the subcom-

mittee expressed concern over the fact that some REA borrowers were receiving REA loans while they had general funds in excess of their requirements which were invested so as to earn a return in excess of the 2 percent interest paid on REA loans.

In the report by the House Committee on Appropriations on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1962, the committee stated that REA should consider a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.

In February 1962 REA established a policy setting forth certain guidelines with respect to borrowers' general funds for its use in reviewing loan applications. This policy provides, among other things, that where a borrower has general funds exceeding 20 percent of the total amount of its plant, the loan application must be supported by a detailed analysis clearly justifying the amount of general funds. The 20-percent level is based on REA's estimate of the borrowers' needs for current operating costs and working capital (6 percent), plant replacements (6 percent), contingencies (3 percent), and allowance for local differences (5 percent).

It is to be noted that REA's guidelines on borrowers' general funds relate only to the amount of such funds which borrowers have on hand at the time of the loan application. They do not concern themselves with the funds expected to be generated by the borrowers' income-producing operations in periods subsequent to the time of loan application.

If borrowers were required by REA to demonstrate a financial need for loan funds after giving consideration to the funds expected to be generated from future income-producing operations, it is possible that fewer or smaller REA loans would be made, thereby reducing future REA borrowings from the Treasury. Since the Treasury is the source of REA loan funds, reduced borrowings by REA from the Treasury would result in reduced public debt interest costs incurred by the Treasury.

EXAMPLE OF QUESTIONABLE NEED FOR REA LOAN

We noted, for example, that on May 15, 1962, REA made a 35-year loan for \$6,660,000 to a cooperative for the construction of generation facilities. On the basis of the borrower's forecast of the financial results of operations for succeeding years, it appears that the program objectives of rural electrification could have been accomplished in the borrower's service area without an REA loan at that time.

The loan by REA was made to help finance a 50,000-kilowatt generating plant to be constructed pursuant to a contract the cooperative has with the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). The nuclear reactor boiler part of the plant will be constructed and owned by the AEC, and the conventional portion of the powerplant will be owned by the cooperative. The plant is scheduled to begin commercial operations in 1966. If the nuclear reactor produces steam at a net operating cost of 3.25 mills per kilowatt-hour, the cooperative will be required to buy the reactor from AEC sometime between the 5th and 10th year after the plant becomes operational, which is estimated by REA to be in 1966. If the reactor does not produce steam at the designated net cost, the cooperative plans to build a conventional boiler with additional funds to be provided by REA or with its own funds if REA will not make a loan for that purpose.

The cooperative furnishes power on a wholesale basis to 27 member distribution-type cooperatives located in four different States, over transmission lines owned and operated by the cooperative. The member

cooperatives serve more than 100,000 consumers.

At December 31, 1961, general funds of the cooperative amounted to about \$14.9 million, or 19.6 percent of the total amount of its plant. A financial forecast prepared by the cooperative for the 10-year period 1961-70 shows that the cash margins (net cash from operations less debt service payments to REA) expected to be generated for the 10-year period total about \$55 million. The purposes of the forecast, as stated therein, were (1) to show the cooperative's financial requirements, (2) to furnish cost-of-power estimates for the use of its member distribution cooperatives, (3) to evaluate the financial position of the cooperative, and (4) to furnish information to the board of directors and management for development of procedures, policies, and overall future planning.

According to the forecast, the cooperative plans to invest about \$43.6 million of its cash margins in long-term and temporary investments earning 3 to 3.5 percent. The forecast shows that during the same period (1961-70) the cooperative plans to spend about \$45.5 million for plant additions; this aspect of the forecast is based on obtaining REA loan funds to finance about \$45 million of the increase in plant.

The financial forecast also shows that the cash margins expected to be generated for the years 1962-66, the period during which the generating plant financed by REA is to be constructed, total about \$23.5 million. According to the forecast, the cooperative plans to invest about \$18.3 million of its cash margins generated during these years in long-term and temporary investments earning 3 to 3.5 percent.

We noted that the financial forecast prepared by the borrower made no provision for the refund of patronage capital during the years 1961-70. In this connection, the borrower informed us in December 1962 that it had never paid any patronage refunds and did not expect to pay any patronage refunds in the near future. In June 1963 the borrower advised us that it may decide to make refunds of patronage capital in the future.

On the basis of the borrower's annual cash margins expected to be generated over the years during which the generating plant financed by REA is to be constructed, and the estimated annual amounts required for construction of the generating plant during these years, it would seem that the borrower's financial needs could have been satisfied without the \$6,660,000 REA loan approved in 1962 and without detriment to the rural electrification program objectives. Further, the information in the financial forecast indicated that the use of borrower's own funds for construction of the generating plant would still have permitted the borrower to make patronage refunds if so desired. The interest cost to the Federal Government, around the time of the loan approval, for money obtained from outside sources for long-term marketable obligations was slightly more than 4 percent. On the basis of the difference between the interest rate paid by the Treasury and the 2 percent interest paid to REA by its borrowers, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on the \$6,660,000 loan over the 35-year period will be about \$3.6 million.

EXAMPLE OF REDUCTION IN BORROWER'S GENERAL FUNDS TO BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR NEW REA LOAN OF QUESTIONABLE NEED

Mr. President, beginning on page 18 of his report, the Comptroller General cites an example of reduction in borrower's general funds to become eligible for new REA loans of questionable need. The report reads:

We noted, for example, where one REA borrower had general funds (cash and investments) at March 31, 1962, of \$844,500 which

was 23.5 percent of its total plant of \$3.6 million.

In order to become eligible for another REA loan, the borrower adjusted its general funds to about 19.9 percent of total plant by, among other things, making an advance payment of \$221,000 on outstanding REA loans on July 6, 1962. On August 15, 1962, REA approved a new 35-year loan of \$399,000 to the borrower to finance new distribution lines and improvements to the borrower's electrical system and to reimburse the borrower's general funds for construction costs previously paid by the borrower.

A financial forecast contained in the REA files for the years 1961 through 1970 prepared by the borrower shows that the facilities to be financed by the REA loan of \$399,000 could have been financed by the net cash margins (cash from operations and interest on investments, less REA debt service payments) generated by the borrower's own operations. The forecast shows that, during the 2 years in which the borrower planned to receive loan funds from REA for construction of the facilities—1962 and 1963—cash margins expected to be generated by the borrower's own operations would be about \$306,000. These cash margins plus the borrower's \$221,000 advance payment of July 6, 1962, that need not have been made had the borrower planned to use its own funds for construction purposes, exceeded by about \$128,000 the amount of construction funds which, according to the financial forecast, the borrower planned to receive from REA in 1962 and 1963. It would appear, therefore, that the borrower could have financed with its own funds the cost of the planned additions to its plant in 1962 and 1963, thus making unnecessary the approval of the REA loan for \$399,000.

The borrower's forecast also shows that, in addition to the facilities to be constructed with the \$399,000 loan, the borrower planned additional plant construction of about \$500,000 through 1970. If the borrower were to finance all plant additions planned for the years 1961-70 out of funds expected to be generated by its own operations without any REA loans, the forecast shows that the borrower's general funds by the end of 1970 would be about \$1,500,000 or 35.7 percent of the total amount of its plant at that time. Under a plan set forth in the forecast whereby the borrower would use REA loan funds for all plant additions planned in the years 1961-70, the borrower's general funds by the end of 1970 (after allowing for the advance payment to REA of \$221,000 on July 6, 1962) are expected to be about \$2,139,000 or 51.0 percent of the total amount of its plant.

Concerning the financial forecast, the borrower, by letter dated June 10, 1963, informed us that the purpose of the forecast was to attempt to determine the financial condition of the cooperative for the years 1961-70 with the thought of refunding capital credits to the members of the cooperative on a scheduled basis. The borrower further informed us that in February 1963 the board of directors decided to begin refunding capital credits to the members of the cooperative. The borrower stated that in 1963 the cooperative would refund about \$150,000 to its members and that, by the end of 1967, the cooperative expects to have refunded at least a total of about \$500,000 to its members. The decision to refund capital credits to members of the cooperative, the borrower stated, followed the establishment of a policy by the cooperative's board of directors in June 1962 whereby the amount of general funds of the cooperative would be maintained at 20 percent or less of the total amount of its electric plant. We noted that during the years 1941-62 total retirements of capital by the cooperative amounted to only \$38,200.

On the basis of the borrower's financial forecast and the information on contemplated patronage refunds furnished to us by the borrower, it would appear that the borrower could have financed the cost of facilities covered by the \$399,000 REA loan with its own funds and still have made planned patronage refunds of \$500,000 and maintained the level of its general funds at about 20 percent of the total amount of its electric plant. We estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on the \$399,000 loan over the 35-year term, net of the savings attributable to the advance payment of \$221,000, will be about \$147,000.

REPAYMENT PERIOD OF ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION AND GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS IS ESTABLISHED WITHOUT CONSIDERING BORROWERS' ABILITY TO REPAY

Mr. President, according to the Comptroller General's report, it appears that it is the policy of the REA to make electric distribution and generation and transmission loans—section 4 loans—for a maximum 35-year repayment period without determining before the loan is made whether or not the cooperatives might be able to repay the loan in a shorter time. The report states that if the repayment period of each section 4 loan were established after consideration of the borrowers' ability to repay, it is probable that in some cases loans could be repaid in less than 35 years without endangering the borrowers' financial positions or their capacity to provide electricity at rates that would promote and encourage its use by rural customers.

Such accelerated repayment periods would permit REA, in turn, to accelerate the repayments of its borrowings from the Treasury, therefore enabling reduction in public debt interest cost incurred by the Treasury. The Comptroller General cites an example, on pages 22, 23, and 24 of his report, which reveals an excessive length of time on the loan which resulted in an excess interest cost to the Government of about \$162,000.

On page 35 of his report, the Comptroller General points out that:

Insofar as rural electric systems borrowing from REA are concerned, if their continuing needs for expansion of facilities to meet anticipated heavy increases in future energy requirements are to be met by continually increasing amounts of Federal funds borrowed by the Treasury at an interest rate greater than the 2-percent maximum paid by REA borrowers, costs to the Government will increase substantially. We believe that, by effective implementation of our proposed revisions of REA policies and procedures for evaluating loan applications, REA would be in position to effect economies in Federal expenditures by requiring those borrowing rural electric systems capable of providing for their own needs to shoulder a part of the financial burden that would otherwise be borne by the American taxpayers.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, on this particular phase of the Comptroller General's report, his recommendation is as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture institute appropriate action to provide that REA, in addition to extending its current policy on general funds to make it applicable to future advances of funds under new loans, avail itself of the possibilities as exemplified in the cases described in this report, for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program by imposing a requirement

upon borrowers to prepare and submit long-range financial plans in support of REA loan applications. Provisions should also be made for careful analysis of such financial plans and forecasts before approving loans or granting loans for the maximum authorized 35-year repayment period, giving particular attention to the availability of funds expected to be generated by borrowers' income-producing operations and to the financial policies governing the planned disposition of borrowers' expected operating margins. The merits of such financial policies should be carefully weighed by REA with due regard to the rightful interests of the borrowing cooperatives and the consumer public, and also to the possibilities of effecting economies in the expenditure of Federal funds.

THE LACK OF FULL EXPLORATION BY REA OF OFFERS BY EXISTING POWER SUPPLIERS

Mr. President, it appears that there have been cases where REA has made loans to cooperatives for generation and transmission facilities without thoroughly determining the availability of existing power suppliers who would be able and willing to fill the cooperatives' requirements. Beginning on page 40 the Comptroller General cites a specific case, which resulted in a \$5.4 million interest loss to the Federal Government and which, had full cooperation between the REA and the cooperative been exercised, excessive cost could have been avoided.

The Comptroller General reports this case as follows:

In our review we noted a particular case where REA did not thoroughly examine into the merits of an offer by an existing power supplier to provide the power requirements of six electric distribution borrowers before making a loan for \$14,683,000 for the construction of generation and transmission facilities to serve these six borrowers. On the basis of our examination, it appears to us that, if REA had taken a more active role in helping the borrowers and the power supplier try to reach agreement on power contract rates and terms, it possibly would have been unnecessary for REA to make the loan. The salient facts pertaining to this loan are as follows:

BACKGROUND DATA ON LOAN TO FEDERATION OF DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

On May 12, 1961, REA made a 35-year loan for \$14,683,000 to a federation of 10 distribution cooperatives for the construction of generation and transmission facilities. At the time the loan was made, a private power company which sold power to 6 of these 10 cooperatives was negotiating with them for a new power supply contract. The other four cooperatives, although members of the borrowing federation, were purchasing their power from the Lower Colorado River Authority and not from the power company. Representatives of the cooperatives informed us that the cooperatives and the power company had been making intermittent efforts since 1958 to negotiate new power supply contracts and that the efforts were unsuccessful primarily because the power company refused to eliminate from its power contracts a dual-rate-provision—a higher rate for large nonfarm consumers served by the cooperatives than the rates charged by the company for other consumers served by the cooperatives.

The loan recommendation approved by the REA Administrator showed that a plan for self-generation of power by the federation of cooperatives would provide a cheaper source of power over a period of 11 years—1962-72—than would a plan for purchasing

power from the power company. REA estimated that the cost savings to the six customer cooperatives under the self-generation plan over the 11-year period would be \$291,000.

The cost savings advantage of \$291,000 under the self-generation plan, compared with the purchase plan, was based on the assumption that, if the cooperatives did not generate their own power, the power company would continue to charge the cooperatives dual rates. According to REA, the higher rate for large nonfarm consumers would cost the cooperatives \$1,268,000 for the 11 years. Without the imposition of the dual rates on power purchased by the cooperatives from the power company, the self-generated power would cost the cooperatives \$977,000 more than the cost of power purchased from the power company over an 11-year period.

REA, through the loan to the federation of cooperatives, is also providing assistance to another generation and transmission borrower located nearby, which has substantial surplus generating capacity. The cooperatives' plan for self-generation of power is based, in part, on an agreement between the cooperatives and the other generation and transmission borrower whereby the cooperatives will, in effect, purchase most of the latter's excess generating capacity. According to REA, the second generation and transmission borrower will save about \$1.6 million during the 11-year period 1962-72 as a result of the agreement with the cooperatives.

The offer by the existing power supplier in this case to provide the power requirements of the borrowing cooperatives included the supplier's willingness to (1) eliminate the dual-rate provision from its power supply contracts with the cooperatives and (2) purchase any of the surplus generating capacity of the second generation and transmission borrower.

EFFORTS MADE BY POWER COMPANY IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING REA LOAN APPROVAL TO NEGOTIATE POWER SUPPLY CONTRACTS WITH THE REA COOPERATIVES

By letter to REA dated March 24, 1961, the president of the private power company stated that the company had adequate generating and transmission capacity to supply the existing and future power requirements of the six cooperatives which were then purchasing their power from the company, and he requested an opportunity to present to REA detailed information regarding the company's ability to serve the cooperatives with adequate electric power for all their needs at low rates. The president of the company asked that a conference be held either at the offices of the company or REA. REA replied by letter dated March 31, 1961, and suggested that, since the responsibility for securing an adequate supply of wholesale power at a reasonable price for its members belongs to a cooperative's board of directors, the company should discuss its offer directly with the individual boards of directors of the cooperatives.

On April 17, 1961, an official of the power company wrote to the REA cooperatives that were planning to generate their own power and requested to be informed of the details of the plans of the proposed power system so that the power company would be in a position to demonstrate its ability to sell ample power to the cooperatives at a cost lower than that to be incurred by the cooperatives in the generation of their own power. Copies of the company's letters to the cooperatives were furnished to REA. According to a power company representative, the responses received from the cooperatives did not furnish the requested information.

Subsequently, on May 3, 1961, a representative of the power company met with a representative of REA. The power company representative advised REA of the com-

pany's interest in improving relations with the cooperatives. He expressed the willingness of the company to execute a new long-term or short-term contract with the cooperatives and to remove from existing contracts certain features which the cooperatives had found to be objectionable. These features were a dual-rate provision and a restrictive provision prohibiting the cooperatives from using power company energy to serve consumers in towns having a population in excess of 1,500. The power company representative stated that the company was also willing, if necessary, to purchase any surplus capacity of the REA borrower—a party to the agreement with the six cooperatives planning to construct their own generation and transmission facilities.

The representative furnishing REA with a copy of an economic study prepared by the company containing its estimates of costs of operations under the proposed self-generation plan of the cooperatives and under a purchase plan from the company. The company's study states that during the 10-year period 1963-72 the cooperatives' plan for self-generated power would cost them about \$10 million more than purchased power would cost. The REA official advised the power company representative to explain, as soon as possible, directly to the cooperatives any new proposal that the company wished to make.

We were advised by a representative of the power company that on May 8, 1961, an official of the federation of cooperatives telephoned the president of the federation of cooperatives and requested a meeting on May 10, 1961, to discuss power supply contract terms and provisions and other related matters. The power company representative was told that the suggested date was not convenient and that he should call again on May 15, 1961, to arrange another meeting date. In the meantime, on May 12, 1961, REA approved the loan to the generation and transmission borrower for \$14,683,000 to construct its own generation and transmission facilities. Construction of the facilities covered by the REA loan is presently under way, including the construction of about 800 miles of transmission line needed to serve the loan centers formerly served by the power company. The power company representative who met with the REA official on May 3, 1961, informed us that during their discussion he was not given any indication that approval of the loan by REA was imminent.

On May 19, 1961, a representative of the power company wrote to REA and referred to reports in the press relating to the loan to the cooperatives which, he stated, indicated that justification for the REA loan was based on the dual-rate and restrictive-use provisions in the company's power supply contracts with the cooperatives. The power company representative reminded REA of the company's offer on May 3, 1961, before the loan was made, to eliminate the two provisions from its power contracts with the cooperatives. In this connection, the manager of one of the member cooperatives informed us that, although REA advised him of the power company's economic study when it was received by REA, it did not advise him of the company's willingness to drop the dual-rate provision from its power supply contracts with the cooperatives.

Officials of other member cooperatives also stated that at no time did the power company inform their cooperatives specifically of the company's willingness to eliminate the dual-rate provision.

In a reply dated June 7, 1961, to the power company representative's letter of May 19, 1961, the Acting Administrator, REA, stated that

"While in our office we advised you that REA would not be the media by which a company proposal is transmitted to the cooperatives. Nor did we agree to withhold

action on any loan request. You were advised that it was the company's responsibility to put its new policy into a proposal and submit it to the cooperatives. REA does not have any information that would indicate that this was done between your visit on May 3 and the signing of the loan on May 12, 1961."

The president of the federation of cooperatives acknowledged to us that an official of the power company had requested a meeting to be held on May 10, 1961, for the purpose of discussing power contract rates and terms. However, the president stated that the date was not convenient and that the company official had been asked to call back on May 15, 1961. The president further advised us that he was unaware that REA planned to approve the loan on May 12, 1961. Officials of the power company and the generation and transmission cooperative did eventually meet on May 29, 1961; and again on July 24, 1961, but we were advised by the power company representative that the meetings were nonproductive of any changes in existing arrangements.

In our examination we noted where an REA distribution cooperative, located in the same State as but not affiliated with the federation of cooperatives receiving the loan, took advantage of an offer by the power company here involved, which was similar to and made at approximately the same time as the offer made by the company to the six cooperatives. The contract between this borrower and the power company eliminated the dual-rate provision and stipulated an energy rate which is about 22 percent less than the rate that the six cooperatives will pay for self-generated power. The contract also assured an ample supply of power and energy and provided for the possibility of lower rates as the load factor improves.

In the example cited herein, REA officials stated that the offer by the power company representative on May 3, 1961, came after the generation and transmission borrower involved had spent thousands of dollars for engineering studies in connection with the proposed generation and transmission facilities.

They said that when extremely complex loans are involved, and offer by a power supplier to provide the power requirements of an REA borrower, made as many as 18 months prior to final action by REA on the borrower's loan application, might be considered as having not been made timely because of the time required by borrowers to make appropriate studies and application for an REA loan.

CONCLUSION

We believe that in the particular case cited herein REA should have shown more concern over the possible merits of the offer made by the power company which, on the basis of financial data in the REA loan recommendation, would have resulted in the cooperatives' receiving electric energy at a cost lower than the cost of generating their own power. Also, a more active role by REA in helping its borrowers and their power suppliers try to reach agreement on power supply contract rates and terms, than was the case in the loan heretofore described, could obviate the need for generation and transmission loans in some cases.

On the basis of the difference between the interest cost to the Federal Government near the end of fiscal year 1963 (slightly higher than 4 percent) for money obtained from outside sources for REA by its borrowers, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government for each \$1 million of 35-year loan funds is about \$505,000. In the case of the \$14,683,000 loan previously cited, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government over the 35-year life of the loan, computed on the above basis and using the interest rate paid by the Treasury around the time of loan approval

(slightly more than 3.5 percent), will be about \$5.4 million.

Mr. President, the Comptroller General makes other important observations and comments in his report, which I urge Senators to study thoroughly.

In conclusion, these examples cited in the Comptroller General's report clearly reveal how governmental bureaus use every means at hand to perpetuate themselves and continue to feed upon the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. When the Congress returns next January, I shall insist upon early action upon my bill, S. 1926, and shall ask that it be modified in order that recommendations of the Comptroller General may become law.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 349 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 2, it is proposed to strike "\$18,657,000" and insert "\$18,824,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEATING. I asked unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this amendment would restore the sum of \$167,000 to the item of salaries and expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice and is intended, specifically, to provide for the positions requested by the Department of Justice for the Civil Rights Division.

The situation is that 40 lawyers and 41 clerical personnel are now employed in the Civil Rights Division. The Department has requested for the 1964 fiscal year 56 lawyers and 63 clerical personnel. The division has been allowed 48 lawyers and 52 clerical personnel.

I stress, with all the vigor at my command, that this budget was prepared before the civil rights crises in the summer of 1963. I am certain that if the Attorney General and others concerned with the problem were to be asked unofficially the number of personnel the Civil Rights Division needs to do its work, the esti-

mate would be considerably greater than the number that the Department said would be needed when the budget was originally prepared. In other words, there is a minimum need for 19 additional positions, of which 8 would be lawyers and 11 clerical personnel. The budget estimate, let me stress, now reflects only the minimum need for additional personnel.

There is much talk among the opponents of civil rights legislation—and this is one of the arguments which are used against any new legislation of this kind—to the effect that no new laws are needed; that all that needs to be done is to enforce the laws now on the statute books. But to deny to the Civil Rights Division the number of lawyers the Division says it needs, and that it said were needed before all the recent crises arose, would be to cripple it unduly and interfere seriously with the enforcement of existing laws.

Lawyers are not paid overtime. We who have practiced law know that it is not a clockwatching operation. Most successful lawyers in private life work overtime. But the clerical personnel are compensated for overtime; and an illustration of the vast increase in work, which I am sure would be even greater now, would be to compare the overtime hours paid to clerical personnel in 1962 with the amount paid in 1963. In 1962, in the Civil Rights Division, there were about 2,500 hours of clerical overtime; in 1963, more than 5,000, or more than double the amount paid for in the previous year.

The amount of incoming mail is another illustration. It increased from 32,000 pieces in 1962 to 54,000 pieces in 1963; and 23,000 of the 54,000 were complaints of violations of the law, which, of course, required careful attention.

The lawyers who are engaged in this work are dedicated persons. They necessarily must be. They work in a division of the law in which it is difficult to acquire marketable skills for private practice. We all know that many young lawyers spend time in the Antitrust Division in order to become experts or peculiarly equipped to handle antitrust cases. The same is true of the Tax Division.

But when lawyers in the Civil Rights Division step out to enter private life, they are in an entirely different position. Their experience and expertise are not of a nature which would readily command as large salaries or incomes as those enjoyed by lawyers who have worked in the Antitrust Division or the Tax Division. Unquestionably, by inclination and by the nature of their work, the lawyers in the Civil Rights Division work as hard as any other group of lawyers in the Government, perhaps harder, and they are under constant pressure and, often, harassment.

Without going into great detail, I have been told of cases in which lawyers from the Civil Rights Division were looking into alleged violations of civil rights laws and denial of voting rights in various parts of the country and were stopped by the police and questioned at length about what they were doing in the community. Their work is hard, and many

times it is unpleasant; but they continue at their jobs, and do them well.

If I intend to enforce the civil rights laws on the statute books, we must give the Attorney General the necessary "muscle" with which to bring about their enforcement. Proper enforcement of the law is seriously threatened by the prospect of personnel shortage. Although there are those who would see an advantage in not having the laws strongly enforced, I feel sure that that is not the view of a majority of the Senate, and that a majority of the Senate would say the Attorney General should have what he needs in order to do a proper job in this area. Certainly we cannot have it both ways; we cannot refuse to pass additional laws, and at the same time not provide for proper enforcement of the existing laws.

Mr. President, this amendment involves \$167,000—a sizable sum, although small in comparison to the total amount of appropriations provided by this bill, namely, \$1,800 million. The bill provides an appropriation of \$156,000 earmarked for purchasing the West Publishing Co. Law Digest for the district court and circuit court judges. In my opinion, enforcement of the law is at least as important, to say the least, as is the provision of such assistance to judges, to enable them to ascertain what the law is.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope very much that this amendment to give to the Department of Justice the amount it has requested for enforcement of the law will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for this purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from New York to yield to me at this time, because I must attend an important meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

As a member of the subcommittee on the bill providing appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, I attended a number of the committee hearings, although I could not attend all of them. I did attend the one at which the chairman and the other members marked up the bill.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee and its ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], have done top quality work on the bill, and I wish to support the committee in its actions and recommendations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the

distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He attended the hearings and labored with us, as did the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who, I believe, attended every session of the hearings, and was most faithful and diligent.

Such cooperation made it possible for us to go thoroughly into the various items involved in the bill and to bring the Senate a bill which can be defended in connection with any particular issue which may be raised.

I am most grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for his cooperation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his kind remarks.

I also thank the Senator from New York for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I started to say a moment ago, I am a cosponsor of this amendment; and what I shall say about it will, I believe, be completely consistent with what has just now been stated by the Senator from Massachusetts. This amendment involves a comparatively small amount—\$167,000—whereas the total amount of appropriation provided by the bill is \$1,800 million. I think that in all fairness it can be said that it is clear that, comparatively, this amendment is a small one. I have seen amounts 3 or 4 or 10 times as large voted by the Senate as a courtesy to a particular Senator who felt very strongly about the particular item involved.

This amendment involves a very special matter, because, according to the evidence produced before the committee, this amount of money undoubtedly will be used for particular purposes, and this is what gives this amendment its great importance.

According to the law, even if some well-meaning persons were to wish to contribute to the Civil Rights Division, for the purpose of providing funds to enable it to employ lawyers, that would be contrary to law. So, Mr. President, if this service is to be rendered in the name of the United States, we must appropriate this amount of money. Although the amount may be small, what is involved in the amendment is of very great importance and, hence, deserves the argument that is being made in its behalf. I think it is most important that we keep that principle clearly in mind: Although the amount called for by the amendment is small, the work to be done by means of the amendment is of critical importance.

I believe that this amendment, which has been proposed by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself along with our colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY], can best be explained as follows: If there is any consensus in the Senate, it is that Negroes are entitled to their voting rights. I wish to repeat that statement, because it is important: If there is any consensus in the Senate—one which sweeps right across the board, and is supported by Senators from all sections of the country and Senators of all views, including those with various views in regard to States rights and Federal rights—it is clear that the Senate is very favorably inclined

toward securing to Negroes their voting rights.

The principal work being done by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice is to assure to Negroes their voting rights under the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts. That is the purpose of providing this amount of money. If we fail to make this provision, if we do not implement the granting to them of this important right of citizenship, on which there is so broad a consensus in the Senate, how can we say to the Negroes of the country, "It is your solemn duty to preserve order and tranquility by not going into the streets to fight for your rights"?

Two things which came up in the course of the testimony on this subject are, in my opinion, very important in this connection. In the testimony of Burke Marshall, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, he made clear why the U.S. attorneys cannot be used in the way indicated in the questioning that it was desired that they be used in order to keep the staff of the Civil Rights Division itself very small.

The U.S. attorneys, Mr. Marshall pointed out, are in no position to handle these vastly complex voting cases, which, like antitrust cases, necessarily involve a very great amount of preparation. Mr. Marshall cited one case in which 36,000 pages of voting records had to be examined and the brief that was written amounted to almost 300 pages in order to present the case properly to the court.

A U.S. attorney is not physically in a position to do that kind of work, if he is not going to bog down in the many other cases which it is his duty also to prosecute. Invariably, the Department of Justice in Washington handles cases of that character, as well as land cases, bribery cases, and income tax cases, and antitrust cases of great complexity. Everyone who has engaged in the active practice of law knows that to be a fact. So U.S. attorneys cannot do the job in this field.

As to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Mr. Marshall said—and properly—on page 1100 of the record of the hearings:

It was not the wish of Congress that the Commission be used as an investigative arm of the Department of Justice and it has never been used that way, Senator.

He made that statement in answer to a question.

He said further, as shown on page 1101:

I will say, Senator, that since I have been in the Department of Justice, which is since March of 1961, the Commission has never been used by us to gather evidence to enforce the voting laws which the Congress enacted in 1957 and 1960.

I assume that it is the wish of Congress that the Commission should not be used as an agency of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. Therefore, again, the Commission cannot be a source from which—even if it had the resources—the Department of Justice could draw the support which it needs.

To indicate how tough these cases are, I should like to cite what I consider to be the historic words of a Senator. On page 1100, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], responded to a statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] about discrimination in voting. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] had stated:

They are not treated that way in Arkansas, I want you to know, sir, and I don't care what your records show. In Arkansas every Negro that walks up to the polls after paying his poll tax can vote.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said—and I make no criticism of, or comment on, that statement whatever; I am referring only to the justification for the service which is sought to be supplied by the amendment:

I would say the same thing in Louisiana except in six or seven cases where the Negroes outnumber the whites considerably. Those are the only instances where there might be some trouble.

Let us ponder that statement for a moment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not quite understand what the Senator from New York said about Arkansas. Is the Senator challenging my statement that every Negro in Arkansas votes on the same terms as white citizens?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York was not discussing the Senator's—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I heard the Senator say something about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I will come to that, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I was not discussing anything the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] had said except that when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] spoke, he spoke against the background of a brief statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. In order to understand the statement of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], it was necessary to read the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I make no comment whatever upon either situation. The Senator has taken his position, and there he stands. I was pointing out that what was said was practically an admission that in Louisiana there were cases. That is an admission from a Senator who, I am sure, wishes to stand up completely for his State. It seems to me that if we need any justification for the fact that this work must urgently be done, there it is.

Facing the kind of situation in which, even in the most guarded and considered way, it must be admitted that there are cases that have to be dealt with, it seems to me that is conclusive evidence that we are dealing with a situation urgently requiring the attention of the Senate.

I close as I began. Whatever may be thought of my arguments or the arguments of others, including those of my

colleague, the various aspects of the law which are in effect, or should be in effect, stress the securing of various rights of citizens of the United States. One thing was clear during passage of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts. There was no real argument; it was only a question of method. The securing to every individual, without regard to his color, of his voting rights, was agreed to by everyone.

We in the Senate have good faith in that principle. We either mean what we say, or we do not. Therefore, what the amendment seeks to do is to implement the consensus of Congress as enacted into law and to express the determination of what I deeply feel is the overwhelming majority of our people everywhere—North and South alike—to secure a basic right. In order to secure it, we must have a certain type of official in the Federal Government. When we deny that official adequate personnel to do the job, it is tantamount to making it so difficult to implement the right upon which we all agree, as to deprive it of the validity we intended it to have.

When we consider the amount of money involved in the bill, I say to Senators who have a passion for economy and who wish to sustain the committee, that this is one case in which, for so small a sum—even if we feel strongly about the amounts—we should stretch the point, because so much is at stake in having the country satisfied that we are doing everything we can to sustain the very minimum of rights which should be sustained for Negro citizens under the Constitution.

Mr. President, as this question has been raised—and it should be raised—what more reason could there be for resolving it in the way it should be resolved, with credit and dignity to our deep conviction that we shall, in good faith, implement that which we have by a broad consensus and in good faith legislated?

I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted. I am grateful to my colleague for including me as a cosponsor. I believe he has rendered a fine service by raising the point and making the strong and effective argument that is his wont.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful for the Senator's cosponsorship of the amendment. No one needs to be told in this Chamber of the Senator's fight for effective enforcement of the civil rights laws—and all the laws. I am particularly grateful for his eloquent support of the amendment, and for the arguments which he has advanced, every one of which is eminently sound.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what the committee has done, not only in the department to which

reference is made, but also in the others involved, for which money is provided in the bill. The use of the word "need" is almost becoming a stock phrase in discussion of expenditures.

If the Appropriations Committee granted funds every time a department or some agency said we need more money or we need more personnel, the budget and the cost of Government would soon be completely out of control.

For example, I should like to point out in the bill that in the State Department the House allowed 197 new positions.

The State Department appealed from that, and requested an increase. The Senate committee allowed 197 positions more than the House allowed for the State Department.

For the related agencies, the House allowed money for 426 new positions. The Senate committee allowed an additional 244 positions.

For the Justice Department, the House allowed 623 new positions. The Senate committee has recommended 40 more. They say they need even more.

There is no end to it. I remind my colleagues that, after all, the appropriation is a lump sum appropriation. If the Department has a need to use the money, it could allocate the money to any of the particular functions to which it wished to allocate it.

I also point out that the amendment was not offered in the subcommittee. It was not offered in the full committee. It is an amendment which is presented in the Senate.

We have done a pretty good job in this connection. I notice one instance was cited, that perhaps in one State there might be a need for some enforcement of existing law. I point out that there are U.S. attorneys and U.S. district attorneys in the law enforcement field and in the civil rights field.

Forty attorneys are to be allowed, in Washington, for that Division. The House allowance has provided 8 more. That will make 48. There will be 48 attorneys.

Let us see what is the record concerning the complaints received. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] questioned the witness, Mr. Marshall. He asked him:

Would you be able to tell the committee how many complaints you did receive from the Commission during the fiscal year 1963?

Mr. MARSHALL. From the Commission?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes.

The reference is to the Civil Rights Commission, which is conducting investigations. Money has been appropriated for it. It is on the job. That is its business. Mr. Marshall replied:

Senator, I do not have that figure. I would have to supply it.

Senator ELLENDER. Will you supply it for the record and also indicate the nature of those complaints?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. I will do that.

The information requested was supplied. It is:

During fiscal year 1963 the Civil Rights Commission referred some 50 letters relating

to a variety of civil rights complaints to this Division.

Fifty letters. There will be 48 attorneys, Mr. President. I believe that is enough.

If we wish to provide money on the basis of whatever is requested, we ought to allow the State Department another 441 personnel. We ought to allow more personnel for the Commerce Department, and more for the related agencies, if we are to act on the basis of stated need.

There is the prospect that a new civil rights bill will be passed some time next year. There are those who hope it will be passed. If it should be passed, there will come to the Congress a request for a great number of attorneys more, and more clerical help, to enforce the law.

I believe that the number of attorneys and the number of personnel in this section are adequate. If not, 10 new lawyers were authorized in the Civil Division and the Tax Division. They could use another one or two. They do things like that from time to time. They are not bound to any one division. They use their personnel wherever they need them.

I am persuaded that what the committee has recommended is pretty generous. It is equitable. It is on a basis of what actually is needed and what can be used.

We should support the President in the present drive, if we can call it that, for economy, and in the concern he has indicated, particularly in respect to the Defense Department and other departments, about holding down expenditures and beginning to retrench in some of these fields.

We could not be charged with not providing adequately for this activity or not giving due consideration to this particular item. I feel that the committee has been reasonably generous. I believe the committee should be sustained.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, is it not correct that the \$18,657,000 is a lump-sum appropriation which could be used in any part of this area?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, indeed. That is what I have tried to say. If another two or three attorneys are needed, the money is provided for that purpose.

There is one thing which is certain. If we appropriate all the money requested it will be spent. If we hold down the amount, so that it will be necessary to make certain adjustments from time to time, we shall get more for our money. I believe we shall get better results.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mrs. SMITH. I should be happy to yield, but I believe the chairman of the committee has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. The report of the committee is quite explicit on that point, and justifies an increase of \$84,000 over the House allowance in this way:

The additional amount will provide funding for about 10 additional positions in the

Tax and Civil Rights Divisions to assist with the increased workloads.

Certainly if any of these particular funds were used for the Civil Rights Division the Appropriations Committee would be the first to complain about the Department using the funds contrary to the report of the committee.

I recognize that the report does not legally bind the Department, and it could legally use a portion of the \$84,000 or of other sums for this division.

The Department made its presentation. The committee made its decision, up to this point, as to the number of personnel for the Civil Rights Division. The committee would allow 10 additional positions for 2 other divisions. If I were administering the Department of Justice, I would hesitate to use any of these funds for the purpose of the Civil Rights Division, in the face of this statement in the committee report.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that the 10 additional positions recommended by the committee were earmarked, and could not be transferred. That would not prohibit or prevent the transfer of any other amount from the very large appropriation, the remainder of \$18,573,000.

This question was quite thoroughly discussed in the hearings as the Senator will notice.

My civil rights record is a good one, and I would not wish to deprive the people in this division of the attorneys they need. We were of the opinion that there was sufficient flexibility in that area so that the Civil Rights Division could borrow, whenever there was a need to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I know of the fine record of the distinguished Senator from Maine in the field of civil rights; and I am sure it would be furthest from her thought to cripple this division in any way.

However, the amount requested was considerably higher for the total appropriation. It is true that for all salaries and expenses for legal activities in the Department of Justice—excluding the Antitrust Division, which is covered by a separate item—the \$18 million-plus is a sizable sum, but we are discussing what has been requested for this division.

I appeal to the Senator from Maine, who may not have been present at the time of my previous presentation, in this way: Even the sums which have been asked for and which have not been allowed were estimates made up at a time before the recent crisis in the summer of this year, which called for many additional legal personnel, which situation, we hope, will not be repeated; but there is no assurance that it will not be. Many of the lawyers worked night and day—around the clock in some instances—during that time of great crisis.

The Senator from Arkansas referred to the commendable efforts of the President to keep expenses down; but I call

attention to the fact that the President also has taken a very vigorous position favorable to civil rights.

I quote this sentence from an editorial in the New York Times on this very subject, dealing with the amendment which the Senate now has before it, in which it is stated:

Here is an opportunity for President Johnson to go beyond his admirable support of new civil rights legislation and help make existing law work. A strong word from the President should produce the votes to restore all 19 requested positions to the Civil Rights Division—or even to go beyond that figure, as events since the budget was drawn up a year ago clearly demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from which I have read, and also an editorial from last night's Star which is very favorable to this amendment.

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

STARVING CIVIL RIGHTS

The extent of Southern congressional power to hobble the Government's efforts to achieve Negro rights is illustrated by what has happened to the appropriation for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

The Division has only 40 lawyers to do all the laborious work of suing for the right to vote in counties across the South, of investigating police brutality, of planning legislation. In the current budget, President Kennedy sought a modest increase of 19 individuals. The House allowed funds for only eight. The Senate Appropriations Committee, while giving the Justice Department somewhat more than the House figure, specified that none of this additional sum was to go to the Civil Rights Division.

The Senate is to debate the Justice Department appropriation bill tomorrow. Here is an opportunity for President Johnson to go beyond his admirable support of new civil rights legislation and help make existing law work. A strong word from the President should produce the votes to restore all 19 requested positions to the Civil Rights Division—or even to go beyond that figure, as events since the budget was drawn up a year ago clearly demand.

CIVIL RIGHTS LAWYERS

In the area of civil rights enforcement, the Department of Justice proceeds on the basis of laws which Congress has adopted. Now, however, the Department finds itself in the anomalous position of not having enough lawyers to carry out the civil rights job delegated to it by Congress.

This matter should be gone into when the Justice Department appropriation bill comes up in the Senate this week. It is expected that an effort will be made to show that the Appropriations Committee, though proposing more money, has subjected it to restrictions which will prevent the Department from hiring the lawyers it needs. If this can in fact be shown, the necessary funds should be made available without restriction or the Senate should indicate that it really does not expect the Department to go forward with the assignments that Congress has given it.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not like to take issue with my able colleague and good friend from New York on this

matter or any other matter, but I remind Members of the Senate that 6 months of the fiscal year are practically over and that the new budget will come in early in January. At that time I am sure we shall know better the points which the new President, President Johnson, will emphasize, and I am sure this will be one of those which I shall be very glad to support.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield, I have no doubt that civil rights legislation will be enacted and that it will require additional staffing in the Civil Rights Division. However, we are discussing the situation as of today. The work of the Department, this minute and tomorrow, is crippled, in enforcing voting rights, by the lack of personnel.

While I agree with the distinguished Senator that very shortly there will be an opportunity to review the question hopefully, in connection with next year's appropriation bill—not a year from now but preferably 6 months from now—yet we cannot take a chance, judging from what has happened this year. We cannot very well plan to make provision for next year.

I realize that a large part of this year has gone by—half of the fiscal year, roughly—and that these positions are not to be filled retroactively, and it might be that there could be some modification of the figure of \$167,000 which would be acceptable. But I could not withdraw the amendment with the hope that it will be taken care of next year, because there will be problems next year, and we must now face those which we have at present.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Maine, whom I admire and respect. I am sure that she understands our sincerity.

What is important is that the departments, as the Senator knows, pay the strictest attention to the views of the Appropriations Subcommittee before which they appear. What happens when there is a kind of consolidation of view in a matter of this character is that, the request having been considered and not granted, the Department becomes very loath to shift its employees around. In addition, it strengthens the other elements of the bureaucracy—and I say that kindly—in the Department, particularly when, as here, the positions are authorized in the words of the committee report and they are identified as being earmarked for the tax and civil divisions.

As to the question of coupling these items together, especially since the amounts of money involved are so irrelevant to the issues involved, we should really pay attention to the maxim that justice deferred is justice denied. As these positions are needed to do justice in an area as to which there is such a broad consensus, namely, the voting rights area, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee may be prevailed upon to accept a proposal for a reasonable sum, enough to carry the program for the next 6 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York in its present status would provide for an additional \$167,000.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Half of the fiscal year has gone. A modification has been proposed to the Senator's amendment, about which I have spoken to him, that would for a half year require about \$70,000 to employ 10 lawyers. I have discussed this question with the Justice Department. There is a feeling in the Department, as expressed by Department officials, that an additional 10 lawyers would be needed. I feel, however, that since it is now almost mid-December, and since it would require a rather considerable period of time to obtain security clearance for the personnel, a smaller amount would be provided in the amendment, which would fulfill the needs of the Department.

There is no need for asking more than is required and more than can be constructively used.

Therefore, I elicit the attention of the chairman. I feel a proposal to add \$50,000 to the amount lined on line 2, page 16, to make the amount "\$18,707,000," instead of "\$18,657,000" would mean that an additional \$50,000 would be made available to the Justice Department in this particular category, and thereby permit the Justice Department to employ approximately between six and seven additional attorneys for the remainder of the year. Actually, the number might be more, because it would greatly depend upon the time required for security clearance. I do not believe it would be done in much less than 6 weeks.

Therefore I should like to elicit the views of the chairman on this matter. I know what the committee report states. I serve on the committee. I must say, in all candor, that I voted for the committee recommendation. Incidentally, I have received no complaints from the Justice Department. I read about the possibility of an inadequate professional staff for the Civil Rights Division, and I inquired about it. I was told that there definitely was a need for additional professional staff members. Therefore, I prepared the amendment. However, I have no desire to substitute my amendment for the amendment offered by the Senators from New York, who took the lead in this matter. It is not a question of whose amendment is voted on; it is a matter of adjusting the figure to the point where we can obtain what we feel is needed, and nothing more. Would the chairman care to venture his views on this subject?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator indicates that there has been no complaint from the Justice Department with respect to the committee's action. No representation was made that the amount be increased. Of course, I would personally favor the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota over that of the amendment as originally sponsored.

However, I come back to this point: According to the best judgment of the department there is need for a few additional attorneys. If we go back to my original point, every agency has some need. However, I do not think it is a pressing need. It is not a need that must be accommodated immediately. I believe the Department can do pretty well with what is in the bill. This question was not raised either in the subcommittee or in the full committee.

I am hopeful that what we have done can be sustained. As has been indicated, there will be very early consideration of this subject next year. We shall find that there will be an insistence on getting down to business on appropriation bills early in the next year. There will be plenty of time to consider this matter.

I hope the committee will be sustained. If it cannot be sustained, naturally I would prefer the lesser amount. It seems to me that this is an admission that the Department does not need what the original amendment calls for. It is not insisting on it. In conversation it has been said, "We could use 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 more attorneys." I know I could use a couple more attorneys in my office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So could I.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We must recognize the fiscal problems, too, and try to adjust ourselves to them as much as we can. With 40 allowed, and 8 more to be proposed, that would make 48 lawyers. Why should they have that money, when they received only 50 letters or complaints from the Civil Rights Commission? That clearly indicates that with all the district attorneys and assistant district attorneys all over the country, for the next 3 or 4 months they certainly should be able to get along with what the bill provides.

Mr. KEATING. Did I understand the Senator to say that only 50 complaints had been received?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I previously indicated that 50 letters had been received from the Civil Rights Commission. That is all that had been received in fiscal 1963. That is their testimony.

Mr. KEATING. Is the Senator talking about the Civil Rights Commission or the Civil Rights Division?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Civil Rights Commission. That is the commission which is doing the investigating, and doing all the work on this problem. The Civil Rights Commission referred about 50 letters to the Division. Those letters related to a variety of civil rights complaints. That is their testimony.

Mr. KEATING. That may be so. The Division, however, had received 23,000 complaints. It may be that only 50 of those were referred to it by the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If 23,000 complaints were received, as the Senator says, from sources other than the Civil Rights Commission, it seems to me that the Commission is not very vigilant.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that the Commission referred to the Division specific matters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They were letters of complaint.

Mr. KEATING. Undoubtedly the Civil Rights Commission transmitted to the Civil Rights Division only those letters or complaints which were most meritorious, the remainder having been culled out for one reason or another. However, Justice Department testimony before the Committee was to the effect that they had received 23,000 complaints on new matters and cases, and that they had received 12,000 reports and memoranda from the FBI and other sources. I assume that in those 12,000 cases are included the 50 or so to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know the number; but does the Senator know how many district attorneys and assistant district attorneys there are all over the country? They handle matters that are referred to them.

Mr. KEATING. My colleague from New York has clearly stated the principal reason why the U.S. attorneys alone cannot handle these complicated cases. For example, in Montgomery County, Alabama, 36,000 pages of voting records had to be analyzed, and the brief ran to 300 pages. Mr. Marshall, the head of the Division, testified that if the U.S. attorney in this district had to prepare this case alone, he could not have done anything else for an estimated period of 2 years.

There are many other such cases. We know that every roadblock is thrown into the path of successful prosecution in such cases. They are like complicated anti-trust or tax cases. They cannot all be handled by U.S. attorneys. If the U.S. attorneys tried to do so, their other work would become completely bogged down. They would not be able to handle the regular civil and criminal litigation which makes up the usual caseload in every district.

Addressing myself to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, it is true that the figure of \$167,000 is for the full year, just as the other figure in the bill was for the full year.

We are faced with an unprecedented situation. We are passing an appropriation bill when the fiscal year is half over. If additional lawyers were employed—and most of the pressing need is for lawyers and not for clerical personnel—they would have to go through the normal FBI clearance procedure, which a Government lawyer must go through, and this would require about 6 weeks, as the Senator from Minnesota has indicated.

Therefore, it might be adequate to make an allowance for the remaining 5 months of the fiscal year. That might be adequate to employ the 10 lawyers that are needed, for the balance of the fiscal year. In that case I would compute the amount to be closer to \$70,000 than the \$50,000 the Senator from Minnesota has indicated.

I believe that some amount in that neighborhood would, as I envision it, do

the job which the Department of Justice says is necessary for the balance of the fiscal year.

I wonder if the Senator could not see his way clear to agree to a figure of \$70,000 as opposed to \$50,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the amount I had originally intended to suggest for the 6-month period. In light of the security checks, I was of the opinion that \$50,000 would be adequate. That is merely a rule-of-thumb suggestion. I do not guarantee accounting accuracy on this subject. The question to be decided is whether we want to add a few additional lawyers to handle the workload which the Senator from New York has so adequately documented. My own view is that if \$50,000 were allowed, it would be of significant help to the Department, because the \$50,000 would not be earmarked. That would permit some shifting of personnel among certain of the divisions and units in the Department of Justice, as has been suggested by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. She reminded us that there is a flexibility in the employment of lawyers and professional staff personnel, except in the instance of the Tax Division, where the report, I believe, requires—

Mr. KEATING. The Tax Division and the Civil Division.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the Tax Division and the Civil Division there is a requirement that any additional personnel be assigned to those Divisions.

The Senator may wish to modify his amendment. I have no desire to press any amendment of my own, because he has taken the lead, and I do not believe in "cutting in." Why does not the Senator modify it to provide some amount between \$50,000 and \$75,000? Then the Senate can vote.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, to show what a reasonable fellow I am, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment to provide \$60,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The arrangement, then, will provide a modification of the amendment, so that the amount will be \$18,717,000.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On page 16, line 2, "\$18,657,000" would be stricken, and in lieu thereof "\$18,717,000" would be inserted.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. President, since the yeas and nays have already been ordered, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from New York may modify his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, if we took a little longer, perhaps we might reduce the amount still further. I was not a party to this arrangement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that modification.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to make it clear that the Senator from Arkansas has been very cooperative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota would be willing to extend the debate, we might discuss the question a little further, perhaps reduce the amount still further, and convince Senators that the amount should be reduced. I am very happy with the progress that is being made.

I shall not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Arkansas is willing to become a third party to this arrangement, I think I could persuade the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to reduce the amount to \$50,000.

I have never known a finer chairman than the Senator from Arkansas. He is one of my favorite chairmen. The Senator from Arkansas has been chairman of a committee on which I have served for many years. I know of no one whom I admire more, or for whose work I have greater respect. I would be glad to become party to such an arrangement. After this sincere testimonial, we should be able to simplify the whole procedure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota; but I fully subscribe to the view of the President of the United States and shall remain frugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Both my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I deeply appreciate the effort of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to resolve this question in a favorable way. I sincerely hope that this evidence of practicality on our part—and I fully appreciate why the Senator from Arkansas in this case might not be able to accept the amendment—will find favor with the Senate, and that the Senator from Minnesota, although he is a member of the committee, will feel that it is proper to support it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Sena-

tor from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "yea."

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

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty and, if present and voting, would vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Allott	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bayh	Humphrey	Nelson
Beall	Jackson	Neuberger
Boggs	Javits	Pastore
Burdick	Keating	Pearson
Carlson	Kennedy	Fell
Case	Kuchel	Prouty
Church	McCarthy	Proxmire
Cooper	McGee	Randolph
Dodd	McGovern	Ribicoff
Douglas	McIntyre	Scott
Edmondson	Mechem	Symington
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, N. J.
Gore	Miller	Yarborough
Gruening	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morton	

NAYS—33

Alken	Ervin	Russell
Anderson	Hill	Saltonstall
Bennett	Inouye	Simpson
Bible	Johnston	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche	Stennis
Cannon	Long, La.	Talmadge
Curtis	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dirksen	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Robertson	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster	Goldwater	Magnuson
Clark	Hayden	McNamara
Cotton	Holland	Monroney
Dominick	Hruska	Sparkman
Engle	Jordan, N.C.	Walters
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	

So Mr. KEATING's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was passed be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7073) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question.

There has been a good deal of objection from the supporters of the informational media guarantees program which is a program for the guarantee of payment in dollars instead of local currency, which might be tied up, for various publications sent abroad in the interest of our Nation. These people have appealed to us very strongly on the basis of the provision in the committee report, in which the committee directs that the program be eliminated.

Without trying to change the mind of the committee at this particular time, I should like to ask the chairman a question.

This is really, for all practical purposes, a foreign policy question, as to whether the foreign policy of the Nation is or is not helped by the informational media guarantee program—which has been, I know, under considerable fire. The plea has been made that the question ought to be considered and studied by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to ask the chairman whether he could consent to making some request of the Committee on Foreign Relations for its opinion, in view of the fact that the provision in the committee report is so strong on that subject. I have it before me. On page 23 of the report it is stated:

The committee has previously expressed its disapproval of this program and directs that it be phased out.

The language is "and directs that it be phased out."

That is pretty drastic language. Of course, the committee cannot compel the program to be phased out. There may be some objection to it.

I ask the chairman whether he would agree that the Foreign Relations Committee should be asked to review the program and give its judgment to the Appropriations Committee on the subject.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is nothing to prevent the committee from doing that at any time, either informally or formally, so far as I know, if the Committee on Foreign Relations wishes to act and wishes to submit a recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. The position of the Appropriations Committee is known. I do not know why we should make a special request to the Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a new program. It amounts to a subsidy. There is a feeling that it should be phased out.

Mr. JAVITS. The committee does not content itself by saying that it should be phased out. That is what brought me to my feet. The committee says: "Directs that it be phased out."

There is a very real question as to whether any committee of the Congress has any right to direct a Government department to phase out a program, in the absence of legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It can do so indirectly, if it does not appropriate the money.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is the indication that the committee feels the program should be phased out, because the committee does not feel it should continue to make appropriations. It might be done in a more gentle way; I do not know. Apparently this is the view of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the reason why I came back to the proposition that the Foreign Relations Committee should conduct a review of the program and should express itself upon this subject. In view of the report's very drastic statement directing that the program be phased out, we ought to know, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, before a Government department accepts that direction in the absence of any other statement by anybody else, whether or not in the foreign policy interests of the United States the program should be phased out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I pointed out, I know of no restriction on the Foreign

Relations Committee about making its recommendations.

Mr. JAVITS. So it would be fair to say that what the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee are doing is serving notice that they will not appropriate money in the future for this program. That is really what it amounts to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is serving notice that the committee feels it ought to be phased out.

Mr. JAVITS. At this particular time that is the viewpoint of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be recalled that last year the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Congress, reduced the amount for this program to \$1 million. It was felt by us then that efforts should be made to phase out the program. Irrespective of our feeling, I understand that this year the Bureau of the Budget made a request for \$3 million. Is that the correct amount?

Mr. KEATING. The sum of \$3,960,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, \$3,960,000. The committee felt that the only money which should be appropriated, in view of the action taken last year, was an amount to provide enough to pay back the interest on the fund.

Actually, we are appropriating money out of the Treasury to pay back the Treasury. That is what it amounts to. I do not have before me now the breakdown as to how the money is being spent. But as I recall, all of the publishers which will be denied this subsidy, to which my good friend from Arkansas referred, are located in New York except for one in California.

Mr. KEATING. That is nothing against them, is it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have nothing against them, but I believe this is a program we should dispense with. We have had the program since 1947. It was started on more or less a temporary basis. Like many other programs, it has been continuing, instead of being phased out. Some are inclined to increase it.

Under the foreign aid program a large sum is being spent to provide school-books for people we are serving abroad, by way of foreign aid. There is not much objection to that.

Under another program millions of dollars of counterpart funds, derived from the sale of surpluses abroad, are being used to assist libraries for school-children.

I believe those programs are well directed. There is no opposition to them. However, when it comes to subsidizing large corporations, not only in the book line, but also in the motion picture business—since we are guaranteeing profits for the sale of motion pictures and other media, I do not believe it is either good or necessary. I am very hopeful that the program will be phased out as soon as possible.

I call attention to the fact that this program is operating for the benefit of our large publishing concerns not only in the so-called underdeveloped countries, but also is acting to guarantee

them profitable business in such strong and prosperous nations as France, West Germany, and Israel.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the informational media guar-

antee program, as of June 30, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. Information Agency—Informational media guarantee program, June 30, 1962

[Summary for each country, inception of program through June 30, 1962, listing total contracts of guarantee issued, dollar payments for foreign currency purchased, dollar proceeds of foreign currency sold, losses or gains on sales, dollar cost, and market value of excess foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department, and of foreign currency on hand June 30, 1962]

Country (1)	Number of contracts ¹ (2)	Number of contracts ² (3)	Guarantee amount issued (4)	Dollar payments for currency purchased (5)	Sale of foreign currency	
					Dollar proceeds (6)	Loss (gain) on sales (7)
Afghanistan.....	13	22	\$77,000	0	0	0
Austria.....	31	108	591,010	\$369,553	\$330,056	\$39,497
Burma.....	28	64	355,650	149,758	87,139	(866)
Chile.....	69	99	1,476,110	921,915	481,149	440,766
France.....	23	60	851,625	428,483	428,003	480
Germany.....	70	224	11,518,052	7,068,729	7,057,036	11,693
Indonesia.....	58	200	6,827,735	4,958,761	0	0
Israel.....	132	566	15,406,154	12,183,027	1,895,375	930,158
Italy.....	8	10	83,295	9,307	9,302	5
Korea.....	26	27	190,000	0	0	0
Netherlands.....	60	174	2,866,559	1,838,719	1,833,889	4,830
Norway.....	12	44	586,443	314,757	311,813	2,944
Pakistan.....	86	283	3,105,273	1,896,077	0	50
Philippines.....	122	449	17,913,904	15,409,151	14,598,956	810,144
Poland.....	65	183	5,068,864	3,558,260	1,288,040	1,130,260
Spain.....	58	180	2,643,675	1,799,911	1,468,070	331,841
Taiwan.....	59	212	1,880,948	1,283,747	1,237,194	46,553
Turkey.....	88	331	7,305,343	5,539,569	3,016,554	2,523,015
Vietnam.....	56	170	4,251,903	3,398,795	1,643,741	1,753,041
Yugoslavia.....	90	327	9,001,125	6,648,329	3,177,378	2,805,191
Total.....		3,733	92,000,668	67,776,848	38,863,695	10,829,602

Country (8)	Foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department (9)		Foreign currency inventory on hand June 30, 1962 (10)		Country (8)	Foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department (9)		Foreign currency inventory on hand June 30, 1962 (10)	
	Dollar cost (11)	Market value (12)	Dollar cost (11)	Market value (12)		Dollar cost (11)	Market value (12)	Dollar cost (11)	Market value (12)
Afghanistan.....	0	0	0	0	Norway.....	0	0	0	0
Austria.....	0	0	0	0	Pakistan.....	\$1,592,497	\$1,605,393	\$303,530	\$306,844
Burma.....	\$60,323	\$60,946	\$3,162	\$3,162	Philippines.....	0	0	51	29
Chile.....	0	0	0	0	Poland.....	883,366	647,342	256,594	256,595
France.....	0	0	0	0	Spain.....	0	0	0	0
Germany.....	0	0	0	0	Taiwan.....	0	0	0	0
Indonesia.....	3,724,304	1,243,604	1,234,457	609,582	Turkey.....	0	0	0	0
Israel.....	9,357,403	4,122,937	91	63	Vietnam.....	0	0	2,013	968
Italy.....	0	0	0	0	Yugoslavia.....	300,713	120,279	365,047	151,626
Korea.....	0	0	0	0	Total.....	15,918,606	\$7,800,500	2,164,945	1,328,869
Netherlands.....	0	0	0	0					

¹ Most contractors participate in more than 1 country. The number of different contractors at June 30, 1962, was 331. Several of the contractors act as jobbers and publishers' representatives for several hundred exporters of informational materials who do not have contracts directly with the Agency.

² Of the 3,733 contracts, there were 635 active as of June 30, 1962. Foreign currencies sold by Treasury after they were received as excess currencies are valued at actual sale rate for this computation, remaining units foreign currency valued at June 30, 1962, rates.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York. I believe that for the Appropriations Committee to direct—using the word "direct"—that a program be phased out is going somewhat beyond the proper scope of its activities.

Senators who are interested in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which the Senate has been discussing, would feel that if the Appropriations Committee should direct that the activities of that Division be phased out, the committee would be going a little bit wide of the mark.

I agree with my colleague, that this subject does come primarily under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Its advice in the matter would be highly desirable.

I hope an effort will be made to obtain such advice. I do not know whether the request should be initiated by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]

or the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], since the Senators are chairmen of the respective committees; but I hope an effort will be made by the Foreign Relations Committee to make its views known to the Appropriations Committee, so as to determine whether or not the opinion of members of the Appropriations Committee will be changed.

The fact is that the United States is spending thousands of dollars to send Peace Corps volunteers overseas to teach people to read and to understand English, yet at the same time there is a great scarcity of interesting current reading materials.

The Soviet Union subsidizes vast quantities of reading matter to be sent all over the world. It is propaganda, designed to woo men's minds. It is a threat to U.S. policies.

What we send in return, even under this program is meager compared to the Soviet effort. To reduce still further, or to eliminate the sending of published materials from the United States would be a very serious step, very much against the national interest.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it ought to be made clear that while there are publishing houses in places other than New York, it is fair to say, also, that most of the book publishing companies are in New York City.

Mr. KEATING. There is an important one in St. Paul.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the West Publishing Co.

Mr. KEATING. And they got about \$150,000 out of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very good.

Mr. KEATING. It is a fine company, and everybody highly respects it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel that the point that has been made about the authorization of this program by the Foreign Relations Committee ought to be given serious consideration. If we are to change an authorization program, it ought to be done by the authorizing committee the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committee certainly has the power to decide the degree of the

program, but the authorization has been made by the appropriate committee.

I hope the reduction in the informational media guarantee of some \$350,000 will not seriously affect the distribution of educational and truly worthwhile material. This program has served a very useful purpose overseas. It seems to me we would be wise to take a constructive look at it, rather than say, at the appropriation level, "We are going to eliminate it or phase it out." My interpretation of "phase out" is that it does not necessarily mean the end of it next year. Programs are phased out over a period of time. But the chairman and the ranking minority member and other members of the legislative committee will want to take a look at it, because it is a program that has always been considered and reported favorably.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we ought to let it rest this way; namely, that it be directed that the program be phased out. We know the qualifying jurisdictional question involved, but I think it is important to spell it out. No one committee is given the authority to phase out the program. The Senate and the House have something to say about it. I am sure the chairman, who has always been fair, would want to make that clear.

Apart from that feeling, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that one of the important areas in which we are greatly deficient is the informational area.

There are three ways to win the cold war—militarily, economically, or informationally.

We certainly do not want to have a military test of strength. We want to be well prepared, but we do not want to be put to a test.

We are trying to win in the economic field and we have an enormous aid program involving billions of dollars.

But when we get to information there is something in us which restrains us from acting and doing what we ought to do in the interest of success for the United States. We are spending less money on information now than the Russians used to spend when they jammed American broadcasts. In the hierarchy of broadcasting, with all the genius of America, we come after Communist China in expenditures in that field. There is something wrong in this situation.

When we talk about the informational media guarantee fund, it is easy enough to say that Time and Life are big organizations, and to ask why we should do anything that makes it possible for them to gain. But they will be able to say, "We thank you, gentlemen. You are very kind and distinguished. But we are still a free enterprise, and instead of sending the magazines to Saudi Arabia, or to Yemen, or wherever you think they should go, we will instead sell them in the United States, France, or Britain, where we can get cold cash." They can very well say that. So it is no answer to say that they are big organizations.

Mr. President, who is getting the foreign aid business? Poor organizations? Who is getting the billions of dollars in contracts for hardware? General Motors, General Electric, and other great

companies. Who provides telephone service? American Telegraph & Telephone Co., the biggest organization on earth. Is that any reason to cut them out? No; we want them to prosper and to keep busy and do a great job for the country.

I have previously urged that perhaps it would be a better decision to have the legislative committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, take a look at the whole posture of the information program of the United States. With all respect and deference to my colleagues of the Appropriations Committee, it is not right for them to determine what shall be the information program of this country. This is a great foreign relations question. Neither the Navy, Army, Air Force, nor foreign aid, can do more than this program. We are told, for example, that the main problem in the Alliance for Progress is that Latin Americans think we are buying their support, instead of winning their political and ideological support. Yet the very instrument we have to get that done is inadequate to the task we have before us.

So it is with the greatest respect that I urge—and I hope that it will be considered—that the Foreign Relations Committee set a rather high priority upon looking into the whole problem. Naturally, the Appropriations Committee can do only that which the law allows, and it does not deal with authorizations.

If the law needs change—and I believe it does—in order to give amplitude to our program, if the Foreign Relations Committee believes, for example, that the sums provided for the informational media program deserve a better break than they have been getting, I think it is up to that committee to say so.

Even if it is not within the premise of general legislation, there is the authority of legislative oversight to permit that committee to deal with the question of the informational media guarantee fund. To take a specific example, under the authority of legislative oversight, pressure can be brought to have the Foreign Relations Committee give high priority to the problem. I would hazard a guess, with all due respect, that there are few questions which are considered important enough to bring to the floor as a review of the informational media program, especially with the points that have been raised with respect to the program, and the making of some recommendations, either legislative or in terms of policy, to which I am sure the Appropriations Committee and the chairman will give the greatest respect and consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. I think there is here involved a policy question that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me the way we are viewed abroad is of great importance to the United States, and I know of no country about which more misinformation circulates.

No one can go abroad and not be impressed with the distorted view of America one finds all over the world. I think

our motion pictures do little to correct this misimpression, and our Government-sponsored broadcasts abroad are naturally suspect, and are not given the credence we should like them to have.

Therefore, it seems to me that the best and most accurate sources for giving a true picture of America abroad are our periodicals and other magazines, which need to be circulated in areas where popular impressions of the United States count for much, and where they are grievously distorted.

So I believe the proper way to deal with the question is through the committee which is responsible for overseeing the conduct of American foreign policy. I subscribe to the recommendation the Senator from New York has made.

It seems to me that approaching this problem through a statement in the report of the Appropriations Committee is an improper and a backdoor method, to which I cannot subscribe. I hope the proper committee will undertake to review this question and give to it the weight that in my judgment it deserves.

THE EAST-WEST CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to express my special gratitude and appreciation to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, as well as the members of that subcommittee, for their assistance and understanding in restoring the cuts previously administered to the appropriations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West.

I also would like to express my sincere thanks to the majority leader and to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and its members for the most expeditious consideration of the restoration request of the East-West Center.

Speaking as a Senator from the State of Hawaii, I have personally watched the Center grow since its inception in 1960. Although some critics may disagree with me, I assure you that our tax dollars have been well spent. Dollar for dollar, the East-West Center, in my opinion, has better served the cause of relations between the people of these United States and the peoples of the Pacific basin and Asian nations than many other institutions and projects.

Through the East-West Center, we have made it possible for the future leaders of the Pacific and Asian areas to get to know each other, to understand their mutual problems, and to try to seek common solutions. The Center has also made it possible for selected future leaders from the United States to become acquainted with their counterparts from the Pacific and Asian countries, an experience which should prove valuable in the future course of this Nation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii made a very good presentation, and the committee was glad to approve the fund for East-West Cultural Center.

Again I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is another area in which we are undertaking to bring proper information abroad, in this case to the students who come to the Center

to receive their education. I am perfectly willing to do that. I like to see money spent where I believe it will do some good. However, there has been a great deal of loose operation elsewhere in the State Department. I am not sure that all the information we are paying for sending abroad puts this country in the proper light. Many articles published in various periodicals do a great deal of harm.

I like to see money spent to put the American image over correctly, and not to tear it down. I agree that the Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this field, and should look into the program. I am perfectly willing to have it do so. I hope it will do so.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and particularly the members of the State Department Subcommittee, who evidenced their great interest, faith, and confidence in the East-West Center in Hawaii by restoring almost all of the entire amounts cut by the House of Representatives.

Particular credit is due to the able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and to the distinguished ranking minority member, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. They sat through the hearings on the East-West Center, and they asked searching questions about the various programs conducted by it. As a result, I believe a very convincing record has been compiled to take to conference with the House.

I want at this time to accord to these two leaders on the subcommittee the appreciation properly due them for their strong support of the East-West Center.

Other Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee have likewise been staunch and steadfast friends of this fledgling institution which holds so much promise for improving East-West relations.

The distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana, expressed his firm and enthusiastic support of the East-West Center at the second hearing, which was very helpful to our cause.

Other Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee have expressed to me similar favorable sentiments.

I and all the many friends of the East-West Center are deeply grateful that so many Senators believe that the East-West Center should continue its march toward the full potential envisioned by Congress when the Center was established by Congress in 1960, just 3 short years ago.

I am confident the Senate will endorse the full amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the East-West Center.

INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTEE PROGRAM

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables issued by the U.S. Information Agency dealing with the informational media guarantee program.

I hope these tables will enable the Foreign Relations Committee to give early attention to this matter and to go into a consideration of all the facts.

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

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Informational media guarantee program—list of motion picture contractors and total payments for currency purchased

Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased		Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased	
		Fiscal year 1962	Inception of program to June 30, 1962			Fiscal year 1962	Inception of program to June 30, 1962
Aleo Pictures Corp.	Beverly Hills, Calif.		\$5,950.00	Moulin Productions, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		\$23,964.76
Allied Artists International Corp.	New York, N.Y.		152,037.73	Paramount International Films, Inc.	do	\$90,284.93	843,921.06
Alperston, Edward L., Productions, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.		1,550.00	Paramount Pictures Corp.	do		523,455.00
American Trading Association	New York, N.Y.		1,500.00	Republic Pictures International Corp.	North Hollywood, Calif.		211,050.02
Cavalcade Pictures, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.		2,535.00	RKO Radio Pictures, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		902,513.22
Columbia Pictures Corp.	New York, N.Y.		329,032.74	RKO Teletadio Pictures, Inc.	do		76,420.71
Columbia Pictures International Corp.	do	\$116,628.59	713,075.10	Selznick Co., Inc.	Culver City, Calif.	14,974.08	45,458.57
Crystal Pictures	do		7,000.00	Selznick Releasing Organization, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		118,073.04
Walt Disney Productions	do		36,879.20	Small, Edward, Productions, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.		25,370.00
Du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co.	Wilmington, Del.		526,237.55	Sparta Film, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		5,020.00
Eagle Lion Films, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		52,485.00	Sunset Securities Co.	Los Angeles, Calif.		6,100.00
Goldwyn, Samuel, Productions, Inc.	do		120,820.00	Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.	New York, N.Y.	42,951.98	1,015,121.68
Guaranteed Pictures Co., Inc.	do		1,200.00	Twentieth Century-Fox International Corp.	do		457,281.50
Keystone Pictures, Inc.	do		13,013.36	United Artists Corp.	do	235,257.72	858,851.12
Lexington Trading Co., Inc.	Los Angeles, Calif.		9,443.00	Universal International Films, Inc.	do	54,021.20	618,492.15
Little Fugitive, Inc.	New York, N.Y.		3,022.10	Universal Pictures Corp.	do		422,347.12
Loew's, Inc.	do		2,755.55	Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.	do		390,354.83
Loew's International, Inc.	do		1,323,431.45	Warner Bros. Pictures International Corp.	do	93,885.79	922,380.69
Loew's, Inc., and Loew's International Corp.	do		635,226.99	Westrex Corp.	do		176,243.90
MJP Enterprises, Inc.	do	4,000.00	34,340.00				
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.	do	219,534.45	725,301.12				
Motion Picture Export Association of America, Inc.	do		1,915,860.59				
				Total		908,417.94	14,740,884.13

Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased (A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962

Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased		Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased	
		(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962			(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962
Academic Press, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	\$16,323.05	\$272,419.40	American Book Sellers Agency, Inc.	do	0	\$221.99
Acme Code Co., Inc.	do	43,084.07	491,634.32	American Chemical Society	Washington, D.C.	0	70,796.35
Adeo International Co.	do	4,461.50	122,219.56	American Foreign Credit Underwriters Corp.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,500.00
Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.	Reading, Mass.	38,195.30	134,385.36	American & Foreign Trade Corp.	do	0	9,993.01
Aero Publishers, Inc.	Los Angeles, Calif.	0	1,203.35	American Institute of Accountants	do	0	784.65
Affiliated Publishers, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	14,234.24	1,361,961.83	American Jewish Committee	do	0	3,546.78
Aleo Pictures Corp.	Beverly Hills, Calif.	0	5,950.00	American Library Association	Chicago, Ill.	0	2,607.93
Allied Artists International Corp.	New York, N.Y.	0	152,037.73	American Map Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	22,473.38
Allyn & Bacon, Inc.	do	0	44,062.69	American Mitchell Fashion Publishers, Inc.	do	\$3,149.67	27,464.24
Alperston, Edward L., Productions, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.	0	1,550.00	American News Company, Inc.	do	7,080.52	332,037.74
American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	256,124.41	American Technical Society	Chicago, Ill.	0	445.55
American Book Co.	do	151,934.60	965,350.31				

Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased
(A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962—Continued

Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased		Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased	
		(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962			(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962
American Trading Association	New York, N.Y.	0	\$1,500.00	Franklin Square Agency, Inc.	Englewood, N.J.	\$8,511.80	\$8,511.80
Americana Corp.	Beverly Hills, Calif.	\$13,270.67	31,474.09	Freedman, Harold, Brandt & Brandt Dramatic Department, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,000.00
Amsco Music Publishing Co.	New York, N.Y.	0	106,591.83	Gazzo, Michael V.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,000.00
Annual Reviews, Inc.	Stanford, Calif.	0	8,753.53	Gilberton Co., Inc.	do.	0	5,026.84
Architectural Book Publishing Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	171.39	Gilmary Society, Inc.	do.	0	9,930.00
Archway Book Store	Philadelphia, Pa.	0	7,472.36	Ginn & Co.	Boston, Mass.	108,101.81	1,150,500.35
Arcos Publishing Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	15,325.58	Goldman, Sam	New York, N.Y.	0	99,912.12
Army Times Publishing Co.	Washington, D.C.	176.43	6,212.54	Goldman, S. Otzar Hasefarim, Inc.	do.	0	2,598.53
Ashely-Radcliff Corp.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,245.23	Goldwyn, Samuel, Productions, Inc.	do.	0	120,920.00
Ad. Auriema, Inc.	do.	0	2,025.71	Grolier Society, Inc.	Beverly Hills, Calif.	0	271,429.64
Avon Book Sales Corp.	do.	0	84,828.92	Grune & Stratton, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	844.68	72,131.42
Baker & Taylor Co.	Hillside, N.J.	0	20,099.07	Guaranteed Pictures Co., Inc.	do.	0	1,200.00
Baker Voorhis & Company, Inc.	Mount Kisco, N.Y.	0	3,174.09	Haagens, Gerard E.	Bronxville, N.Y.	0	44,035.54
Ballantine Books, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	14,160.37	Hall, W. S., & Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	123,018.49	1,301,028.50
Bantam Books, Inc.	do.	0	324,561.79	Hansberry, Lorraine	do.	1,000.00	1,000.00
Barnes & Noble, Inc.	do.	10,046.06	81,946.46	Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.	do.	0	89,206.15
Barsa Co.	Los Angeles, Calif.	42,508.07	419,690.33	Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.	do.	1,043.64	1,043.64
Barsa Publications, Inc.	do.	0	19,393.00	Harper & Bros.	do.	36,587.02	703,682.84
Bender Co., Inc., Matthew	Albany, N.Y.	0	6,397.17	Harvard University Press	Cambridge, Mass.	0	20,818.62
Benzing Bros., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	62,710.15	Hearst Corp.	New York, N.Y.	17,736.92	163,291.32
Berliner J. J. & Staff	do.	177.40	10,605.78	Heath, D. C., & Co.	Boston, Mass.	16,490.22	167,251.41
Bernett, F. A. and Ilse B.	Larchmont, N.Y.	0	1,680.61	Hebrew Publishing Co.	New York, N.Y.	0	7,373.74
Bloch Publishing Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	1,558.53	Heinman, W. S.	do.	0	2,053.11
Boarts International, Inc.	do.	21,487.47	122,586.21	Herder, B., Book Co.	St. Louis, Mo.	922.70	26,665.15
Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc.	Indianapolis, Ind.	0	236.83	Hillman Periodicals, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	237.97	307,303.06
Book Exports, Ltd.	New York, N.Y.	311,656.92	1,954,812.05	Hoeber, Paul B., Inc.	do.	0	15,648.39
Book Production Industries, Inc.	Chicago, Ill.	28,650.00	244,184.92	Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.	do.	4,721.99	4,721.99
Book Promotions	New York, N.Y.	3,396.84	1,022,932.27	Hope International Co., Inc.	do.	0	12,922.59
Boston Music Co.	Boston, Mass.	144.67	23,946.10	IPMA Publishing Co.	Minneapolis, Minn.	0	3,031.95
Boxer, Oswald	New York, N.Y.	25,628.11	155,860.26	Informational Media Publishing Co.	New York, N.Y.	0	19,941.41
Brue Publishing Co.	Milwaukee, Wis.	0	36,152.71	Inge, William	do.	3,000.00	3,000.00
Buena Vista International, Inc.	Burbank, Calif.	134,272.43	134,272.43	Intercultural Publications, Inc.	do.	0	2,590.20
Capital International, Inc.	Derby, Conn.	105.96	10,307.60	International Art Publishing Co., Inc.	Detroit, Mich.	0	2,499.98
Castle & Overton, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	71,827.45	International Book Supplies	New York, N.Y.	0	34,558.35
Catholic Book Publishing Co.	do.	6,087.14	48,303.29	International College of Surgeons	Chicago, Ill.	0	187.89
Catholic Digest	St. Paul, Minn.	0	1,386.53	International Correspondence Schools World Limited, Inc.	Scranton, Pa.	0	5,069.86
Cavalcade Pictures, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.	0	2,535.00	International Music Co.	New York, N.Y.	0	17,605.59
Cellar Book Shop	Detroit, Mich.	0	5,187.28	International Schools Company of Latin America	Scranton, Pa.	0	6,567.95
Central National Corp.	New York, N.Y.	0	240,312.94	International University Press, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	398.90
Century Music Publishing Co.	do.	0	12,733.80	Interscience Publishers, Inc.	do.	0	546,242.51
Chelsea Publishing Co.	do.	0	8,733.08	Jewish Labor Committee	do.	0	10,991.63
Collier, P. F., & Sons Corp.	do.	0	25,940.74	Jewish Theological Seminary of America	do.	0	5,150.00
Columbia Pictures Corp.	do.	0	329,032.74	Johnson, Walter J. Inc.	do.	3,842.90	105,807.67
Columbia Pictures International Corp.	do.	116,628.59	713,075.10	Journal-News Corp.	do.	0	3,760.00
Columbia University Press	do.	0	6,433.32	Kalmus E. F., Orchestra Scores, Inc.	do.	0	12,510.02
Commerce Clearing House, Inc.	Chicago, Ill.	0	1,740.09	Katz, Menyhert	do.	0	63,323.71
Compton, F. E., & Co.	do.	0	5,556.89	Kenedy, P. J. & Sons	do.	2,001.80	14,693.19
Consolidated Music Sales, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	4,000.00	7,357.79	Keystone Pictures, Inc.	do.	0	13,013.36
Coronet Films	do.	0	5,784.08	Kleiman, Saul	Kansas City, Mo.	0	454.41
Coronet Instructional Films	do.	0	9,682.89	Knopf, Alfred A., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	6,809.36
Coronet Subscription Agency	do.	0	1,787.49	Kramer, Sidney, Books, Inc.	Washington, D.C.	0	12,203.57
Cosmos Ltd., Inc.	Hanover, Pa.	0	140.60	La Hacienda Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	1,102.48
Cosmos Ltd., Inc., & Cosmos Ltd. Europe, Inc.	do.	26,633.24	91,136.39	Laidlaw Bros., Inc.	River Forest, Ill.	3,000.00	73,466.97
Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	228.97	Lake, Harry B.	San Francisco, Calif.	0	10,738.74
Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.	do.	0	302,373.04	Lana Lobell, Inc.	Hanover, Pa.	0	364,797.59
Crystal Pictures, Inc.	do.	0	7,000.00	Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd. Asia, Inc.	do.	1,981.85	80,185.35
Curtis Circulation Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.	108,847.76	471,379.48	Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd., Inc.	do.	0	1,715.53
Curtis Publishing Co.	do.	0	891,559.10	Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd. Canada, Inc.	do.	0	6,731.95
Dalana Trading Corp.	Hanover, Pa.	0	10,025.37	Lange Medical Publications	Los Altos, Calif.	945.00	8,744.91
Daro Exports, Ltd.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,745.62	Latoorp, Ltd.	New York, N.Y.	8,547.69	70,760.57
Davis Book Wholesale, Inc.	do.	0	66,766.05	Lawson & Co., Inc.	do.	40,664.14	112,223.01
Day Publishing Co., Inc.	do.	5,158.50	151,696.40	Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co.	Rochester, N.Y.	111,854.04	1,567,783.82
Decca Records, Inc.	do.	0	9,951.28	Lea & Febiger	Philadelphia, Pa.	20,484.55	220,888.73
Dell Distributing, Inc., and Dell Publishing Co., Inc.	do.	23,197.37	92,071.20	Lexington Trading Co., Inc.	Los Angeles, Calif.	0	9,443.00
Dell Publishing Co., Inc.	do.	0	185,015.47	Lippincott, J. B., Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.	20,683.68	239,746.27
Denver-Geppert Co.	Chicago, Ill.	0	84,167.10	Little Fugitive, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	3,022.10
Dental Items of Interest Publishing Co., Inc.	Brooklyn, N.Y.	0	451.48	Loew's International Corp.	do.	0	1,323,431.45
Disney, Walt, Productions	New York, N.Y.	36,879.20	526,237.55	Loew's Inc.	do.	0	2,755.55
Dodge & Seymour, Ltd.	do.	4,273.70	27,029.77	Loew's Inc., and Loew's International Corp.	do.	0	635,226.99
Doubleday & Co., Inc.	do.	2,707.44	408,692.34	Long's College Book Co.	Columbus, Ohio	2,037.04	24,462.88
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc.	do.	0	345.78	Loyola University Press	Chicago, Ill.	10,747.70	110,608.83
Dun & Bradstreet Publishing Corp.	do.	0	1,902.50	McCormick-Mathers Publishing Co.	Wichita, Kans.	3,100.00	26,923.66
Du Pont, E. I., de Nemours Co.	Wilmington, Del.	0	522,547.48	McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	364,295.73	3,221,056.97
Eagle Lion Films, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	52,485.00	McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.	do.	26,956.92	962,375.74
East European Fund, Inc.	do.	0	23,937.33	MIP Enterprises, Inc.	do.	4,000.00	34,340.00
Eastman Kodak Co., Inc.	Rochester, N.Y.	960.22	9,374.57	Macfadden Publications International Corp.	do.	0	2,024.76
Editors & Engineers, Ltd.	Santa Barbara, Calif.	0	1,000.00	Macmillan Co., The	do.	130,293.51	1,527,588.08
Eerdmans, William B., Publishing Co.	Grand Rapids, Mich.	0	13,651.98	Maco Magazine Corp.	do.	0	4,800.00
Elkan-Vogel Co., Inc.	Philadelphia, Pa.	0	165.02	Madden, Richard J. Play Co., Inc.	do.	2,000.00	6,000.00
Encyclopaedia Americana, division of Grolier Society, Inc.	Beverly Hills, Calif.	0	24,871.54				
Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.	Chicago, Ill.	33,768.79	231,683.45				
Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	46,442.05	114,390.31				
Fawcett Publications, Inc.	do.	33,474.76	285,908.76				
Faxon, F. W., Co., Inc.	Boston, Mass.	0	68,768.81				
Feffler & Simons, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	433,833.45	3,558,417.49				
Feldheim, Philip, Inc.	do.	0	84,788.68				
Fidelity Trading Co., Inc.	San Francisco, Calif.	0	949.86				
Fischer, Carl, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	775.33	16,098.77				
Forward Association, Inc.	do.	106.80	37,645.61				

Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased (A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962—Continued

Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased		Name of contractor	Address	Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased	
		(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962			(A) Fiscal year 1962	(B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962
Mapleton House	Brooklyn N.Y.	\$685.71	\$6,678.81	Sanborn, Benjamin H. & Co.	Chicago, Ill.	0	\$3,893.02
Marks, Edward E., Music Corp.	New York N.Y.	498.13	13,511.33	Sann's Publishing Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	149,049.20
Matson, Harold, Co.	do.	0	4,522.76	Saunders, W. B., Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.	\$60,701.67	423,057.94
Mentzer, Bush & Co.	Chicago, Ill.	13,922.32	33,720.96	Schirmer, G., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	10,640.49	202,257.39
Mercury Publications, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	964.03	Schultz, Albert, Inc.	do.	31,777.72	303,663.03
Merkos L'Invoeni Chinuch, Inc.	Brooklyn, N.Y.	0	260,000.00	Screen Gems, Inc.	do.	1,950.00	9,355.00
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	219,534.45	725,301.12	Select Magazines, Inc.	do.	8,188.80	37,547.91
Miller, Arthur	do.	0	7,500.00	Seiznick Co., Inc.	Culver City, Calif.	14,974.08	45,458.57
Mondo Publishers, Inc.	do.	0	157,150.00	Seiznick Releasing Organization, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	118,073.04
Monsky, Jacob	do.	0	4,926.32	Seymour Mittlemark Organization, Inc.	do.	0	4,011.62
Moody Bible Institute	Chicago, Ill.	0	14,198.07	Shulinger Bros. Linotype & Publishing Co.	do.	0	40,709.15
Moore-Cottrell Subscription Agencies, Inc.	North Cohocton, N.Y.	13,948.07	911,936.51	Silver Burdett Co.	Morristown, N.J.	3,736.04	357,243.70
Morehouse Association, Inc.	Bronxville, N.Y.	0	1,000.00	Simon & Schuster, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	17,260.27	96,966.00
Mosby, C. V., Co.	St. Louis, Mo.	44,420.04	260,453.25	Singer, L. W., Co.	Syracuse, N.Y.	0	96,593.10
Motion Picture Export Association of America, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	1,915,860.59	Skarsky, Morris S.	New York, N.Y.	0	30,938.65
Moulin Productions, Inc.	do.	0	23,964.76	Small, Edward, Productions, Inc.	Hollywood, Calif.	0	25,370.00
Muller, Maclean & Co, Inc.	do.	7,226.04	75,001.27	Snyder, Henry M., & Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	3,409,805.86
Museum Books, Inc.	do.	0	54,866.72	South-Western Publishing Co., Inc.	Cincinnati, Ohio	38,581.42	371,297.24
Museum Publications, Inc.	do.	2,874.26	1,158,621.50	Sparta Film, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	5,020.00
Music Sales Corp.	do.	6,687.36	6,687.36	Stechert-Hafner, Inc.	do.	0	3,159.12
Nassau Distributing Co.	do.	0	52,459.33	Sunset Security Co.	Los Angeles, Calif.	0	6,100.00
National Bellas Hess Caribbean Corp.	North Kansas City, Mo.	0	2,426.24	Tams-Witmark Music Library, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	4,000.00	17,400.00
National Bellas Hess World Wide Corp.	do.	0	7,191.97	Thomas Law Book Co.	St. Louis, Mo.	0	12,036.14
National Broadcasting Co.	New York, N.Y.	1,560.00	1,560.00	Time, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	100,916.15	2,295,155.26
National Telefilm Associates, Inc.	Beverly Hills, Calif.	0	3,055.00	Tomkins, J. E., & Son, Inc.	do.	9,259.03	41,538.77
New American Library of World Literature, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	7,918.96	538,948.70	Turner Subscription Agency, Inc.	do.	145,625.89	687,602.69
Newman Press	Westminster, Md.	0	1,503.81	Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.	do.	42,951.98	1,015,121.68
Newsweek, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	26,545.51	182,700.63	Twentieth Century-Fox International Corp.	do.	0	457,281.50
New World Club, Inc.	do.	153.68	15,907.81	Ungar, Frederick, Publishing Co.	do.	436.00	15,053.11
New York Graphic Society	Greenwich, Conn.	0	867.11	United Artists Associated, Inc.	do.	4,858.75	4,858.75
New York Herald Tribune, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	16,038.32	332,690.85	United Artists Corp.	do.	235,257.72	858,851.12
New York Times Co.	do.	13,353.58	81,037.18	United World Films, Inc.	do.	0	7,137.61
Nystrom, A. J., & Co.	Chicago, Ill.	0	33,798.52	Universal International Films, Inc.	do.	54,021.20	618,492.15
Ottenheimer, I. & M.	Baltimore, Md.	0	287.78	Universal Pictures Co., Inc.	do.	0	422,347.12
Overseas News Agency, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	3,590.00	Universal Publishers Representatives, Inc.	do.	8,014.65	21,949.74
Pacific Book & Supply Corp., New York	New York 3, N.Y.	223,809.19	1,097,741.07	Van Nostrand, D., Co., Inc.	Princeton, N.J.	1,831.91	33,941.87
Pacific Book & Supply Corp., Virginia	do.	0	410,440.66	Van Riemsdyck Book Service, Inc.	Kew Gardens, N.Y.	27,129.69	466,752.33
Paramount International Films, Inc.	do.	90,284.93	843,921.06	Viking Press	New York, N.Y.	0	1,364.65
Paramount Pictures Corp.	do.	0	523,455.00	Vox Productions, Inc.	do.	0	10,000.00
Petro Deiro Accordion Headquarters	do.	0	2,617.70	Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.	do.	0	390,354.83
Pines Publications, Inc.	do.	0	97,569.47	Warner Bros. Pictures International Corp.	do.	93,885.79	922,380.69
Pocket Books, Inc.	do.	212,258.42	926,785.44	Weber Costello Co.	Chicago Heights, Ill.	491.05	5,251.47
Popular Library, Inc.	do.	11,439.74	12,875.51	Webster Publishing Co.	St. Louis, Mo.	0	392.38
Popular Mechanics Co.	do.	0	74,987.14	Weekly Publications, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	82,054.78
Popular Mechanics Press	do.	0	5,000.00	Westminster Recording Co., Inc.	do.	0	4,950.00
Præger, Inc., Frederick A.	do.	0	146,116.21	Weston Woods Studios, Inc.	Westport, Conn.	0	1,028.33
Prentice-Hall, Inc.	Englewood Cliffs, N.J.	0	362,355.39	Westrex Corp.	New York, N.Y.	226,839.59	1,694,159.28
Prentice-Hall International, Inc.	do.	222,701.76	597,560.71	Wiley, John, & Sons, Inc.	do.	3,000.00	3,000.00
Princeton University Press	Princeton, N.J.	74,184.47	747,435.23	Williams, Annie Laurie, Inc.	do.	1,500.00	3,000.00
Prior, W. F., Co., Inc.	Hagerstown, Md.	834.96	36,358.50	Williams & Wilkins Co.	Baltimore, Md.	20,790.44	124,021.32
Publications Development Corp.	New York, N.Y.	0	2,903.83	Winston, John C., Co., Inc.	Philadelphia, Pa.	4,312.23	58,022.27
Purchasing Service, Inc.	do.	0	25,174.69	Wolf Sales	New York, N.Y.	0	5,000.00
Querido, Inc.	do.	40,044.72	40,044.72	World Book Co.	Tarrytown, N.Y.	0	6,275.76
Quigley Publishing Co., Inc.	do.	0	2,499.93	World Tennis, Inc.	New York, N.Y.	500.00	1,000.00
RKO Radio Pictures, Inc.	do.	0	902,513.22	World Wide Distributors, Inc.	do.	0	21,237.13
RKO Teledio Pictures, Inc.	do.	0	76,420.71	Yale University Press	New Haven, Conn.	0	7,256.84
Rafidane, Corp.	do.	4,789.78	4,789.78	Year Book Medical Publishers, Inc.	Chicago, Ill.	4,601.10	14,943.80
Rand McNally & Co.	Chicago, Ill.	1,633.63	164,600.56	Year Book Publishers, Inc.	do.	0	146,117.97
Readers' Digest Association, Inc.	Pleasantville, N.Y.	27,088.34	2,312,111.84	Yorke Publishing Co., Inc.	New York, N.Y.	0	946.67
Record Hunter	New York, N.Y.	0	297.64	Total		5,310,262.72	67,776,848.51
Reinhold Publishing Corp.	do.	0	6,145.84	Less value of foreign currency returned to contractors.		324.91	
Replogle Globes, Inc.	Chicago, Ill.	0	14,702.13	Total payments (net)		5,309,937.81	
Republic Pictures International Corp.	North Hollywood, Calif.	0	211,050.02				
Research Institute of Religious Jewry	New York, N.Y.	0	3,409.55				
Roberts, Alex S., Associates, Inc.	do.	5,823.54	11,063.80				
Roberts, Flora, Inc.	do.	1,000.00	1,000.00				
Russak, Ben.	do.	1,913.36	2,908.56				
Sadler, William H., Inc.	do.	5,613.68	28,396.77				
Salisbury, Leah, Inc.	do.	0	1,500.00				

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the reduction in the Informational Media Guarantee Fund of some \$350,000 will not adversely affect the distribution of educational and truly worthwhile materials. American interests can best be served abroad by wide dissemination of the products of American minds.

Education has been the strength of our country; let us hope that unwise frugality will not deprive our friends and allies of access to the valuable information which is pouring out of our colleges and universities.

Due to the exertions of our educators, our country bathes in the glow of an intellectual renaissance. I hope that we

shall not, in our zeal to curtail mass media considered to be not in our national interest, miss the opportunity to light a few candles in countries less fortunate than ourselves.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with regret that I note a deep cut in the funds for the informational media guarantee program.

The original budget request was for \$3,960,000 and the appropriations bill we are considering today contains a Senate committee recommendation of only \$650,000.

This is an even lower figure than that of the House, which made a large slash down to \$1 million.

But even more a cause of concern to me and to the other supporters of the informational media guarantee program is the Senate Appropriations Committee statement in its report that "the committee has previously expressed its disapproval of this program and directs that it be phased out."

This is one of the least costly programs conducted abroad by the United States. Actually, all we do is provide a guarantee to American exporters of books, magazines, newspapers and motion pictures that the payments they receive in local currency can be converted into American dollars at the official rate.

Because it is important that American books, magazines and other informational material be available to people in other countries, especially in the newer ones where currencies are not freely convertible, we should as a matter of national policy remove some of the financial risk that the exporters of this material run when they sell their product overseas.

It is in our national interest to sell through private channels textbooks and good magazines and the demand for them is substantial in many of the newly developing countries.

But as long as I have been in the Senate, we have encountered great difficulty in obtaining even enough funds to keep this program going at a modest level.

We have managed to keep it going, however, and I am convinced that the distribution of books, magazines, and newspapers made possible by this guarantee has been beneficial to the United States.

Let us just look briefly at what the Communists are doing in this area. The Russian and the Chinese Communists make available to countries throughout the world a tremendous amount of books, magazines, and other periodicals, either at a very nominal cost or at no cost.

We seek no such ambitious program. All we are trying to do under the informational media guarantee program is encourage exporters to sell American educational products overseas.

This is not the whole answer to meeting the Communist cultural offensive, but it is a worthwhile part of our efforts to bring to the attention of other people an aspect of American life that is one of the strongpoints of our society.

Mr. President, I do not think we should permit the IMG program to be terminated by a terse statement in a committee report that "it be phased out."

We deserve more explanation than this. Personally, I do not believe that IMG should be ended, but if it is to be phased out we should have a good reason and an adequate justification for taking such a serious step.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want the Record to show my opposition to one particular appropriation contained in H.R. 7063. I am referring to the appropriation for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

When the House of Representatives considered this appropriation bill, they included an appropriation of \$1,669,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. At the time the House considered the appropriation bill, this amount was the total remaining amount authorized to be appropriated. Since that time, Congress passed S. 777 which authorized an additional appropriation of \$20 million for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. H.R. 7063, as it is before the Senate, has raised the appropriation, therefore, to \$7,500,000.

Mr. President, I opposed the establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961, and I also opposed S. 777 which authorized additional appropriations to that Agency when it was considered by the Senate on June 13, 1963.

Most of the funds of this Agency are apparently spent on studies of various aspects of disarmament. Out of the \$15 million which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency requested for fiscal 1964, the Agency proposed to spend \$11 million on research studies.

I have examined a number of the studies already completed for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For instance, the Institute of Defense Analysis in Washington, D.C., produced a study under contract from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency entitled "A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations." This study was completed on March 10, 1962. The description of the paper is as follows:

This paper is an attempt to sketch out the possible contours of a world effectively controlled by the United Nations, followed by a discussion of the difficulties attending an enterprise of this nature. The question of feasibility seems so overwhelming in today's world, and the common answer on the part of politically sophisticated people so invariably negative, that it may be wondered why the exercise is undertaken at all. It has three justifications. On policy grounds, it would be well to spell out with greater precision that to which this country has committed itself. On heuristic grounds, it may be worthwhile to apply analytical methods to a problem commonly approached on the basis of hunch alone. Finally there is always the possibility that sophisticated people will turn out to have been wrong.

The latest major series of studies to be completed which I have read were written by Mr. Vincent Rock on the subject of "Common Action for the Control of Conflict." I would certainly recommend the reading of all parts of this study to all those interested in finding areas in which to practice economy with governmental funds. It is charitable to characterize these contracts as impracticable and theoretical nonsense. If most of them are considered seriously by policymakers then they have much more dire consequences and it is even a greater reason to withhold appropriations for such purposes.

The appropriation of \$7½ million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is grossly excessive.

Disarmament is an ancient and elusive goal that has been sought by civilized societies since groups of people first equipped themselves for combat. The prophet Isaiah recognized the wisdom of disarmament but relegated the time of fulfillment when "they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks" to the "last days."

Throughout history efforts to achieve disarmament have been more notable for their loftiness of purpose than for their effectiveness. Such steps toward disarmament as have come about through international agreements have been unilateral in application, usually against a prostrate and defeated nation at the end of a war. Even these forced disarmaments have been temporary in nature, and enforced more by economic conditions within the defeated country than by the dictates of victor nations.

In post-World War II years, disarmament has been promoted as never before as an ultimate solution of the world's political problems and disagreements. Some seem to think that actual disarmament is just beyond our grasp, with agreement among nations prevented merely by differences over concepts and techniques of inspections to assure compliance. This same school of thought anticipates solution of the inspection barrier through the continued development and perfection of such scientific achievements as the observation satellite and seismographic instruments of increased sensitivity.

As pleasing as are the temptations to join in the utopian dreams of a world unarmed lying just over the horizon, both the lessons of history and the cruel practicalities of the current political status of international relations reveal with stimulating clarity the opiate unrealism of such dreams.

Just as the development of defensive weapons never quite catches up with the development of offensive weapons, the development of observation and detection devices will never match the devices of subterfuge used to conceal the development, tests and buildup of new and advanced weapons. The design of observation and detection devices is necessarily dictated by the nature of the object or activity to be detected or observed, just as the defensive weapon's design is dependent on that of the offensive weapon.

The failure to achieve enforceable agreements for disarmament stems, however, not from the inadequacies of scientific devices with which to assure that such agreements are being adhered to, but rather from a failure in basic approach to the problem. The approach to disarmament which has been exclusively adopted in international negotiations, both in the past and in the current crisis, has been premised upon the mistaken assumption that the emphasis on armaments by the various nations of the world is a cause, rather than an effect, of the political differences which exist among those nations.

Prospects for disarmament are no better and no worse than—but indeed are

identical to—the prospects for peaceful resolution of the controversies among nations. So long as any nation or group of nations harbor ambitions of aggrandizement at the expense of other nations, hope is futile for the development of the international good will which is a prerequisite for cessation of the arms race.

Unfortunately, national and bloc aggrandizement still exist as the foundation of the political system which holds sway in countries behind the Iron Curtain. Peaceful expressions of intent by the leaders of these countries are belied by their actions as well as by the words of their counterparts in other nations of their bloc.

Although the scientific instruments devised by freemen may be inadequate to detect the breach of disarmament agreements which might be reached, the minds of freemen can always detect the inconsistencies of peaceful words with the subjugation and enslavement of millions of people and the patently aggressive aims underlying the incitement of others to rebellion and revolution. No disarmament and no resolution of the conflicting aspirations of the several nations which constitute the cause of the arms race, is probable or possible so long as deception and aggression are the goals of one or more governments; for freemen will not willingly jeopardize, even for the preservation of life itself, their even more precious possession—individual liberty.

Preoccupation of our policy with arms control and disarmament is sapping the will and ability of our Nation to maintain its security. Disarmament is an idealistic road to tragedy, whether through pursuit of a formal plan for general and complete disarmament, or through unintentional unilateral disarmament as a result of policies based on an assumption that the ballistic missile is an ultimate weapon.

It is far better, therefore, that the funds of the United States be appropriated for positive programs to insure the security of the United States and the free world from the menace of aggression by Communist nations and other totalitarian nations than on the impractical and theoretical consideration of utopian concepts such as disarmament in a hostile world.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 7063) was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the conference report on the foreign aid bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that the conference report on the foreign aid bill represents a fair and reasonable compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. Some of these differences were very great. It required five long and arduous meetings of the conference committee to resolve them.

So far as the amounts authorized are concerned, the final figure represents almost an exact 50-50 split. The House had authorized \$3.5 billion and the Senate \$3.7 billion. The conferees have agreed on \$3.6 billion.

In many respects, the differences in substantive provisions were more important, and more difficult to resolve, than the question of the amounts to be authorized.

The bill is extraordinarily long and involved, and I do not want to take the time of the Senate to go over the conference report in detail item by item. I will, of course, be glad to answer any questions Senators may have about specific points.

Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is at present engaged in a hearing on the cultural center bill, I shall be glad to answer such questions as Senators may have concerning specific points. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the major provisions of the Senate bill retained in the conference report.

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

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL RETAINED IN CONFERENCE REPORT

- Research into population growth.
- Aid to Latin American cooperatives.
- Restrictions on military assistance to Latin America.
- Restrictions on military assistance to Africa.
- Sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.
- Expropriation of U.S. property or nullification of contracts with U.S. citizens and valuation of claims by Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.
- No assistance to economically developed nations.
- Use of private enterprise in providing technical assistance.
- Most-favored-nation treatment for Poland and Yugoslavia.
- Inclusion of fish in Public Law 480.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

REQUIREMENT OF NOTICE FOR CLOSING OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require that, before the Secretary of Defense closes an installation or major facility or activity in an area of substantial unemployment, which would involve the loss of more than 100 civilian jobs, he be required to notify the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration. The ARA shall then be required to furnish within 60 days a report on the impact of such a closing, both immediate and over the long run, and on the estimated cost to the Federal Government to recreate the same number of jobs through other programs.

Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation should be clear. It is the express object and policy of the Federal Government to make particular efforts in areas of high unemployment to recreate jobs and business. This is based on the long-term recognition that depressed areas and areas of high unemployment are contrary to the national interest and result in long-term losses for the Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, incredible as it may seem, the Defense Department is actually prepared to close down two installations in New York State and a number of others elsewhere that are in Federal aid under the Area Redevelopment program or the public works program.

When this question was raised yesterday at a meeting with Defense Department officials, when it was pointed out that the loss of one facility in a seriously distressed area of New York State would mean the elimination of 7,500 jobs, that is, one-tenth of the total national cutback proposed, the reply of these high Defense Department officials was, "I know it is a depressed area, but that is not my responsibility."

Well, Mr. President, it may not be the responsibility of the Department of Defense, but it certainly is the responsibility of the President, of the Congress, and of the U.S. taxpayers. The Congress has just been asked to appropriate nearly \$1 billion for accelerated public works projects. It costs on an average \$4,230 to recreate a single job under this program. To recreate all of the jobs that the Defense Department wants to take away from central New York from areas that qualify for this type of assistance, would amount to \$38 million. I cannot believe that any savings that the Defense Department might claim as the result of closing these installations would compare in cost with the expense of recreating these jobs. The taxpayers are not saving money in the long run if the Defense Department budget is cut by a few million dollars, but the area redevelopment program then has to be increased by several hundred million dollars.

Mr. President, this bill would insure that the Congress have adequate information on all aspects of proposed Defense Department cutbacks, so that the

Congress and the President can make an intelligent judgment as to the overall impact on the economy and on the budget of what the Defense Department so shortsightedly described as economies.

Yesterday afternoon, the New York congressional delegation had a bombshell dropped in their laps when they were told by a high-ranking official of the Department of Defense that the Department intended to close two major installations in New York State, one in Rome and one in Schenectady, both of which are areas of substantial unemployment, as well as five other smaller defense activities. This would result in a total loss of 11,000 jobs from a nationwide total of 75,000. Thus, New York is being asked to bear about one-seventh of the load.

Under the bill which my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I now introduce, the Area Redevelopment Administration, after it had been advised by the Secretary of Defense of the intention to close an installation in an area of substantial unemployment, would be required, within 60 days, to furnish a report of the impact of such a closing, both immediately and over the long run, and of the estimated cost to the Federal Government to recreate the same number of jobs through other programs.

The proposal of the Department of Defense was placed before us as an economy move. It is incredible that anyone could believe it is an economy move. The Area Redevelopment Administration has estimated that it costs \$4,230 to recreate a job in an area which comes within its jurisdiction.

Taking Schenectady alone, which has the smaller of the 2 larger installations to be closed, the proposal of the Department of Defense would involve a loss of 1,700 jobs. When I speak of the loss of jobs, that expression must be understood. That is why I say this proposal is false economy. The job would still be provided in some other area. What it would mean would be that the 1,700 people in the area of Schenectady or the 7,500 people in the area of Rome would be thrown out of jobs there but some would be told that they could move to Georgia or Texas, or some other State, if they wanted jobs. It is likely that a few persons would move; but most of them have ties in the present locations and would not be willing or able to move. The unemployment situation would be greatly aggravated in the areas involved.

The purpose of the bill which my colleague and I are introducing should be clear.

It is the expressed object and policy of the Federal Government to make particular efforts to recreate jobs in areas of high unemployment. Congress appropriates large sums of money for that purpose. The program is based on the recognition that depressed areas and areas of high employment are contrary to the national interest and result in long-term losses for the Nation.

Incredible as it may seem, the Department of Defense is actually proposing to close two major installations in New York State. It plans to close installa-

tions in other States, too; but as to New York, this procedure has become standard operating procedure. In this instance, New York would take the brunt of the cut. The Department of Defense is preparing to close installations in areas which currently qualify for direct Federal aid under the area redevelopment program or the public works program.

In the Schenectady area, as to which I have the figures, in order to save \$1,500,000, it would cost \$7,191,000 to recreate the same number of jobs. If that is economy, I think it will be necessary to rewrite the definition in the dictionary. If there is a desire to create another Appalachia in the Nation, this is one of the best ways I know of to go about doing so.

When this question was raised yesterday at the meeting with the officials of the Department of Defense, it was pointed out that the loss of one facility in a seriously distressed area of New York State—the Rome area—would mean the elimination of 7,500 jobs in that area. Again, I stress that the jobs will be continued, but somewhere else. That is why I say there is no economy in the proposed move. It would mean the elimination of those 7,500 jobs.

But the reply of the Defense Department officials was, in effect, "We know it is a depressed area, but that is not our responsibility." Only a rather hard-boiled official could make that kind of reply. It may be technically accurate to say that it is not the responsibility of the Department of Defense, but it certainly is the responsibility of Congress, of the President, and of the taxpayers. Congress has just been asked to appropriate almost \$1 billion for accelerated public works projects.

As I have said, the average cost of recreating one job under this program, according to the figures of the agency itself, is \$4,230. To recreate the jobs that the Department of Defense wants to take away from central New York would amount, as I calculate it, to around \$38 million, which is many times greater than the amount of any savings it is claimed would result from the closing of these installations.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. First, I feel privileged to join with my colleague in introducing the bill and to join with him in the description of what was dropped in the laps of the New York congressional delegation yesterday as a bombshell. With the Senator's permission, I should like to clarify one point.

The Department of Defense has a duty to undertake economy. To pinpoint what we are arguing, it is not that the Department of Defense does not have a duty to close installations which no longer have any usefulness for defense; what we are arguing is that it cannot close them in the light of all the other consequences which will flow from such action. That is exactly what is happening.

Mr. KEATING. Not when they propose to move the installations to other places and conduct the same activities.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. We are not saying that it is necessary to keep every installation open. We are saying that the right hand must know what the left hand is doing.

We were told yesterday that this was not the Department's responsibility. It is a direct confrontation. The Department said it did not have to be concerned about anything that happened as a result; that, whatever might be the departmental purposes, if it were felt desirable to move the Material Command from the Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome to another place in the United States, the Department would do it; and if other departments or places or appropriations had to bear the burden, or if the community went to pot, that was just too bad; it was the responsibility of somebody else. The Department is not a member of the wedding in that regard; it is autonomous unto itself.

I thoroughly agree with my colleague that there must be congressional determination on this score. The action of a department cannot be the rule. Our Government never intended that it should be. The program is extremely wasteful in terms of absolute dollars, as the Senator has so eloquently pointed out, in that what would be saved would not remotely resemble what is claimed would be saved, because it would be necessary to pay far more for other programs, which are that much more expensive, than if the facility, which is obviously needed at the point where it is were to be continued.

I am grateful to the Senator for allowing me to make this intercession, because we are always charged with being like Senators from other States which lose defense installations: That we want to keep them all alive. That is not what we are arguing. We are arguing for the right to have the Department of Defense apprised of what every other department of Government is doing.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague. He is entirely correct.

Of course, those of us who complain about this action will be charged with parochialism. But the parochialism is manifested by a Government department or administrator who considers only one of the factors involved in the cost—not by those who are attempting to consider the overall picture.

Of course, the Senators from New York are interested in their own State—as all Senators are. However, this issue goes far beyond that. This is a case—on the figures of the Defense Department, with which I do not agree; and I have tried to point out why the Department is not correct when it says a saving will result—of making a saving of \$5, on the one hand, and then asking Congress to provide another part of the Government with \$25 in order to care for the situation which has developed as a result of making the \$5 saving. That is exactly what the Department is doing when it seeks to have \$1 billion appropriated for an accelerated public works program. In the total view, there will be no actual saving. So the taxpayers are being deceived if they are led to believe that a saving will result from the cut of \$1 bil-

lion in the Defense Department budget, whereas, by reason of making of that cut, several billion dollars will have to be added under the area redevelopment program.

This bill would not, of course, and should not, prevent the elimination of closing of installations; no one wants to have the Federal Government carry on unnecessary activities. But the bill would insure that Congress would have adequate information on all aspects of proposed Defense Department cutbacks, so that Congress and the President could make an intelligent judgment as to the overall impact on the economy and on the budget of what the Defense Department has so shortsightedly described as economies.

Yesterday, the Defense Department told us that as of today it was going to make this recommendation to the President. Certainly it is a courtesy to be told in advance, although it would have been a greater courtesy to have been told more than 24 hours in advance. It is my hope that the President, after considering this matter from the overall point of view, and realizing that Congress is appropriating large sums of money for the area redevelopment program, will not support the recommendations of the Department of Defense.

Perhaps this bill cannot deal with this particular situation; but certainly the bill will deal with a repetition of it, and the bill might help in even this situation, because, of course, many of these closing would be phased out over a period of time.

This is the minimum that Congress should do in connection with the devastating situation in the face of the recommendations made by the Defense Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At about 4:30 last Tuesday, word came to my office that the Secretary of Defense and his assistants wished to meet with me, and said they would have to see me on Wednesday morning at 10 a.m. My staff arranged the meeting, which was held; and at that time I was notified that the Erie Depot, at Port Clinton, Ohio, was to be phased out in 3 years, and 1,740 employees were either to be transferred or to be released during the 3-year phaseout period.

I concur in the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that it would be improper for us to try to have existing facilities that are not needed maintained; but I also agree with him that a Senator or a Representative is thrown into a rather cold situation when he is told of the decision to eliminate a Federal operation without any other preliminary notice.

Mr. KEATING. It certainly is. The Senator from Ohio and I can take it; but we are thinking of the people in these communities, who are given this news just before Christmas. Even though then we are told, "What this will cost under the area redevelopment program is no responsibility of ours."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I said to the Secretary of the Army, "What do you expect

me to say and do? I have no knowledge as to whether you have applied this treatment in equal measure to all parts of the country. How can I learn whether you are treating other States better or worse than you are treating Ohio?"

I was told about the installation being closed in New York. Part of the Ohio installation is to go to Pennsylvania. So I asked him, "How can I express an opinion that is rooted in fact, when I do not know how you have treated Texas, California, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and other States?"

If I had that information and if I were able to say that Ohio was treated on the same basis as other States, I would have nothing more to say. But yesterday the newspapers reported that the evaluating committee which recommended the closing of the New York installation and the Ohio depot, had recommended phasing out naval installations at Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco, but that recommendation has been set aside. If that one has been set aside, why is the one to eliminate the New York and Ohio installations still in effect?

I wish to express my view—without having studied the bill of the Senator from New York—that it seems to me it will enable us to know whether the Central Government is using an identical measuring stick in determining the rights of the 50 States within the Union.

The Washington Post on December 12, 1963, said:

Meanwhile Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California reported that a naval survey board had recommended immediate closing of naval shipyards in Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco.

Later, however, informed sources said the decision was not final, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, reported last night that the Pentagon had informed him the Boston shipyard would remain open.

"NO COMMENT" AT PENTAGON

To all of the reports a Pentagon spokesman replied with a "no comment."

The Wall Street Journal on December 12, 1963, wrote:

The Navy has told Congressmen that a survey board has recommended immediate closing of shipyards at Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco in an economy move, the Associated Press said. Top Defense officials have long suggested that the military services have more facilities than they need, but the Government has been reluctant to close them because of certain protests from Congressmen and others in the areas involved.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his comments, which are very pertinent.

An effort was made by me to ascertain what was happening in the other States, to determine whether equal treatment was being accorded; but we were told then, "We do not like to talk about the other States."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two newspapers published articles in which it was stated that a recommendation was made to phase out the naval installations. But the recommendation to phase out those naval installations subsequently was changed. As a Senator from the State

of Ohio, if I am to pacify the minds of the people who are employed at the Port Clinton installation, I should be able to say to them, "You have been treated no differently than other people in the country, and therefore you have no complaint."

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the Senator. We shall await further information with great interest. I hope that there will be sufficient interest in the problem. Clearly and obviously, the proposal was rather hurriedly drawn. I believe it is sound and carefully worded, but I hope there will be enough interest so that there can be early committee action on the proposal to prevent a repetition of such a shortsighted move, or at least a move which considers only one phase of the situation.

In all fairness, the proposal is only a recommendation at this point. It is my hope—and our delegation has already communicated with the President to express its views and to request an opportunity to be heard before any definitive action is taken—that the President will recognize the overall picture in a way which the Defense Department claims it is not required to do and which certainly it has not done by its own admission, in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2380) to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963— CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield briefly to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ANOTHER REASON WHY THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IS IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 is in many respects disappointing; in others it is gratifying.

This conference report follows a pattern for similar conference reports in prior years on foreign aid bills. That pattern, Mr. President, illustrates another reason why the foreign assistance program is in deep trouble—one might even say it is in grave peril for its continued existence.

This year on the floor of the Senate occurred a long overdue attempt by the friends of the foreign aid program to instill into its administration a new sense of direction and control, the lack of which heretofore had opened the program to overly harsh criticism and played directly into the hands of those who would do away with the program completely and who so unrealistically believe that if the United States would but ignore the woes of the world they would somehow vanish into thin air and we could continue, safe behind this dream wall, to go about our petty daily chores.

The attempt to change the AID program was, as it turned out, and as it has always turned out in the past, an attempt to save the AID program from itself.

I deplored the method used in the Senate early last month to rewrite the foreign aid bill on the floor of the Senate, acting as though we were meeting as a Committee of the Whole. I joined with others in an attempt to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations so that that committee could implement its caustic criticisms of the foreign aid program by appropriate amendments.

That attempt failed, and those who wanted to give direction to the foreign aid program and who wanted some little say on how U.S. taxpayers' dollars were to be spent had no recourse but to propose amendments to the bill.

This we proceeded to do with all possible dispatch.

The fact that so many amendments were adopted on the Senate floor was definite proof of widespread dissatisfaction with the manner in which the foreign aid program was being administered, irrespective of the amount of money authorized to be appropriated.

This problem of the amount of money to be authorized to be appropriated has been the source of much misunderstanding. Without in any way minimizing its importance, I would venture to say that discussions of the dollar figures have thrown a smokescreen around more important factors. Basically the question is more fundamental than whether we authorize the appropriation of \$4.5 billion or \$3.5 billion or \$2.5 billion although as I shall demonstrate the last figure would be more than ample. We are and should be as much concerned with the authorization of the appropriation of even \$1 for a purpose in which we do not believe and which we feel will not assist in the proper conduct of the foreign policy of the United States as in the authorization of the appropriation of \$1 billion for that same purpose.

And yet year in and year out we get enmeshed in a gigantic numbers game—so far enmeshed, as a matter of fact, that this year we found that while our eyes were diverted to the dollar amounts the

program itself had been extended to 107 countries around the globe and that U.S. taxpayers' dollars were being shipped on a grand scale to nations which were using these dollars to build political and economic systems at cross-purposes with our own or to acquire armaments with which to harass their peaceful neighbors, which were also receiving U.S. AID dollars or to construct costly and unsound projects, or to bail out governments which decline to put an end to their own financial follies, waste, extravagance, inflation and corruption.

I shall, later in my remarks, discuss the amount reported by the conferees to be authorized for the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964 and shall demonstrate with specific examples that the totals authorized by the bill are far too great and that they will do the AID program more harm than good.

At this point, however, I wish to confine my remarks to certain aspects of the program itself and point out how the dropping or weakening by the conferees of some of the provisions in the bill as it went to conference from the Senate, constitute yet another reason why the foreign aid program is in deep trouble with the people of the United States. If my colleagues doubt this, let them sound out grassroots opinion when they go home for the Christmas recess.

First let us consider the amendment sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and cosponsored by his colleague [Mr. ENGLE] by my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], and by myself.

The Kuchel amendment would have prevented aid to countries in Latin America which have been levying tribute on U.S. fishermen fishing on the high seas.

As was pointed out during the debate on this amendment, it is most disconcerting for U.S. fishermen engaged in their peaceful pursuits 200 miles off the coast of some Latin American nation to be illegally seized and forced to pay tribute to that nation, being hauled off to jail in a vessel given to that very same nation under our military assistance program.

The fishermen of the United States cannot understand why the United States continues, year after year after year, to send millions of U.S. dollars to the very same nations that engage in such piracy.

The actions of these Latin American countries recall the actions of the Barbary pirates off the North African coast a century and a half ago. Unfortunately, the vigorous action of the United States in those days, when we numbered only 18 States and were a far weaker Nation than now, contrasts with the supineness and inaction of our executive departments in the mid-20th century, and as the only alternative, properly inspired Senate action to redress the wrongs visited on American citizens, and to try to serve notice, not only on the offending nations, but on our own State Department that the Senate was sick and tired of watching these examples of piracy and blackmail continue.

We sent no gold for the economic development of the Barbary pirates.

Neither did we give them naval vessels and arms so they could continue to prey upon our shipping. Instead we sent the U.S. Marines to the shores of Tripoli to enforce the freedom of the seas and respect for the Stars and Stripes.

This harassment of American fishermen by certain Latin American countries has been going on for some time now. Protests to our Department of State brought the usual reply that negotiations were going on and that the way in which to solve the problem was through continued negotiations.

Unfortunately the evidence was clear that while we sought to negotiate the abuses continued and increasingly revealed Uncle Sam's present preference to use the doormat as his symbol rather than our time-honored emblem.

The Senate decided that nations which harassed American fishermen were not worthy of our economic or military aid.

It was not a decision made on the spur of the moment by a handful of Senators. It was not an amendment slipped into the foreign aid bill at the end of a long day with the Chamber almost empty. It was discussed fully on the day previously by the senior Senator from California. It was adopted by the Senate in midafternoon after further discussion on the day following. Moreover it was decided by a recorded vote. Fifty-seven Senators—more than an absolute majority—voted in favor of the amendment. Only 29 voted against it.

And yet, what happened to the amendment in conference.

It was quietly dropped. The "fishing amendment," one might say, was "spuros versenkt"—sunk without trace along with the rights of our American fishermen.

But how could it be, Mr. President? There was no similar amendment in the House version of the bill—the House had not even considered such an amendment, so there was no sentiment pro or con recorded in the House on such an amendment. The sentiment expressed in the Senate can be noted in the 57 votes in favor of the amendment.

It might be pertinent at this point to ask: Whom do the conferees on the part of the Senate really represent? I ask that question, Mr. President, with all due respect for the ability, the honesty, and the integrity, of each and every Member appointed to represent this body on the conference committee. I ask it, Mr. President, because in the answer to it will be found one of the reasons why the foreign aid program is in real danger. The pattern is all too familiar. It has been going on for years and years, leaving behind deep frustrations.

Each year the Senate adopts an amendment or two setting forth the purpose and direction of the foreign aid program. Even though the amendment was adopted, as the fishing amendment was, by a clear majority of the Senate—that valuable amendment sponsored by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and cosponsored by his junior colleague [Mr. ENGLE] and supported by the two Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]—nevertheless, the will of that majority was

thwarted in conference, and the amendment was dropped.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished colleague the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able Senator from Alaska for his comments. I agree with him with respect to the regrettable situation whereby the will of the Senate—in which he and I and two-thirds of those Senators present and voting participated—was blithely sheared away in conference.

I have some comments on that subject that I shall want to make later this afternoon; but the Senator from Alaska is correct. I remember that during the debate the distinguished Senator pointed out how, time and time again over the past decade, our fellow Americans were denied the right to use the seas, under the theory of freedom of the seas, because of a ridiculous contention, by three South American countries that their sovereignty extended 200 miles seaward from their shores.

The Senator from Alaska performed a service for the country during that debate. He performs a service now in pointing out the incredible fact that the will of the Senate was shunted aside in the conference report. I regret it keenly.

I speak as an American citizen who believes in the theory of mutual security, the helping of "free friendly nations," which is the language of that section. But the Senator has pointed out in his statement instance after instance in which aid was given to certain not very friendly nations. In one instance, in which the able Senator participated successfully, the Senate indicated that it does not want military aid funneled into a country which thereafter uses that aid as an offset for its own funds which can then be channeled into potentially aggressive acts.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from California. We must emphasize that we prefer the method of negotiation, the peaceful method of give and take; but, as was clearly brought out by the Under Secretary of the Interior, negotiations with certain countries had proceeded at length, with no effect. They continue their abuses. They continue to seize our fishermen on the high seas with—strange irony—naval vessels which we had furnished to them as part of our foreign aid. If anything could be more amazing and ironical than that fact, I do not know what it could be. The Secretary was not a party to that aid, but he said negotiations were getting nowhere. I do not know what he hinted at when he said it, but he said more drastic action should be carried out. If the State Department had carried it out—and it should have taken action long since—it would have said to those countries, "We cannot continue to help you when you are violating international law, when you continue to permit acts of piracy," and that they would receive no aid if they continued to impose arbitrary and ruthless injustices.

So the Senate was impelled to act. Now the conferees have removed that

provision in conference. I shall be interested to see what the results will be, because if the State Department does not take action within the next few months, I propose to speak on it at such length that it will become a public scandal, and public opinion will compel the State Department to act.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is eminently correct in his statement. He knows, without my saying so, that I shall be with him in the pursuit of that objective. In the comments which I shall make, which will be synthesized with the very able statement that the Senator from Alaska is now making, I point out, by way of reiteration, that it is an American tragedy that the American Government does not protect American citizens when they seek to use the freedom of the seas, in order to earn their very livelihood, 200 miles seaward from the coastlines of some nations which have made a mockery of the theory of the freedom of the seas.

The Senator will recall instance after instance in which, many, many miles from the shoreline of a certain country, American citizens were arrested, and their boats were confiscated, on the theory that they were within the sovereign area of the country abutting the sea at that point.

The Senator is correct in the statement he has made.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate what the Senator has said. When the amendment was originally introduced, I took occasion to contrast the failure of our Nation to act at this time with our action taken a century and a half ago, when we were a small nation of 18 States. Yet, when the Barbary pirates attacked our shipping, we did not send them foreign aid in the way of ships or arms. We sent our Marines to stop them.

Have fashions completely changed so that now when we are powerful and wealthy, we are impotent to act? I do not concede that because we are strong and powerful we should be repeatedly kicked and abused.

I hope the situation will be resolved in the next few months.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. The cry is raised: Do not tie the hands of the Administrator or the President. They must have flexibility.

I agree that there must be a certain amount of flexibility. But when 57 Senators vote to refuse aid to any nation ruthlessly harassing U.S. fishermen, penalizing them, imprisoning them, robbing them, one would think that, whether the amendment is or is not written into the law, the Administrator of the AID program would take the broad hint and stop aid to such countries.

But, Mr. President—and here is the reason for the mounting resentment—even in the face of such a record aid will continue to go to countries harassing American fishermen. These restrictions which we have been voting into the foreign assistance act in the Senate have been dropped in conference and ignored by the AID administrators.

Another example of how the will of the Senate has been thwarted in confer-

ence is furnished by the provision relating to interest rates on development loans.

As reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, interest rates on development loans would be raised from as low as three-fourths of 1 percent per annum, with a grace period of 10 years and a repayment period of 40 years to a minimum of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum for the first 5 years, and then a minimum of 2 percent per annum for the remaining years of the term of the loan.

The House version raised it to a flat 2 percent per annum.

During the debate on the bill I offered an amendment raising the rate to that which is paid by the United States for the funds which it borrows. That vote was narrowly defeated by a vote of 41 to 47, indicating a general dissatisfaction on the part of many Senators to the percent interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum.

With 41 Senators voting to increase the rate to over 4 percent, there seems to be no justification for the action by the conferees in adopting an interest rate more lenient than either the Senate or House versions. But that is exactly what the conferees did. The conference bill proposes a grace period of 10 years—there was no grace period in the House bill and only a 5-year grace period in the bill passed by the Senate—with a minimum interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum during the 10-year grace period. The Senate-passed bill provided for the three-fourths of 1 percent per annum interest rate for only a 5-year grace period. In addition, gone from the conference bill was the Senate provision of a maximum term on loans of 35 years. In addition, the conference bill exempts loans from the International Development Association or loans authorized or committed prior to the passage of this bill.

Here we see a clear-cut example of the third legislative body—the conference committee in action. It matters not what either the House or the Senate passed. A small minority overrules the majorities of both Senate and House. This is scarcely a demonstration of the democratic process.

The conference is king. The bill is rewritten in conference from scratch with neither the House version or the Senate version of the provision used as guidelines.

With such an example of the disregard of the wishes of both Houses before them, can the AID administrators wonder any longer at the dimming view in both Houses of the program?

Yes, Mr. President, maybe they got away with it this year. But in a few short months they will be before the Congress again and it may be that then we will be able to devise a method of circumventing these attempts to thwart the obvious will of both Houses of the Congress.

The 10-year grace period provided by the conference version of the interest rate provision will permit the program to continue as it has been in the past with absolutely no change in pace.

Loans will continue, as they have in the past, to be granted at three-fourths of 1 percent per annum interest with our Nation steadily going deeper into astronomical debt and our taxpayers paying about 4 percent for the money we reloan at less than one-fourth of that rate. And is there any concern on the part of the AID administrators as to whether those loans will ever be repaid? None of those responsible for this prodigal financing today will be around at that distant date.

In addition a new "gimmick" has been written into the provision. The restrictions—such as they are—do not apply to loans already "committed." Nowhere is the word "committed" defined, explained or limited. I wonder, Mr. President, when we examine the activities in the AID program next year how many loans we will find that were secretly "committed" at some cocktail party or luncheon.

It is my intention to follow through on this point in the months ahead and ask the Administrator of the AID program for a full justification of all development loans granted on "easy terms" for which there has been no obligation on the books of the AID at the time of passage of this bill.

A third provision I would mention at this time which was "junked" by the conference committee is the so-called junta provision barring aid to nations where a military coup has taken over from the duly-elected civilian governments.

Section 254 of the Senate bill provided as follows:

Sec. 254. Restrictions on Assistance. None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections unless the President determines that withholding such assistance would be contrary to the national interest.

This is far and away a very mild provision designed to strengthen the hand of the President in a very vital area. You will note, Mr. President, that complete discretion is vested in the President of the United States to waive this provision whenever he determines—in his sole and unreviewable discretion—that "withholding such assistance would be contrary to the national interest".

Yet even this mild provision was dropped by the conferees.

One very unfortunate change was the dilution almost to the point of nullification in the wise Senate provision to assist nations in meeting their population explosion problems. Unless something of this nature is done—and soon—the whole program in many countries—particularly in India and Latin America—will go down the drain. I could cite ample substantiation of this prospect. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee deserves high credit and praise for writing such a provision into the bill for the first time. This action corresponds to a great surge of favorable public opinion. But the conferees watered it down to a meaningless wordage about doing some research.

I do not wish to give the impression that all the Senate amendments were dropped.

One amendment, which I sponsored, would deny military assistance to Latin America. This was retained. For that I am grateful and hope that it will be implemented and that the ample exemptions permitted to the President in that amendment will be sparingly used.

The other amendment, which I also sponsored, would bar aid to nations which are waging aggression against or preparing to wage aggression against countries also receiving our economic or military assistance. This amendment was also retained. For that I am thankful. I hope that the President will promptly make the necessary findings that Egypt and Indonesia are aggressors and just as promptly stop our aid program in those countries until their aggressive actions have abated.

I cannot help be disturbed that, despite the action of the Senate and the clear-cut exposure of Sukarno's aggressive policies, military aid continues to be given to Indonesia in next year's program.

However, this aggressor amendment points out the corner into which are being painted those of us who would seek to amend the foreign assistance bill in order to improve its administration.

Apparently, the one certain way of amending a foreign assistance bill is to adopt House-passed language thereby "locking in" the amendment and not making the amendment amenable to conference consideration. We are, in short, being asked to abdicate our obligations in the Senate in favor of the other body and to adopt precisely the same language adopted by that body even though that language could be improved.

If permitted to persist, this is very unfortunate.

It will ultimately spell the end of the influence of the U.S. Senate in an important area of United States foreign policy.

It should be clear that in these two bodies, in the field of foreign relations, the Senate plays, or should play, under the Constitution, a far more important role.

This situation will hand to the other body a complete veto over whatever conditions can be written into the foreign assistance bill.

I truly hope that those exercising the leadership role in this matter reconsider their positions and become reconciled to the fact that conferees should truly represent the will of the Senate and not the collective will of those appointed to serve on the conference committee.

Now, Mr. President, a few words about the money authorized to be appropriated for the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964.

It is far too much.

And, because it is too much, it will lead to profligate practices and procedures. This is so obvious as to need no argument.

I recently completed for the Senate Committee on Government Operations a study of our foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries. In my report on that trip I showed the

proliferation of technical assistance programs because of the abundance of funds. It can safely be said that we are in 107 countries with an AID program precisely because we have had too much money. If the AID program had to count its pennies, it would have fewer projects and would be in fewer countries.

But, Mr. President, precisely because it had less money and therefore had to be more selective, the AID program would have been in those countries and those programs where it could be more and most effective.

What is the money situation?

The administration request was for \$4.5 billion.

The House-passed bill authorized the appropriation of \$3.9 billion.

The Senate passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$3.6 billion.

The figure of \$3.5 billion was agreed to by the conferees—a sum \$100 million more than the House figure.

Can this amount be cut further? I think it can and should be.

It is ironical, Mr. President, that at almost the precise moment that the Senate conferees were in conference on this measure we here in the Senate were engaged in a serious debate as to whether to appropriate \$45 million for the accelerated public works program. The motion to delete the item was defeated. This double-standard thinking should stop. Items for foreign assistance should be scrutinized as closely as items which are destined to boost our economy here at home. For unless that economy here is strong and vigorous, we cannot long sustain the burdens abroad.

But there is much more to be said on this issue, while we are being importuned to vote these billions of dollars for aid to 107 foreign countries the funds for our domestic employment program—under the accelerated Public Works Act—has run dry. Not only have the \$900 million authorized run out, but hundreds of useful projects in areas of mounting unemployment in every State of the Union are fully processed, approved and ready to go. But there is no money. At this very time, Mr. President, a special ad hoc committee appointed by the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNAMARA], and chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is holding hearings on the extent of that great domestic need. Hearings are being held all this week to hear Governors, mayors, State, county, and city officials who present a harrowing story of increasing unemployment with their useful projects ready to go—and no money.

I am a member of that ad hoc committee. It is shocking to think that such a situation could develop. I know, of course, that the ad hoc committee cannot, in the face of this tragic new factual evidence, fail to report favorably the bill of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] which would authorize \$2,400,000, or to allow the accelerated works program to resume. That sum will be used up by existing projects.

My own bill (S. 1121) provides for the same amount that will be appropriated

for foreign aid, which may be a slightly larger program. But to me, it is not only shocking, but incomprehensible, that the dire needs of the American people go unattended, while aid to 107 foreign countries proceeds merrily on. At best, we cannot get both authorization and appropriations to take care of American needs for months. This double standard—help for 107 foreign nations, none for America's communities and America's unemployed—is revolting. Moreover, these projects are sound, useful, desirable, needed undertakings.

As I listened to the testimony of State officials, I was impressed with the conscientiousness with which these community needed projects were prepared, presented, and processed. They include such research projects as installations for water supply, sewers, health centers, municipal buildings, and street improvements—projects which not only would employ people locally, but also back in the factories where the materials are manufactured. They would aid the transportation industry, including railroads and trucks, which convey the materials to the States where they will be used.

Yet we are just now holding hearings in an ad hoc committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, in order to get this essential program moving again. I could only wish that we might shortcut this delay and transfer what will be cut from the foreign assistance program to the domestic assistance program. But let it be crystal clear that I shall not cease my efforts to try to gain attention to the needs of American citizens at least equal to that which has been consistently given for years to the citizens of foreign lands. Our citizens should have not merely equality, but priority. At present, they have neither priority nor equality. They have posteriority. I repeat that I deem it shocking.

In the next 48 hours, there will be the final vote on a multibillion-dollar foreign aid bill. Action on the smaller domestic aid bill is for the indefinite future—the sweet bye and bye. That policy must cease.

During the course of the debate on the foreign assistance authorization bill, I urged repeatedly that the program be reviewed on a country-by-country basis.

Time is now of the essence, but I shall attempt to do precisely that very briefly.

All figures given will be those for fiscal 1963.

First, I would eliminate the military aid program for all Latin America—a saving of \$74.8 million. This prohibition is now in the act and should necessarily lead to this savings.

Second, I would eliminate all military aid to the African nations. It must be remembered that, except for the violence in the Congo, the remaining nations in Africa have come into existence peacefully. Nevertheless, there is grave danger that the United States through its military assistance program is initiating an arms buildup which inevitably will mushroom into an arms race and world violence. Indeed, that is now happening. We are assisting Somalia, one

of the newer republics, which is being invaded, harassed, and attacked by troops from neighboring Ethiopia. Food has been supplied as well as American planes, tanks, and machineguns. This is the fruit of our military aid program in Africa. It has already begun; it should be stopped immediately.

What a mockery this makes of our professions on behalf of a world at peace.

The elimination of this item will save \$27.4 million.

Then I would eliminate the \$476.4 million item for military assistance to economically prosperous Europe.

I would eliminate military aid to prosperous Japan—\$172.9 million.

Next let us turn to the Middle East: Our program in Greece is supposedly stopped so that should save us \$128.8 million.

So is our program to Israel at a savings of \$78.9 million.

Our program for Lebanon, they tell me, is also stopped, so we should save \$300,000.

Our programs in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt should also be stopped until those countries start thinking more in terms of their own economic development than their political aggrandizement, and stop engaging in aggressive warfare.

Stopping these three programs will save \$318.6 million.

We should stop our aid program to oil-rich Libya—\$12.5 million.

Turning again to Latin America on the economic front, we have recommended that the aid program in the Dominican Republic and Honduras be stopped because of the military junta overthrow of the duly constituted civilian government. This would save an additional \$66.1 million.

In addition, until Brazil takes the needed economic measures which would prevent our funds from being dissipated, we should withhold the \$155.4 million in economic aid.

We can save \$140.9 million in Indonesia and \$29.2 in Cambodia which is resisting strongly our efforts to thrust this money on that nation.

How fantastic now appears the \$300 million we have sunk into Cambodia. Not only is the money wasted, but, worse than that, our military air unit training, now that the Cambodians have elected to get into bed with Red China, helps that country in its war against freedom. We had better revise all our military aid programs with respect to which similar situations exist. It would be interesting to find out how we happened to be deceived, misled, and mispersuaded by those who happened to be in charge of this program during these years, and who could not foresee the waste which would occur, despite the generous amounts of money we poured into the program.

In line with the Clay Committee report, we should cut by at least 50 percent the aid given to the newly emerging nations of Africa, giving the former colonial powers the opportunity to assist their former colonies. This would save \$250 million.

Then there is Taiwan, that little island into which we have poured the incredible sum of \$4,500 million. It seems

to me about time that that island were on its own. Of course, we want to prevent it from falling into the orbit of Red China. For that purpose we have built a tremendous military force there. We are paying the salaries of countless generals in the Taiwanese Army; but the real protection of Taiwan, if war should break out, would devolve upon our 7th Fleet. When we consider the amount of aid we have given Taiwan, it is almost fabulous. We have supplied Taiwan with machinery, powerplants, chemical plants, and fisheries. Everything the imagination could possibly conceive has been done for Taiwan. It is about time we stopped, and let that little island grow on the resources and the billions of dollars we have given it.

Another place where we could save money is in British Guiana. I tried to have an amendment adopted to prevent giving aid to colonies of old-world nations before they were set free. I see no reason why we should continue, as we have done in the past, to give aid to British Guiana, British Honduras, French Guiana, Dutch Guiana, and Surinam while they are still colonies. Is not such aid inconsistent with our stand that we will not aid nations that we have made prosperous, and that it is not proper to help their colonies while they are still colonies?

Thus even on this cursory review of our program the amount of \$2 billion can be cut from the amount authorized to be appropriated.

I am fully aware of the argument that we must authorize more to be appropriated than we believe justified in order to bargain with the other body.

I reject that argument completely. I cannot in all good conscience vote to appropriate one more dime for this or any other program than I believe can be honestly and wisely spent.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Star of November 9, 1963, entitled "Beginning of the End," a column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "Our Brothers' Keeper," and a table showing funds expended on the AID program for fiscal year 1963.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I voted in favor of H.R. 7885 a few weeks ago. I shall not vote in favor of the conference report; and I shall continue my efforts to cut this program down to a reasonable size and to eliminate some of its past and persistent follies which apparently those in charge of the program—and, I regret to say, some of our conferees—do not wish to see remedied.

When they go home to their constituents for their Christmas holidays, I think they will find an increasing view as voiced by the Evening Star editorial, which is that the foreign aid program should be scrapped.

I do not share this view. I want to see foreign aid continued where it is needed, where it is useful, where it is appreciated, where it will strengthen the cause of peace and achieve the objectives alleged for it, but so frequently honored in the breach in the execution of the program.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 9, 1963]

BEGINNING OF THE END

The foreign aid authorization, though improved in one respect, has emerged from conference in a form which indicates that this vast international subsidy at the expense of the American taxpayer is on its way out. We hope so.

The improvement consists of the restoration of the President's authority to extend most-favored-nation trade treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland. The theory is that the President should not be forbidden by law to exercise this discretion in trying to encourage countries that seem to be endeavoring to break away from Communist domination. This, of course, has nothing to do with foreign aid. But it makes sense, and it is too bad that the conferees would not grant the President similar discretionary authority in the case of other Communist countries. The Kremlin's empire may or may not be in process of disintegrating. But why erect arbitrary bars which can only serve to discourage that process?

As for the rest, the conferees split the House and Senate money versions pretty much down the middle. The final authorized figure was \$3,599,950,000. When the appropriations committees are through, the total will probably be down to \$3 billion, or perhaps even a little less. This will represent a big cut from the \$4.5 billion originally requested by the administration, and it will evoke anguished screams from the professional foreign-aiders.

We do not think, however, that any anguished screams will be heard from the taxpayers of America.

They have been lugging this foreign aid load for some 17 years and have doled out something like \$100 billion in its support. They are fed up with it. This Congress should serve unmistakable notice that in the business of foreign aid we have come to the beginning of the end.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 9, 1963]

OUR BROTHERS' KEEPER—CONGRESS REFLECTS U.S. DISILLUSIONMENT WITH WHAT HAPPENS TO VAST FOREIGN AID

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

What is the sensible thing to do about foreign aid?

And let's define "sensible."

Foreign aid should feed the calf without killing the cow. It should help unness

messed-up political systems and social philosophies.

It should turn mendicant countries with chronic deficit economies into going concerns that can stand on their own feet.

It should expand the area of freedom, making realistic allowances for the fact that ignorant and volatile people have to make a choice between a high degree of centralized authority and utter chaos.

Our first attempt at foreign aid, the Marshall plan, was a thumping success. Western Europe and Japan lived on industry, and the war had wrecked their means for living. American aid plus native energy and know-how created a miracle of reconstruction that filled a vacuum into which communism had confidently expected to flow.

But no sooner had we shored up war-ravaged economies than most of the rest of the world, including that part of it which far from having been injured by the war had profited from it, began shaking tambourines in our faces and crying, "Do you love us less?"

And we couldn't think of any other answer except to unlock Fort Knox.

It wasn't long before someone in Washington invented a marvelous phrase, "the take-off point." You were to give foreign aid to a poor and underdeveloped country until its industries were started, its dams and irrigation projects built, its starved fields revitalized with fertilizer, and then the marvelous takeoff would arrive.

This was the point where the country's economy would become self-regenerating and self-expanding. Foreign aid would then no longer be necessary and what had once been a miserable land, easy prey to communism, would become a vigorous, happy, free nation.

And this could happen, indeed. Provided such a country did have large untapped natural and agricultural resources, that its people were energetic and eager to learn, that public servants were generally honest and progressive, and that its wealthy citizens were willing to reinvest their money in new job-making and wealth-spreading ventures.

The only trouble is that where people had all these qualities they were generally already pretty prosperous. What we soon found ourselves doing was running a gigantic WPA for fouled-up nations remarkable for laziness, graft, and huge private fortunes that hid themselves in foreign banks.

In some nations we have simply shored up inefficient socialist regimes that have smothered enterprise in red tape and scraped the bottom of the confiscation barrel. In other

words, as in India, we have poured money down a widening ratehole as the increase in population chronically outruns the rise in the gross national product.

In Yugoslavia we gave the frankly Communist Mr. Tito a billion or so on the theory that this would encourage an independent course for satellites. Mr. T. and Mr. K. are now closer than 10 college students in a phone booth.

If we expected gratitude we misjudged human nature. Many peoples to whom international philanthropy is unbelievable looked for the bug under the chip. They were helped by hints from the Communists about "hidden Yankee imperialism." The human being rebels at thinking of himself as a recipient of charity. He prefers to imagine that he is giving value in return, willingly or not.

President Sukarno of Indonesia recently said that the world's new nations, including his own, do not have "rising expectations," but "rising demands." He expects these demands to be met by the wealthy nations of the world.

Well, Sukarno runs a graft-ridden travesty of democracy, notable for its inefficient administration and its own brand of neo-imperialism. How do we advance human justice by periodically bailing out Sukarno?

Among some tribes of the Ivory Coast in Africa it is customary for a man to retire at 25. After that he squats around the village with his fighting cocks. How much earlier must a 65-year-old Iowa farmer get up so that he can contribute to the retirement fund of these 25-year-olds?

A huge bureaucracy has grown up in Washington and in the foreign service as a result of foreign aid. A man naturally sells what his job depends on and Americans have been given a heavy dose of the propaganda line that only our outlays can save the world for democracy.

But the recent reaction of Congress only reflects an advance disillusion among Americans in general. Americans, representing 7 percent of the human population, cannot continue to underwrite the deficits of people who cuddle their dry sacred cows.

Only a radical minority would end foreign aid altogether. There is much good that can be done with a carefully supervised and screened program for people who are determined to exercise the energy and self-discipline necessary to make their economies viable. But we're through tossing the gold over the transom. And history will not blame us.

U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)

[In millions of dollars]

Region and country	Grand total	Total military	Total economic	Economic assistance													
				AID programs				Other economic assistance									
				Total	Development grants program social progress	Development loans	Supporting assistance and other	Total	Social Progress Trust Fund	Food for peace (Public Law 48)				Export-Import Bank long-term loans	Other economic programs		
										Total	Title I	Title II	Title III			Title IV	
						Total sales agreements	Planned for country use										
Total, all countries.....	7,026.7	1,849.9	5,176.8	2,395.8	343.6	1,287.8	764.2	2,781.0	124.8	1,771.3	(1,268.2)	1,074.2	314.6	314.1	68.4	571.7	313.2
Near East and south Asia.....	2,288.0	380.3	1,907.7	983.9	54.0	779.6	150.3	923.8	-----	854.4	(766.6)	682.0	111.5	60.9	-----	64.5	14.9
Afghanistan.....	19.2	1.2	18.0	17.7	15.1	2.6	-----	.3	-----	.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.2
Ceylon.....	8.4	-----	8.4	.4	.4	-----	-----	8.0	-----	7.8	(4.7)	3.5	-----	4.3	-----	-----	.2
Cyprus.....	4.1	-----	4.1	2.9	.6	2.3	-----	1.2	-----	1.1	(1.1)	.9	-----	.2	-----	-----	.1
Greece.....	128.8	79.6	49.2	31.6	-----	31.6	-----	17.6	-----	14.6	(11.2)	6.5	-----	8.1	-----	-----	.9
India.....	821.0	30.0	791.0	402.3	6.3	396.0	-----	388.7	-----	347.5	(373.3)	333.9	-----	13.6	-----	49.3	.9
Iran.....	115.9	88.1	57.8	28.4	3.8	17.4	-----	34.4	-----	34.2	(7.7)	5.8	25.0	3.4	-----	-----	.2
Iraq.....	1.0	.1	.9	.8	.8	-----	-----	.1	-----	.1	-----	-----	-----	.1	-----	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Region and country	Grand total	Total military	Economic assistance																			
			Total economic	AID programs					Total	Social Progress Trust Fund	Other economic assistance						Export-Import Bank long-term loans	Other economic programs				
				Total	Development grants program social progress	Development loans	Supporting assistance and other	Total			Food for peace (Public Law 48)											
											Total	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title IV							
Total sales agreements	Planned for country use																					
Near East, etc.—Con.																						
Israel	78.9	0.6	78.3	45.0		45.0		33.3		22.1	² (23.2)	19.8	1.5	0.8		11.2						
Jordan	63.6	4.3	59.3	43.0		7.0		36.0		16.3		14.4	1.9									
Lebanon	3	2	1	1		1																
Nepal	4.6		4.6	3.9		3.9										0.5						
Pakistan	372.5	(¹)	372.5	185.0		7.9		176.8		3		185.4	² (155.4)	146.1	35.5	3.8	2.1					
Saudi Arabia	4	(¹)	4	2		2		(¹)		2				2								
Syrian Arab Republic	317.2	135.7	181.5	131.1		4.7		71.4		55.0		50.4	49.8	(55.9)	45.0	4.8	6					
Turkey	198.7		198.7	48.6		2.3		36.3		10.0		150.1	² (134.1)	120.5		19.6	10.0					
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	4.0	(¹)	4.0	3.4						3.4				6								
Yemen	.8		.8	.5		.5				.3												
Regional	148.5	70.5	78.0	43.5		.4		43.1		34.5		34.5		34.4	.1							
Latin America																						
	1,102.7	74.8	1,027.9	548.9		109.0		342.8		97.1		479.0	124.8	185.4	(63.6)	51.5	18.8	75.6	39.6	91.2	² 77.6	
Argentina	156.5	2.7	153.8	99.7		3.3		76.4		20.0		54.1	30.0								² 24.1	
Bolivia	69.9	1.6	68.3	35.7		7.5		18.3		9.9		32.6	10.5	21.4	(16.9)	14.3		4	3.7	3.0		.7
Brazil	172.3	16.9	155.4	86.9		24.0		37.4		25.5		68.5	5.8	61.6	(43.4)	34.7	11.3	15.6				1.1
British Guiana	1.4		1.4	1.3		1.3																
British Honduras	.6		.6	.1		.1																.2
Chile	99.2	10.2	89.0	41.3		6.3		35.0		(¹)		47.7	4.9	26.5				5.5		21.0	15.5	.8
Colombia	134.9	8.4	126.5	93.5		6.1		87.2		2		33.0	8.5	18.3				11.5		6.8	3.4	2.8
Costa Rica	15.5	.7	14.8	13.0		2.4		10.6				1.8		1.6		1.6		1.1				1.2
Dominican Republic	51.7	2.1	49.6	29.4		3.4		2.1		23.9		20.2	6.5	12.5		1.2		6.3		5.0		1.2
Ecuador	39.2	2.8	36.4	18.2		4.9		6.3		7.0		18.2	9.9	6.1				2.3		3.8	1.3	.9
El Salvador	23.1	.6	22.5	19.6		3.0		16.6				2.9		2.6				2.6				.3
Guatemala	15.4	2.0	13.4	3.4		2.7		.7				10.0	7.8	1.0				1.0				1.2
Haiti	6.2	.4	5.8	4.9						4.9		2.4		.9				.9				.1
Honduras	14.4	1.1	13.3	7.3		3.2		1.6		2.4		6.0		3				3				.2
Jamaica	13.0		13.0	5.8		.8		5.0				7.2		2.0				2.0			5.0	.2
Mexico	50.9	1.2	49.7	4		.4						8		15.5		1.1		14.4			25.8	
Nicaragua	9.0	1.5	7.5	3.5		2.5		1.0				4.0		1.4				1.4				2.4
Panama	10.0	.8	9.2	8.2		2.2		6.0				1.0		7				.7				.3
Paraguay	10.2	.9	9.3	3.0		3.0						6.3	2.9	3.4	(3.3)	2.5		.9				.3
Peru	31.0	6.7	24.3	3.0		3.0				21.3		1.5		6.9			3.1	3.8			10.7	2.2
Surinam	4		4	.3		.3				1				.1				.1				
Trinidad and Tobago	4.1		4.1	3.9		.8				3.1				(¹)			(¹)					.2
Uruguay	24.6	2.5	22.1	7.9		1.9		6.0				14.2	8.0	.6				.6			5.0	.6
Venezuela	56.8	10.4	46.4	33.1		3.0		30.0		.1		13.3	11.0	1.2				1.2			.4	.7
Other West Indies	4		4									.4				(¹)		.4				
ROCAP	11.1		11.1	8.2		5.7		2.5				2.9		4								
Regional	80.4	1.2	79.2	17.2		17.0				.1		62.1	.7									61.4
Far East																						
	1,723.3	785.0	938.3	428.7		53.3		67.1		308.2		509.6		297.7	(220.9)	203.0	43.5	42.8	8.4	131.8		780.1
Burma	15.2		15.2	6.7		1.0				5.7		8.5		8.5	(10.7)	8.1						.4
Cambodia	29.2	10.4	18.8	18.8		7.8				11.0		(¹)		(¹)				(¹)				
China, Republic of	212.6	132.3	80.3	38.6		2.1		36.5				41.7		41.7	² (27.0)	21.9	3.5	7.9		8.4		
Hong Kong	5.6		5.6									5.6		5.6		2.9		2.9				
Indonesia	140.9	17.6	123.3	38.7		14.8				21.9		86.6		86.4	² (91.2)	82.1	.8	3.5				.2
Japan	172.9		172.9	123.8								123.8		9							122.9	
Korea	403.7	199.4	204.3	126.2		5.6		30.6		90.0		78.1		78.1	(74.0)	66.6	1.4	10.1				
Laos	36.8	(¹)	36.8	36.3						36.3		.5		.5				.5				.8
Malaya	2.2		2.2									2.2		1.4				1.4				
Philippines	117.7	23.9	93.8	2.9		2.9				90.9				9.8				9.8			3.9	77.2
Thailand	94.2	71.6	22.6	16.2		6.4				9.9		6.4		1				1			5.0	1.3
Vietnam	208.1	(¹)	208.1	143.7		10.5				133.2		64.4		64.4	(27.0)	24.3	34.8	5.3				
Regional	284.0	² 280.8	3.2	2.5		2.2				.2		.7										.7
Africa																						
	553.9	27.4	526.5	261.6		79.8		98.3		83.4		264.9		231.7	(62.5)	53.4	136.8	37.3	4.2	19.2		² 14.0
Algeria	79.6		79.6	1.8		1.1				.7		77.8		77.8				63.8		14.0		
Burundi	1.5		1.5	(¹)		(¹)						1.5		1.5				.6				
Cameroon	1.5	(¹)	1.5	1.0		1.0						.5		(¹)				(¹)				.5
Central African Representative	.7		.7	.7		.7						(¹)		(¹)				(¹)				
Chad	1.1		1.1	1.0		1.0						.1		.1				.1				
Congo (Brazzaville)	.7		.7	.5		.5						.2									.2	
Congo (Leopoldville)	79.8	.2	79.6	42.4		3.0				39.4		37.2		37.2	(30.6)	27.5	6.3	3.4				
Dahomey	1.0	(¹)	1.0	.7		.7						.3		.3				.3				.2
Ethiopia	24.2	9.0	15.2	10.0		6.0		4.0				5.2		3.0	(.9)	.7		.9		1.4		2.2
Gabon	1.2		1.2	.7		.7						.5		(¹)				(¹)				.5
Ghana	3.0	.1	2.9	1.7		1.7						1.2		.6				.6				.6
Guinea	16.0		16.0	12.1		3.7		2.4		6.0		3.9		3.6	² (4.7)	3.6		(¹)				.3
Ivory Coast	7.9	.1	7.8	2.5		.8		1.7				5.3		(¹)				(¹)			4.7	
Kenya	5.7		5.7	4.9		2.7		2.2				.8		.8				.6				.2
Liberia	50.8	2.1	48.7	39.9		8.6		31.3				8.8		3.0				.2		2.8	4.5	1.6
Libya	12.5	1.1	11.4	10.4		1.4				9.0		1.0										1.4
Malagasy Republic	1.0		1.0	.5		.5						.5		.5				.5				
Mali, Republic of	4.6	.7	3.9																			

U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Region and country	Grand total	Total military	Economic assistance													
			Total economic	AID programs				Total	Social Progress Trust Fund	Other economic assistance					Export-Import Bank long-term loans	Other economic programs
				Total	Development grants program social progress	Development loans	Supporting assistance and other			Total	Food for peace (Public Law 48)					
											Total	Title I	Title II	Title III		
Total sales agreements	Planned for country use															
Africa—Continued																
Benegal	5.2	1.5	3.7	2.2	2.2			1.5		0.6				0.6	0.6	
Sierra Leone	3.9		3.9	2.5	2.5			1.4		.5				.5	.9	
Somali Republic	9.2		9.2	7.8	4.2	3.6		1.4		1.2		1.2	(4)		.2	
Sudan	11.0		11.0	6.5	2.7	3.8		4.5		4.5	(6.0)	4.5				
Tanganyika	12.5		12.5	8.9	2.0	6.9		3.6		3.3		3.0			.3	
Togo	1.3		1.3	.8	.8			.5		.2					.3	
Tunisia	71.9	(9)	71.9	32.3	2.2	23.3	6.8	39.6		39.0	(12.6)	11.3	25.7	2.0	.6	
Uganda	7.0		7.0	6.9	2.5	4.4		1.1		.1				.1		
Upper Volta	1.0		1.0	.5	.5			.5		.5				.5		
Zanzibar	(9)		(9)					(9)		(9)				(9)		
Other British territories	1		1					.1		.1				.1		
Regional	22.0	12.3	9.7	9.7	9.4		.3	(9)		.1				.1	(4)	
Europe	899.1	476.4	422.7	2.9	2.9			419.8		154.8	(145.6)	84.3	4.0	50.3	16.2	265.0
Austria	31.4		31.4					31.4								31.4
Belgium-Luxembourg	28.1	28.1														
Denmark	24.0	24.0														
France	30.6	30.5	.1					.1		.1						
Germany (Federal Republic)	.5	.3	.2					.2		.2				.2		
Iceland	1.4		1.4					1.4		1.4	(1.9)	1.4				
Italy (including Trieste)	300.7	72.4	228.3					228.3		14.4		4.0	10.4		213.9	
Netherlands	16.4	16.3	.1					.1		.1				.1		
Norway	38.7	38.7														
Poland	10.8		10.8	2.8	10.2.8			8.0		8.0	(51.6)			8.0		
Portugal	18.9	11.2	7.7					7.7		7.7				7.7		
Spain	61.0	31.8	29.2					29.2		9.5				9.5	19.7	
United Kingdom	11.2	11.2														
Yugoslavia	113.5		113.5	.1	.1			113.4		113.4	(92.1)	82.9		14.3	16.2	
Regional	211.9	211.9														
Nonregional	459.9	106.1	353.8	169.8	44.6		125.2	184.0		47.4				47.4		1136.6

¹ Represents Peace Corps.

² Includes prorations of multiyear agreements.

³ Military data classified and included in regional totals.

⁴ Less than \$50,000.

⁵ Represents \$60,000,000 subscription to Inter-American Development Bank;

⁶ \$15,200,000 for Peace Corps; and \$2,400,000 for Rama Road.

⁷ Excludes refinancings of \$72,000,000.

⁸ Represents \$73,000,000 war damage claims in the Philippines and \$7,100,000 for the Peace Corps.

⁹ Includes aid to Australia and New Zealand.

¹⁰ Represents \$13,000,000 for the Peace Corps and \$1,000,000 in Libya for special purpose funds.

¹¹ For Krakow Research Hospital.

¹² Includes \$61,700,000 subscription to the International Development Association and \$72,100,000 for U. N. bonds.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by

the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 19 to the bill and concurred therein.

MILLIONAIRE OIL AND GAS OPERATORS WHO PAID LITTLE OR NO TAXES IN 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is now in the process of considering one of the two most important measures before Congress this year—namely, the tax bill.

Despite public discussion about the bill in general, the specific details, both of the bill and of the existing tax structure, are not thoroughly understood by the American people, or, I venture to say, even by the Members of Congress.

The report made last February by the Secretary of the Treasury to the House

Ways and Means Committee indicated that in the field of depletion allowances, a total of approximately \$3,300 million was written off, and served as an exemption from taxes; that of this amount, a total of \$2,200 million was directly connected with gas and oil; and that companies not directly engaged in the gas and oil business possibly received additional amounts. This is one of the largest loopholes or "truck holes" in our entire system of taxation, and it is one of the most powerfully ensconced special privileges in our system of taxation.

OIL AND GAS DEDUCTIONS

We must recognize that the oil industry now is given various tax deductions. First, it very properly is given a deduction for operating expenses. This is entirely correct.

In addition, the cost of dry holes is written off against the income from the successful drillings.

In addition, from 75 percent to 90 percent of the exploration, drilling, and developmental costs, both tangible and intangible, is written off in the first year. This item comes to approximately \$2 billion.

In addition, those who are engaged in the oil and gas business receive a credit of 27½ percent of gross income, up to 50 percent of net income, which is completely free from taxation.

As I have said, the depletion allowance amounts, in all, to at least \$2,200 million for the gas and oil industry, and to approximately \$1,100 million for other industries.

These figures are so huge that apparently they do not make much impression upon the American people. For some 12 years some of us have been hammering home these facts on the floor of the Senate and in the public hearings before the Finance Committee. The special privileges thus received are so huge that they seem to slide off the mental back of the public as water is supposed to slide off a duck's back.

INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLES

The American people seem to be impressed by personal case histories. We introduced some of them in the course of the 1951 debate. We obtained from the Treasury Department a report on 10 individuals whose income was tabulated over a period of 5 years and whose taxes were stated. I remember that in one case a man had, over a 5-year period, a net income of \$13 million, but in that period of 5 years he paid only \$80,000, or two-thirds of 1 percent of his income in taxes. There were other cases, although not quite that striking. Nevertheless, they were very real. However, today these are treated as "old hat" and as not being applicable to the present.

So when this tax bill was under consideration, I asked the Treasury Department to assemble for me some case histories of persons with very large incomes from gas and oil, who paid very small amounts of taxes. This afternoon, I shall introduce, for the RECORD, six of these cases.

I shall begin with the case of a man whom we shall call exhibit O. According to the Treasury Department, in 1960 this man had a total income, before exploration, developmental, and nonallocated expenses, of \$28,716,469, or a total income of almost \$29 million before the deduction of these items. There was a deduction of \$1,546,000 for oil and gas exploration and developmental expenditures; and there was a deduction of \$729,693, for overhead expenses—or a total deduction for exploration, developmental and nonallocated overhead expenditures or costs of approximately \$2,276,000—leaving a total reported economic income of \$26,440,776. I repeat, Mr. President, that this man had a total reported economic income of \$26,440,776.

PAID NO TAXES ON \$26.4 MILLION INCOME

What do Senators suppose were the taxes he paid? Not a single cent, Mr. President. When the deductions were made for drilling and developmental costs, for capital gains, for the depletion allowance, and for certain other items, and also for the carryover of net losses in past years, absolutely no taxable income was left, and no Federal income tax was paid.

Mr. President, I submit that a study of this illustration, example D, should

convince people, and even should convince the Senate, that these existing "truck holes" in the tax system should be remedied.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Lest someone be misled or thrown off the track by the deduction of carry-forward losses of previous years, will the Senator from Illinois give that figure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it is \$3,934,000.

Mr. GORE. So even after that amount is subtracted, there would still be left an income of \$22 million a year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. It is economic income.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator has said, it is an amount on which no taxes were paid?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. As I understand it, the Senator is not alleging any violation of law on the part of this taxpayer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. He is, instead, showing that under the inequitable provisions of tax law, it was possible for a man with that perfectly enormous annual income to have no tax liability assessed against him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is completely correct. I dare say that the computation was completely legal, and completely in conformity with tax law. Of course, every advantage that could be taken of the Government was apparently taken, but the net result was the fact that the man to whom I refer, who had an income of \$26 million, paid no taxes at all, although a wage earner with a salary of \$100 a week, or \$5,200 a year, with a wife and two children, would pay approximately \$400.

Mr. GORE. Even though that wage earner would work as a butler, in the home of the man who had the large income, an oiler on his rig, or whatnot, he would pay his taxes out of every single paycheck he received?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Let us consider the case of another man, whom we call exhibit B, who had a total income, before oil and gas exploration and development expenditures, of \$4,020,000 in the year 1960. There was deducted from that amount oil and gas exploration and development expenditures of \$1,748,000, leaving a total reported economic income of \$2,271,000. Although I speak of oil and gas exploration and development expenditure, some of it, of course, is intangible. For those items that are tangible, it is the fastest writeoff in any industry in the country, with 75 to 90 percent being written off in the first year.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Many people do not understand the meaning of tangible and intangible costs as related to the tax law. It might be well if this was spelled out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some of the intangible drilling and development costs are labor, electricity, pipes, mud, and so forth, used in drilling the hole which in the case of a factory or in most other in-

dustry we consider costs which must be depreciated over a long period of years. In this industry they are written off in 1 year.

The tangible costs relate to the physical structure which remains over a period of time.

After all deductions were made, what do Senators suppose was the amount of taxes which the gentleman or lady to whom I have referred paid? Again, not 1 cent. Not 1 cent.

Let us consider exhibit O. Here is a man with a total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses of \$4,542,000 in the year 1960. After all deductions were made, he paid \$166,768 in taxes, or 7.9 percent of his economic income, which was \$2,110,000. A man earning only \$100 a week would pay about 8 percent. A man earning \$10,000 a year, of course, would pay much more.

NO TAXES PAID

Let us consider exhibit E, which is the case of a man with a total income before exploration development and nonallocated overhead expenses of \$1,522,000, and total reported economic income of \$1,179,000. What do Senators suppose were the taxes that he paid?

Not one single cent, Mr. President. Not 1 cent.

The deductions for drilling and developmental costs, the depletion allowance, the capital gains, the dry holes—all of those items, plus contributions, swept away all taxes completely.

Let me state the final two illustrations. Exhibit C is a case involving income, before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses, totaling \$2,201,000. Deducting the total exploration and development costs, the total reported income was \$1,707,000. That man paid net Federal taxes of \$142,808, or 8.4 percent upon his income. A man earning \$7,000 a year would pay a larger proportion than that.

Finally, the income of the individual in exhibit F is only \$1,307,962. I do not suppose he was up among the "singers" in the oil and gas group. After all deductions were made, he paid \$61,240 in taxes. His net tax, as a percentage of total reported economic income, was 5.9 percent.

There are other cases, which I am assembling.

SHOCKING SITUATION

Mr. President, I submit that what those six cases show is shocking. It seems to me the situation cannot really be defended. I am not proposing to eliminate the deduction for dry holes or unsuccessful drillings. I am not proposing to alter, as of this time at least, the allowances for drilling and developmental costs, tangible and intangible. I do have a modest proposal that the 27½-percent depletion allowance not be changed for enterprises which have a gross income of less than \$1 million a year; but the allowance would be reduced to 21 percent for enterprises whose gross income was between \$1 million and \$5 million, and diminished to 15 percent for enterprises over \$5 million—or, rather,

for the increments of income in excess of \$1 million and \$5 million respectively.

This proposal has been before Congress many times. It has always been voted down. I believe once there were 38 votes for it.

The proposal strikes at one of the greatest sources of privilege in our entire tax structure. It is opposed by the most powerful economic groups in the country, not the oil interests alone, but also those who own shares and stock in the oil properties and oil companies. They are extremely powerful. They are extremely well entrenched.

I suppose this special tax provision will survive even the figures which I am producing before the Senate this afternoon, which I have obtained from the U.S. Treasury, although I wish to make it clear that the Treasury does not endorse my proposal.

There are other facts as well. Some months ago the magazine *Fortune* published an article with detailed statistics estimating how much the depletion allowance meant to some 20 of the great oil companies of the country. At a later time I shall introduce that material into the RECORD.

TAXES OF OIL AND GAS COMPANIES

In years past I have discussed 28 other companies—generally smaller companies—and have examined their records historically and shown how they have been able to escape their fair share of taxation. There is one company whose name I have not made public but which, if stated, would be well known to every Member of this body which, over a period of 5 years, had net earnings of \$65 million but which did not pay a single cent in taxes and received a refund of approximately \$420,000. This was perhaps the most sensational case, but it cannot be said to be completely untypical.

We are maintaining the record on these 28 companies, and I hope at a later date to include additional material in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have been speaking in a somewhat impromptu fashion this afternoon, but I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks, plus the table which we have taken from the statistics given to us, may be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

THE ABUSE HAS SPREAD

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States may disregard this evil on the ground that the entrenched forces of special privilege are too strong to be attacked and that it is politically too hazardous to try to reduce the amounts which they are now evading and avoiding in taxes. But this is the greatest, though not the only, abuse in our existing tax system, and its existence has spread.

I believe the analogy is that, like the fruits of the upas tree, it has poisoned many branches of our whole system of taxation. It has been extended to vir-

tually everything that comes from underground; not merely sulfur but also oyster shells, clam shells, and sand and gravel. It has given to the average taxpayer the feeling that the game is rigged against him and that he is bearing the burden, while men with millions of dollars—and in one case, as we have seen, a man with \$26 million income a year—pay no taxes at all.

There are two ways of plugging loopholes and truckholes. One is to try to close them. That is the method which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I have been trying to follow.

The other method is to generalize special privilege so that everybody receives it. In other words, instead of raising the valleys, lower the mountains so that there is a flat level of special privilege.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. None of this special privilege, however generalized, seems to reach very generously in the direction of the mass of our people whose income is derived from wages and salaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. This is for the millionaires, primarily, but also for those with incomes of more than \$50,000 a year. They are the ones who receive the benefit.

Another test as to the sincerity of any system of tax reform is whether we make a beginning in closing the truckholes. The amendment which I have offered in the past and which I intend to offer in the future is most generous to the owners of royalty rights and to the wildcaters and small drillers, because there would be no change in the depletion allowance for those whose gross incomes were less than \$1 million a year. The decrease would fall entirely upon the earnings in excess of \$1 million, and earnings in excess of \$5 million.

There are reforms which can be introduced in the taxation of foreign oil companies, about which I shall not speak at the moment, but about which I intend to speak in the future.

Mr. President, unless some kind of reform is effected now, this Congress, in my judgment, will stand condemned before the bar of history, if not before the bar of current public opinion.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished Senator agree that the action most urgently needed, justified, and required in the public interest in the field of taxation is tax reform to remove the glaring inequities?

TAX REFORM AND TAX CUTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the measure which appeals to me most. I know there is a case for tax reduction as a stimulant to economic activity, provided it is not canceled by corresponding reductions in needed public expenditures or corresponding reductions in the amount of credit available for private industry. If there were a tax cut and Mr. Martin and the Federal Reserve Board were then to diminish by an equal amount the bank credit otherwise available for business, we would cancel with one hand what we

would create with the other and there would be no net stimulant.

Mr. GORE. Would not the same result be achieved if programs of public improvement now underway were curtailed by an amount equal to the reduction in revenues?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree. Of course, I am not in favor of the maintenance of inefficient expenditures or wasteful expenditures.

Mr. GORE. I understand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there were efficient and necessary expenditures which would otherwise be undertaken, and if they were curtailed or eliminated because of a tax cut, we would be helping to defeat with one hand what we were trying to achieve with the other.

Mr. GORE. I was speaking of the improvement of community facilities—schools, hospitals, streets, waterlines, sewers, and playgrounds.

I do not wish to draw the Senator into a discussion of the tax bill pending before the Finance Committee. I shall confine my questions—and this will be my last—to the tax favoritism extended to the oil and gas industry.

The Senator has pointed out some glaring examples of favoritism. Instead of removing these inequities, I ask the Senator if the tax bill pending before the Senate Finance Committee does not contain further benefits for the gas and oil industry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In one feature, benefits are reduced by approximately \$40 million a year, but there is also a reduction in the capital gains tax and certain other features which, while perhaps they do not directly relate to the gas and oil industry, will help recipients of large incomes, along with others.

The administration more or less ducked the issue of taking on this great abuse. It sought to reduce the oil and gas benefits by very complicated methods which probably, taken together, would have netted probably \$200 million of additional revenue. The House Ways and Means Committee eliminated all but one of those features, and the net gain is about \$40 million a year. This may disappear before it comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator bear in mind the special provision, which some people regarded as obscure when it was discovered, by which the added benefits of investment credit allowances are extended; and that the consideration of these benefits by the Federal Power Commission in determining a ratemaking base is prohibited by the terms of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The Senator is completely correct on that point. I hope it can be discussed later.

Two things have happened. First, the Long amendment of 1962 is to be eliminated. This will increase the amount of the investment credit. Second, the bill in its present form prevents the investment credits given to gas pipelines and utilities from being passed on to the public in the form of lower rates. These two features taken together will unduly increase the net income going to the gas and oil industry by a very appreciable

amount. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I shall not further divert him from his able remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am about finished.

Mr. GORE. I rose only to point out that the tax avoidance examples which he gave are increased, and that instead of the bill pending before the committee on which he and I serve being designed to remove these glaring injustices, in several instances the favoritism is increased rather than diminished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I lay this matter before the conscience of the Senate and, I hope, before the conscience of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details of these six examples of high-income oil operators who paid no or little taxes in the year 1960 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual A) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	\$45,000
Dividends.....	\$1,028,163
Interest (taxable).....	\$5,904
Capital gains (100 percent).....	\$717,166
Oil and gas production (before special deductions).....	\$2,336,729
Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and royalties.....	\$399,495
Farm income.....	\$9,990

Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$4,542,447
---	-------------

Less:	
Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures ²	\$2,072,069
Overhead expenses not allocated ³	\$360,318
Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	\$2,432,387

Total reported economic income.....	\$2,110,060
-------------------------------------	-------------

Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	\$45,000
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$1,028,063
Interest (taxable).....	\$5,904
Capital gains (50 percent).....	\$358,583
Oil and gas production:	
Net before special deductions.....	\$2,336,729
Less special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ⁴	\$881,297
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$464,704
Taxable income from oil and gas production.....	\$990,728
Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and royalties.....	\$399,495
Farm income.....	\$9,990

Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$2,837,763
--	-------------

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual A) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead ²	\$2,432,387
Adjusted gross income.....	\$405,376
Less deductions from adjusted gross income:	
Contributions.....	
Interest.....	
Taxes.....	\$2,157
Medical.....	\$85,483
Other.....	\$452
Total deductions.....	\$88,092

Net taxable income.....	\$317,284
Federal income tax:	
Computed tax before dividends credit.....	\$179,291
Less dividends received credit.....	\$12,523
Net Federal taxes.....	\$166,768

Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent).....	7.9
---	-----

¹ Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

² Including \$1,221,925 in dryhole expenses, \$520,508 in canceled and surrendered leases.

³ Interest expenses of \$382,766 is included in total overhead expenses of \$617,797. Some \$257,479 of total overhead was allocated to oil and gas production. The remaining \$360,318 was not allocated by income category.

⁴ Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual D) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	\$18,150
Dividends.....	\$64,398
Interest (taxable).....	\$852,639
Capital gains (100 percent) ¹	\$26,203,307
Oil and gas production (before special deductions) ²	\$1,534,082
Oil and gas royalties, drilling contracts, partnerships and miscellaneous ³	\$320,724
Farm income (loss).....	(\$276,368)

Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$28,716,932
---	--------------

Less:	
Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures.....	\$1,546,463
Overhead expenses not allocated.....	\$729,693
Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	\$2,276,156
Total reported economic income.....	\$26,440,776

Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	\$18,150
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$64,298
Interest (taxable).....	\$852,639
Capital gains (50 percent) ⁴	\$5,436,224
Oil and gas production:	
Net before special deductions.....	\$1,534,082

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual D) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Less:	
Special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ⁵	\$686,642
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$1,609,530
Taxable income (loss) from oil and gas production.....	(\$762,090)
Oil and gas royalties, drilling contracts, partnerships, and miscellaneous.....	\$320,724
Farm income (loss).....	(\$276,368)

Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$5,653,577
Less total exploration and development and nonallocated expenses.....	\$2,276,156

Adjusted gross income before carryover of net loss.....	\$3,377,421
Less net operating carryover from 1957 and 1959 ⁶	(\$3,934,047)

Adjusted gross income after carryover of net loss.....	(\$556,626)
Less total itemized deductions.....	\$289,704
Taxable income (loss) before personal exemptions.....	(\$846,330)
Federal income tax.....	0
Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent).....	0

¹ For tax purposes an installment of \$10,872,449 was reported in 1960 from a total capital gain realized of \$26,203,307 (under section 453(b)(2)(A)). The gain resulted from the sale of a reserved oil and gas production payment. A second installment of \$5,743,200 from this capital gain was reported in the 1961 tax return.

² Excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion, and intangible drilling expenses.

³ Includes net income from royalties, drilling contracts, drilling tools, and other sources, in part offset by net losses from partnerships in oil development and manufacturing operations.

⁴ Includes \$238,430 in interest, \$80,675 in general overhead and \$63,965 for employees' group insurance.

⁵ Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

⁶ \$232,050 loss carried over from 1957 and \$3,701,997 from 1958, primarily from oil operations.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual B) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	\$1,441
Dividends.....	\$120
Interest (taxable).....	\$1,642
Capital gains (100 percent).....	\$4,061,682
Oil and gas production (before special deductions) ¹	\$4,061,682
Oil and gas distribution, royalties, and other income.....	(\$44,536)

Total income before oil and gas exploration and development expenditures.....	\$4,020,349
---	-------------

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual B) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Total reported economic income—Continued	
Less oil and gas exploration and development expenditures ¹	\$1,748,626
Total reported economic income.....	\$2,271,723
Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$1,341
Interest (taxable).....	\$120
Capital gains (50 percent) ¹	
Oil and gas production:	
Net before special deductions.....	\$4,061,682
Less special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ⁴	\$1,529,667
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$1,464,230
Taxable income from oil and gas production.....	\$1,067,785
Oil and gas distribution, royalties and other income (loss).....	(\$44,536)
Total adjusted gross income before exploration and develop. expend.....	\$1,024,710
Less oil and gas exploration and development expenditures.....	\$1,748,626
Adjusted gross income.....	(\$723,916)
Less deductions from adjusted gross income:	
Contributions.....	\$
Interest.....	\$
Taxes.....	\$1,366
Medical.....	\$
Other.....	\$
Total deductions.....	\$1,366
Net taxable income.....	(\$725,252)
Federal income tax.....	0
Taxes as percent of total reported economic income.....	0

¹ Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

² Includes \$875,622 in dryhole expenses and \$765,620 in canceled and surrendered leases.

³ In 1960 capital gains offset by capital losses carried forward from previous years.

⁴ Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual C) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	\$100
Dividends.....	\$9,927
Interest (taxable).....	\$32,192
Capital gains (100 percent).....	\$571,950
Oil and gas production (before special deductions) ¹	\$2,197,052
Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and other income (loss) ²	\$27,731
Farm income (loss).....	(\$637,674)
Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$2,201,278

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual C) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Total reported economic income—Continued	
Less:	
Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures.....	\$286,527
Overhead expenses nonallocated.....	\$206,912
Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	\$493,439
Total reported economic income.....	\$1,707,839
Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	\$100
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$9,877
Interest (taxable).....	\$32,192
Capital gains (50 percent).....	\$285,975
Oil and gas production:	
Net before special deductions.....	\$2,197,052
Less special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ³	\$861,400
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$106,010
Taxable income from oil and gas production.....	\$1,229,962
Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and other income (loss).....	\$27,731
Farm income (loss).....	(\$637,674)
Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$947,843
Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	\$493,439
Adjusted gross income.....	\$454,404
Less deductions from adjusted gross income:	
Contributions.....	\$38,940
Interest.....	\$49,435
Taxes.....	\$63,365
Medical.....	\$
Other.....	\$62,648
Total deductions.....	\$214,388
Net taxable income.....	\$240,016
Federal income tax:	
Computed tax before dividends credit.....	\$143,203
Less dividends received credit.....	\$395
Net Federal taxes.....	\$142,808
Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent).....	8.4

¹ Excess percentage depletion (footnote 3) and intangible drilling expenses.

² Includes losses on various business ventures, offset by net income from others.

³ Excess of percentage over adjusted basis depletion.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual E) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	\$250
Dividends.....	\$73,176
Interest (taxable).....	\$320,731
Capital gains (100 percent) ¹	\$610,257

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual E) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Total reported economic income—Continued	
Oil and gas production (before special deductions) ²	\$440,918
Oil and gas royalties and miscellaneous income.....	\$83,499
Farm income (loss).....	(\$6,353)
Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$1,522,478
Less:	
Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures ³	\$222,671
Overhead expenses not allocated ⁴	\$120,559
Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	\$343,230
Total reported economic income.....	\$1,179,248
Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	\$250
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$73,076
Interest (taxable).....	\$320,731
Capital gains (50 percent).....	\$66,164
Oil and gas production:	
Net before special deductions.....	\$440,918
Less special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ⁵	\$217,513
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$59,339
Taxable income from oil and gas production.....	\$164,066
Oil and gas royalties and miscellaneous income.....	\$83,499
Farm income (loss).....	(\$6,353)
Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$701,433
Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	\$343,230
Adjusted gross income before net operating loss carryover.....	\$358,203
Less net operating loss carryover from 1958.....	(\$27,558)
Adjusted gross income after carryover of net loss.....	\$330,645
Less deductions from adjusted gross income:	
Contributions ⁶	\$511,419
Interest.....	\$
Taxes.....	\$2,950
Medical.....	\$1,133
Other.....	\$135
Total deductions.....	\$515,637
Net taxable income (before exemptions).....	(\$184,992)
Federal income tax.....	0
Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent).....	0

¹ Includes \$125,469 from sale of oil and gas leases and \$477,929 excess of market value over book value of gift (unimproved land in a major city) to a foundation.

See footnotes at end of table.

² Excess percentage depletion (footnote 5) and intangible drilling expenses.

³ Includes \$145,867 for drilling expenditures on nonproducing leases and \$41,202 for leases expired and surrendered.

⁴ Includes \$82,700 for general and administrative expenses.

⁵ Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

⁶ Includes contribution to foundation referred to in footnote 1.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual F) with low effective tax rate, 1960

Total reported economic income:	
Salary.....	
Dividends.....	\$191,933
Interest (taxable).....	\$1,157
Capital gains (100 percent).....	\$120,089
Oil and gas production (before special deductions) ¹	\$767,488
Oil and gas royalties, partnership, trust, and miscellaneous ²	\$227,295
Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses.....	
	\$1,307,962
Less:	
Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures ³	\$175,665
Overhead expenses not allocated.....	\$102,757
Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	
	\$278,422
Total reported economic income.....	
	\$1,029,540
Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes:	
Salary.....	
Dividends less exclusion.....	\$191,833
Interest (taxable).....	\$1,157
Capital gains (50 percent) ⁴	\$60,940
Oil and gas production: Net before special deductions.....	\$767,488
Less special deductions:	
Excess percentage depletion ⁵	\$297,703
Intangible drilling expenses.....	\$536,955
Taxable income (loss) from oil and gas production.....	
	(\$67,170)
Oil and gas royalties, partnership, trust and miscellaneous.....	\$227,295
Overhead.....	\$278,422
Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead.....	
	\$414,055
Less total exploration and development and nonallocated adjusted gross income.....	
	\$135,633
Less deductions from adjusted gross income:	
Contributions.....	\$1,151
Interest.....	\$1,471
Taxes.....	\$1,066

See footnotes at end of table.

Example of actual high income oil operator (individual F) with low effective tax rate, 1960—Continued

Medical.....	0
Other.....	0
Total deductions.....	
	\$3,688
Net taxable income (before exemption).....	
	\$131,945
Federal income tax:	
Computed tax before dividends received and foreign tax credit.....	\$66,628
Less dividends received and foreign tax credits.....	\$5,388
Net Federal taxes.....	
	\$61,240
Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent).....	
	5.9

¹ Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

² Includes \$166,804 from a family partnership and \$56,619 from rents and royalties.

³ Includes \$152,368 for leases canceled and expired.

⁴ Includes a small amount of short-term capital gains at 100 percent.

⁵ Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

EXHIBIT 1

EXAMPLES OF MILLIONAIRE OIL AND GAS OPERATORS WHO PAID LITTLE OR NO TAXES IN 1960

During the hearings on the tax bill before the Senate Finance Committee, I asked Secretary Dillon to provide me with illustrations of actual cases in which oil operators with large incomes paid little or no taxes.

He has now furnished me with six such cases for 1960. In these cases we find individual oil operators with economic incomes ranging from \$1.3 to \$28.7 million a year. It will amaze my colleagues to know that the oil operator with \$28.7 million of economic income for 1960 paid not one single cent in Federal income taxes for that year.

Another taxpayer with \$4 million in economic income—that is, salary, dividends, interest, capital gains, income from oil and gas production, income from oil and gas manufacturing, distribution, and royalties, and other income such as farm income—paid no income taxes at all.

Another oil operator with \$1.5 million in economic income paid no taxes at all in 1960.

Of the remaining three, one man with \$4.5 million in economic income paid only \$166,768 in Federal taxes, or about 3 percent of his total economic income, and only 7.9 percent of his economic income less his oil and gas deductions.

Another, who had \$2.2 million in total economic income and \$1.7 million in net income, paid only \$142,808 in Federal taxes, or only 8.4 percent of his reported economic income, and about 6 percent of his total economic income.

Further, the sixth taxpayer had total economic income of \$1,307,962 and a net economic income of \$1,029,540. He paid only \$61,240 in Federal taxes for 1960, or 5.9 percent of his net economic income and a little less than 5 percent of his total economic income.

The proportion of their income paid in Federal taxes for those with total incomes of \$1.3 million to \$28.7 million were far lower

even for the three who paid any taxes at all than is paid by an average man and wife with two children and with \$5,000 of income per year.

OUTRAGEOUS SITUATION

This is an unjust and outrageous situation. This is why many of us have been pressing for tax reform for, if the tax laws are not reformed and examples such as this continue, the ordinary person will lose faith in his Government and in the fairness of our tax system.

The low tax rates for three of these millionaires and the three examples where no taxes were paid at all, are the result of the numerous loopholes and truck holes in our tax laws and particularly those which favor oil and gas.

HOW IT WAS DONE

In example A there were deductions of \$2.4 million for oil and gas exploration and development and nonallocated overhead costs.

In another example the oil deductions for exploration and development expenditures, as well as depletion, plus the ability to carry forward capital losses, resulted in the payment of no taxes at all on economic income of over \$4 million.

In other examples we find that the write-offs and deductions give adjusted gross income figures, which is what the ordinary taxpayer pays his taxes on, of from no taxable income to as little as 20 percent of total income which is taxable.

In the case of the man with \$28 million in economic income, of which \$26 million was capital gains on the sale of a reserve oil and gas production payment, only a part of these gains were required to be reported for taxable purposes in the year in which the gain was made. Exploration and development costs further reduced his taxable income as did percentage depletion and intangible drilling expenses, as well as loss carryovers from previous years.

The 27½-percent depletion allowance, the fact that under the intangible drilling and development cost provision from 70 to 90 percent of costs can be written off in the first year, the capital gains provisions for oil and gas, and the loss carryover provisions as well as the other loopholes in the tax laws, are the means by which these six millionaire oil operators paid little or no taxes in 1960.

WE CAN ACT NOW

The Senate Finance Committee, the Senate, and the Congress as a whole will soon have an opportunity to do something about this incredible situation. The minute reforms in the House-passed tax bill scarcely reach these individual millionaires who, in some cases, pay no taxes at all and who in other cases pay taxes at lower rates than the ordinary family workingman in the United States. One of the reasons many of us have been dismayed about the attitude of the Treasury is that Mr. Dillon stated that they do not intend to push for any reform not in the House-passed bill.

Because of these and other examples, some of us have been pushing for tax reform as well as tax reduction. The Treasury, and the administration, and the Senate, and the Congress, and the country cannot close their eyes to this gross injustice in our tax laws. In view of these examples, the Treasury cannot properly give up on needed reform, as it has now done.

In the days which follow, I expect to put in the RECORD information concerning both large and small oil and gas corporations as opposed to the examples of the individual oil operators which I am speaking about today.

TABLE I.—Examples of high income oil operators with low effective tax rates (1960)

Taxpayer	(1) Total economic income	(2) Reported economic income	(3) Adjusted gross income	(4) Net taxable income	(5) Federal income tax	(6) Federal income tax as percentage of total reported economic income (col. 2)
A.....	\$4,542,447	\$2,110,060	\$405,376	\$317,284	\$166,768	7.9
B.....	4,020,349	2,271,723	(723,916)	(725,232)	0	0
C.....	2,201,278	1,707,839	454,404	240,016	142,808	8.4
D.....	28,716,932	26,440,776	¹ (556,626)	² (846,330)	0	0
E.....	1,522,478	1,179,248	330,645	² (184,992)	0	0
F.....	1,307,982	1,029,540	135,633	² 131,945	61,240	5.9

¹ After carryover of net loss.² Before personal exemptions.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. 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. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Depart-

ment of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all of the Senate conferees.

All legislation is the result of compromise. In general, I believe that the Senate conferees did very well in upholding the position of the Senate. The conference report provides \$4,406,272,700, which is \$94,690,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$130,156,300 above the House; \$155,684,300 below the budget; and \$1,128,429,910 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary table explaining the action of the conferees on the various items in the bill.

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

TABLE 1.—Summary table

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES				
Salaries and expenses.....	\$10,846,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL				
General investigations.....	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,600,000	19,115,000
Construction, general.....	819,486,000	798,282,700	849,856,000	827,146,500
Operation and maintenance, general.....	157,368,000	150,000,000	157,368,000	154,000,000
General expenses.....	15,282,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....	74,860,000	74,500,000	80,406,000	77,862,000
U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.....			10,000	10,000
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control.....	1,087,026,000	1,055,782,700	1,123,240,000	1,093,133,500
THE PANAMA CANAL				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses.....	26,465,000	25,000,000	25,725,000	25,725,000
Capital outlay.....	7,250,000	6,500,000	7,250,000	6,500,000
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses.....	(9,550,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,285,000)	(9,285,000)
Total, the Panama Canal.....	33,715,000	31,500,000	32,975,000	32,225,000
Total, title I.....	1,131,587,000	1,098,082,700	1,167,015,000	1,136,158,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
General investigations.....	11,361,000	9,894,000	10,442,000	10,294,000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	185,431,000
Operation and maintenance.....	38,588,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)
Loan program.....	13,300,000	12,217,000	12,367,000	12,367,000
Emergency fund.....				
Upper Colorado River Basin Fund.....	101,287,000	97,845,700	97,989,200	97,989,200
General administrative expenses.....	10,051,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	370,347,000	348,146,700	356,223,200	354,081,200
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction.....	56,058,000	36,000,000	36,204,000	36,204,000
Operation and maintenance.....	13,929,000	13,200,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	69,987,000	49,200,000	49,704,000	49,704,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction.....	3,520,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,568,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....	5,088,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Total, definite appropriations.....	446,422,000	402,846,700	411,427,200	409,285,200
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000
Total, title II.....	455,285,000	411,709,700	420,290,200	418,148,200

TABLE 1.—Summary table—Continued

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION				
Operating expenses.....	\$2,423,500,000	\$2,308,169,000	\$2,369,524,000	\$2,342,669,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)
Plant and capital equipment.....	426,145,000	380,000,000	418,695,000	400,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	2,788,219,000	2,742,669,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	48,284,000	46,000,000	48,284,000	47,142,000
Delaware River Basin Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	39,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission.....	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission.....	156,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins.....				
Total, definite appropriations.....	2,898,085,000	2,734,324,000	2,836,658,000	2,789,966,000
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Total, title III.....	2,930,085,000	2,766,324,000	2,868,658,000	2,821,966,000
TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Public works acceleration.....	45,000,000		45,000,000	30,000,000
Total, title IV.....	45,000,000		45,000,000	30,000,000
Grand totals: Total, definite appropriations.....	4,521,094,000	4,235,253,400	4,460,100,200	4,365,409,700
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000
Grand total, all titles.....	4,561,957,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. For general investigations of the Corps of Engineers the bill provides \$19,115,000, which is \$1,485,000 below the amount approved by

the Senate; \$1,115,000 above the amount allowed by the House; and \$1,015,000 above the appropriation for 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation

showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

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

TABLE 2.—General investigations

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
1. Surveys:				
(a) Navigation studies.....	\$1,535,000	\$1,828,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,164,000
(b) Flood control studies.....	4,440,000	4,777,000	5,875,000	5,351,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies.....	350,000	375,000	400,000	400,000
(d) Comprehensive basin studies:				
Big Black River, Miss.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Big Muddy River, Ill.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Colorado River, Tex.....	215,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N. H.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Fox River, Wis.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Genesee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grand River Basin, Mich.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Missouri River Basin.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Neches River, Tex.....	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Ohio River Basin review.....	775,000	775,000	775,000	775,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Puget Sound area, Washington.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Sabine River, Tex.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
St. Johns River Basin, Maine.....	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md.....	330,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin.....	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Wabash River, Ind. and Ill.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg.....	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(e) Special Studies:				
Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.....	50,000	50,000	200,000	125,000
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.).....	300,000	30,000	300,000	300,000
Great Lakes water levels.....	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.....	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Hurricane studies.....	387,000	387,000	387,000	387,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.....	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska.....	197,000	197,000	197,000	197,000
San Francisco Bay area survey, California.....	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Texas coast.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Hudson River siltation study.....			55,000	55,000
General reduction applied against basin surveys.....		-1,000,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000
Subtotal surveys.....	13,234,000	12,989,000	14,489,000	13,554,000

TABLE 2.—General investigations—Continued

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
2. Collection and study of basic data:				
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....	\$280,000	\$280,000	\$280,000	\$280,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
International water studies.....	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Flood plain studies.....	715,000	715,000	715,000	715,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data.....	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
3. Research and development:				
Beach erosion development studies.....	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
Hydrologic studies.....	185,000	185,000	185,000	185,000
Engineering studies.....	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
Plan formulation and evaluation studies.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Construction.....	461,000	461,000	461,000	461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.....	1,915,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development.....	5,056,000	4,341,000	4,341,000	4,341,000
General reduction due to slippage.....		-1,100,000		-550,000
Total, general investigations.....	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,600,000	19,115,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Mr. ELLENDER. For construction, general, the conference bill provides \$827,146,500 which is \$22,709,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$28,863,800 above the House; and \$34,276,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As I stated earlier this week, when the bill was before the Senate, the House added some new unbudgeted items, which upon review by the Senate committee proved to be desirable projects, and the committee recommended approval of their inclusion in

the bill. The Senate concurred in that recommendation.

The House added 17 new planning starts, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The Senate added 28 new planning starts, and the House approved 20 of these additional planning items approved by the Senate.

The House added 19 new construction starts involving a future commitment of \$89,560,000. These projects were accepted by the Senate. The Senate added 23 additional construction starts. The House accepted 15 of the new starts added by the Senate having a future

commitment of \$20,953,000. The budget provided for 34 new starts having a future commitment of \$365,483,000. Thus the conference bill provides for 68 new construction starts involving a future commitment of \$475,996,000, or about 6 months work at the current rate of appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

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

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:								
(N) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.).....								
(MP) Holt lock and dam.....	\$7,700,000		\$7,700,000		\$7,700,000		\$7,700,000	
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam.....		\$250,000		\$250,000		\$250,000		\$250,000
(MP) Millers Ferry lock and dam.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Paint Rock River.....	231,000		231,000		231,000		231,000	
(N) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.....						225,000		
(MP) Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia).....	500,000				500,000		500,000	
(N) West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.).....								
Alaska:								
(N) Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin.....					921,000		921,000	
(MP) Snettishan power project.....		225,000		225,000		300,000		225,000
Arizona:								
(FC) Alamo Reservoir.....	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir.....		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Tucson diversion channel.....	1,750,000		1,750,000		1,750,000		1,750,000	
Arkansas:								
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification.....	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
(b) Navigation locks and dams.....	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
(MP) Beaver Reservoir.....	10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000	
(MP) Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8.....					567,000		567,000	
(MP) Dardanelle lock and dam.....	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC) De Queen Reservoir.....		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(MP) Degray Reservoir.....	2,350,000		2,350,000		2,350,000		2,350,000	
(FC) Dierks Reservoir.....		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Garland City.....					230,000		230,000	
(FC) Gillam Reservoir.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) Greers Ferry Reservoir.....	2,917,000		2,917,000		2,917,000		2,917,000	
(FC) Manatee Bayou, upstream extension.....					200,000		200,000	
(FC) McKinney Bayou, upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas.....						44,000		44,000
(FC) Millwood Reservoir.....	15,600,000		15,600,000		15,600,000		15,600,000	
(MP) Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit.....	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(N) Quachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,300,000		1,000,000	
(N) Ozark lock and dam.....		285,000		285,000		285,000		285,000
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.....	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts.....						75,000		37,500

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
California:									
(FC)	Alameda Creek		\$250,000		\$250,000		\$250,000		\$250,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	\$600,000		\$600,000		\$600,000		\$600,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir				125,000		125,000		125,000
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek					20,000		20,000	
(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor				95,000		95,000		95,000
(FC)	Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement		150,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	610,000		610,000		610,000		610,000	
(N)	Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor	1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000	
(N) Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)									
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Morrison Slough					50,000		50,000	
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	8,000,000		4,555,000		4,555,000		4,555,000	
(N)	Redondo Beach King Harbor	950,000		950,000		950,000		950,000	
(N)	Redwood City Harbor			660,000		660,000		660,000	
(FC)	Redwood Creek		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	335,000		335,000		335,000		335,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,500,000		70,000		1,500,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	900,000		840,000		900,000		840,000	
(N)	Santa Barbara Harbor					50,000		50,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant)	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Tahchevak Creek			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(BE)	Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)	122,000		122,000		122,000		122,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	100,000		500,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
Colorado:									
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		86,000		86,000	300,000		86,000	
Connecticut:									
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(R)	Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(N)	Connecticut River below Hartford, North Cove at Old Saybrook								
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir	685,000		685,000		685,000		685,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	New London Barrier					50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(BE)	Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000	
(FC)	Stamford	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Delaware:									
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)									
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	831,000		831,000		831,000		831,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	11,000,000		11,000,000		12,000,000		11,000,000	
Florida:									
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)									
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bakers Hanover Inlet	204,000		204,000		250,000		250,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	14,000,000		14,000,000		15,500,000		14,750,000	
(N)	Cross Florida barge canal	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Interoceanic Waterway:								
	(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	950,000		950,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
	(b) Jacksonville to Miami	2,085,000		2,085,000		2,085,000		2,085,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	9,000		9,000		9,000		9,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor					250,000		250,000	
(N)	Pensacola Harbor					299,000		299,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	575,000		575,000		575,000		575,000	
Georgia:									
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)									
(MP)	Carters Dam	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C.			270,000		270,000		270,000	
(N) Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)									
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.		350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
Hawaii:									
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000
(R)	Kahului Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Kaunakakai Harbor					100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	766,000		766,000		766,000		766,000	
Idaho:									
(FC)	Boise Valley	409,000		409,000		409,000		409,000	
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruce Eddy) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir		375,000		375,000		375,000		375,000

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Illinois:									
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:								
	(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,900,000		5,700,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Chicago Harbor—1962 act						\$27,000		\$27,000
(FC)	Clear Lake Special Drainage District		\$51,000		\$51,000		51,000		51,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Freeport		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)								
(N)	Kaskaskia River		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC)	McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.								
	(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir		501,000		501,000	10,000	501,000		501,000
(FC)	Richland Creek		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee					150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)	695,000		695,000		695,000		695,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		166,000		166,000		166,000		166,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee					300,000		300,000	
Indiana:									
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,871,000		9,871,000		9,871,000		9,871,000	
(FC)	Evansville	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	825,000		825,000		1,000,000		825,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee	650,000		650,000		750,000		650,000	
(FC)	McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	3,520,000		3,520,000		4,000,000		3,520,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
Iowa:									
(FC)	Charlton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)								
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehauffey Bridge			150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Dubuque				35,000		35,000		35,000
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries	3,800,000		3,722,000		3,722,000		3,722,000	
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Little Sioux River	1,148,000		1,148,000		1,148,000		1,148,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth	2,700,000		2,700,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisiana County Drainage District No. 13	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir			400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	11,200,000		11,200,000		11,200,000		11,200,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir			400,000		400,000		400,000	
Kansas:									
(FC)	Atchison		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir					35,000		35,000	
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Dodge City		185,000		185,000		185,000		185,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	580,000		580,000		580,000		580,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Melvorn Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Merriam					50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	14,925,000		14,925,000		14,925,000		14,925,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Osawatimie		39,000		39,000		39,000		39,000
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	1,887,000		1,887,000		1,887,000		1,887,000	
(FC)	Topeka	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	6,600,000		6,600,000		6,600,000		6,600,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Kentucky:									
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.	\$27,000,000		\$27,000,000		\$27,000,000		\$27,000,000	
(FC)	Barren River Reservoir	7,067,000		7,067,000		7,067,000		7,067,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,200,000		9,200,000		10,000,000		9,200,000	
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir		\$320,000		\$150,000		\$250,000		\$250,000
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir		220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000
(MP)	Celina Dam (deferred)		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Corbin	270,000		270,000		270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Cumberland		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir					100,000			100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	4,220,000		4,220,000		4,220,000		4,220,000	
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC)	Red River Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
Louisiana:									
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, salt water barrier		103,000		103,000	47,000	103,000	47,000	103,000
(FC)	Campiti Clarence levee		23,000		23,000	100,000	23,000	100,000	23,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Twelve Mile Bayou					1 (258,000)		1 (258,000)	
Maine:									
(N)	Narragausus River			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	2,000,000		1,000,000		2,000,000		1,500,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)								
(N)	Seasport Harbor (1962 act)	718,000		718,000		718,000		718,000	
Maryland:									
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.)								
Massachusetts:									
(N)	Boston Harbor, Chelsea River				40,000		40,000		40,000
(R)	Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	1,385,000		1,385,000		1,385,000		1,385,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	Gloucester Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	3,634,000		3,634,000		3,634,000		3,634,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor (1962 act)				35,000		35,000		35,000
(BE)	Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000		7,000		7,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Westfield		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Michigan:									
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	1,485,000		1,485,000		1,485,000		1,485,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor					200,000		200,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (north revetment)	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.)								
(N)	Muskegon Harbor		18,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(R)	Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Ontonagon Harbor					75,000		75,000	
(FC)	Rouge River		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe lock	242,000		242,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Minnesota:									
(N)	Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:								
	(a) Inner harbor, 27- and 23-foot channels	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	(b) Outer harbor, 32- to 27-foot channels	1,162,000		1,162,000		1,162,000		1,162,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	696,000		696,000		696,000		696,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Winona	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Mississippi:									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Natchez					115,000		115,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Missouri:									
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Canton	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.			400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Hannibal		300,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir								
	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		650,000		650,000		350,000		650,000
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	330,000		330,000		330,000		330,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(MP)	Montana: Libby Reservoir		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
Nebraska:									
(FC)	Clarkson					1 (205,000)		1 (205,000)	
(FC)	Gering Valley	650,000		650,000		650,000		600,000	
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Norfolk		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000	
(FC)	Nevada: Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.						100,000		100,000
(N)	New Hampshire: Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
New Jersey:									
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorage), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	2,200,000		2,200,000		3,000,000		2,200,000	
(R)	Manasquan River (bulkheads)	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel					400,000		400,000	
(R)	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	690,000		690,000		690,000		690,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
New Mexico:									
(FC)	Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		308,000		308,000		308,000		308,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Las Cruces		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Socorro	1,235,000		1,235,000		1,235,000		1,235,000	
New York:									
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:								
	(a) Outer harbor (1962 modification)			250,000		250,000		250,000	
	(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels	707,000		707,000		707,000		707,000	
(N)	Buttermilk Channel	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	500,000		500,000		600,000		500,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)		917,000		917,000		917,000		917,000
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway		380,000		380,000		380,000		380,000
(FC)	Herkimer		286,000		286,000		286,000		286,000
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Lackawanna	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lake Chatauga and Chadakoin River		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(R)	Little Sodus Bay (piers)		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)								
(N)	Oswego Harbor (1962 act)				60,000		60,000		60,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	1,025,000		1,025,000		1,025,000		1,025,000	
(FC)	Rosendale				100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Salamanca				20,000		20,000		20,000
(FC)	South Amsterdam	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
North Carolina:									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(BE)	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach					54,000		54,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir (not authorized)					180,000		180,000	
(FC)	Swift Creek			250,000		250,000		250,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)					135,000		135,000	
North Dakota:									
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir					300,000		300,000	
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (Not authorized.)					300,000		300,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
South Dakota:									
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	\$23,800,000		\$23,800,000		\$23,800,000		\$23,800,000	
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.)								
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000	
Tennessee:									
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam	2,400,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	3,700,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(BA)	Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Texas:									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	3,682,000		3,682,000		3,682,000		3,682,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension		\$132,000		\$132,000		\$132,000		\$132,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Freepoint and vicinity		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios				30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes	562,000		562,000		562,000		562,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	North Fork Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Vjola	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway:								
	(a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
	(b) Rectification and widening (1954 act)	2,138,000		2,138,000		2,138,000		2,138,000	
(MP)	Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	12,450,000		12,450,000		12,450,000		12,450,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	8,100,000		8,100,000		8,100,000		8,100,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC)	Texas City	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Texas City Channel (dikes)	835,000		835,000		835,000		835,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
Vermont:									
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	555,000		555,000		555,000		555,000	
(FC)	Victory Reservoir (deferred)		65,000		65,000		65,000		65,000
Virginia:									
(R)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)	620,000		620,000		620,000		620,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Norfolk	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
Washington:									
(FC)	Collax	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		39,000		39,000		39,000		39,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam		884,000		884,000		884,000		884,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,000,000		23,000,000		23,000,000		23,000,000	
(N)	Port Townsend	598,000		598,000		598,000		598,000	
(FC)	Pullman		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	729,000		729,000		729,000		729,000	
(N)	Swinomish Slough		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Tacoma Harbor		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Washougal area		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
West Virginia:									
(FC)	Barboursville					¹ (150,000)		¹ (150,000)	
(FC)	Beech Fork Reservoir						150,000		
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
(FC)	Buckhannon		73,000		73,000		73,000		73,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		280,000		280,000		280,000		280,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Justice Reservoir		300,000		150,000		300,000		300,000
	Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N)	Opeksiska lock and dam	5,058,000		5,058,000		5,058,000		5,058,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	10,900,000		10,900,000		10,900,000		10,900,000	
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Wisconsin:								
Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC) Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000	
(N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)						150,000		\$50,000
(N) Kenosha Harbor			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(R) Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)		\$30,000		\$30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Kickapoo River			50,000		50,000		50,000	
(R) Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis.	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N) Milwaukee Harbor		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(R) Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(R) Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)	188,000		188,000		188,000		188,000	
(R) Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole	479,000		479,000		479,000		479,000	
Miscellaneous:								
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation	4,000,000		4,000,000		5,000,000		4,500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing					750,000		750,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$200,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(BE) Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$400,000	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		(150,000)		(158,000)	(158,000)		(158,000)	
Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Small authorized projects	2,128,000		2,128,000		2,750,000		2,750,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R) Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to \$400,000)	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
Employees compensation	72,000		72,000		72,000		72,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	-65,000,000		-84,672,000		-65,000,000		-75,000,000	
General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities			-6,033,300				-3,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	800,471,000	19,015,000	778,407,700	19,875,000	\$27,528,000	22,328,000		
	(819,486,000)		(798,282,700)		(849,856,000)			

¹ Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects. ² 40-foot channel.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. ELLENDER. For Mississippi River and tributaries the conference report provides \$77,862,000, which is \$2,544,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$3,362,000 above the House; \$3,002,000 above the budget; and \$4,358,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Unfortunately, there is an error in the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the printed conference report, House Report No. 1027. On page 19 of that report it appears that the conferees agreed on \$50,000 to start construction of the Cache River project in Arkansas. This is an error. The tabulation at the bottom of page 24233 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 11,

1963, correctly reflects the action of the conferees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation explaining the action of the conferees on the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

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

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1964

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys	\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	85,000		85,000		85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees	2,580,000		2,580,000		2,800,000		2,700,000	
Channel improvement	26,500,000		26,500,000		28,000,000		27,250,000	
Memphis Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Old River control	1,225,000		1,225,000		1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	850,000		850,000		850,000		850,000	
Cache River	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	395,000		395,000		395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	58,000		58,000		58,000		58,000	
Enid Reservoir	56,000		56,000		56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	49,000		49,000		49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000		37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
Tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc.	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yazoo backwater	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Bayou Cocardie and tributaries	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	7,000,000		7,000,000		8,000,000		7,500,000	
Lake Pontchartrain					182,000		182,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	54,250,000		54,200,000		57,152,000		55,752,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	-1,500,000		-1,810,000		-1,500,000		-1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,750,000		52,390,000		55,652,000		54,252,000	
3. Maintenance	22,000,000		22,000,000		24,644,000		23,500,000	
Grand total	74,800,000		74,500,000		80,406,000		77,862,000	

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction, and Rehabilitation, the conference bill provides \$185,431,000 for this item, which is \$1,994,000 below

the amount approved by the Senate; \$5,241,000 above the amount allowed by the House; \$10,329,000 below the budget; and \$21,913,000 above the appropriation for 1963. Mr. President, I ask unanimous

consent to insert in the record a tabulation showing the action of the conferees on this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Advance planning	\$692,000	\$692,000	\$692,000	\$692,000
Gila project, Arizona	2,855,000	2,855,000	2,855,000	2,855,000
Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California	4,350,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	973,000	973,000	973,000	973,000
Central Valley project, California	50,445,000	48,295,000	48,295,000	48,295,000
Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Rio Grande project, recreational facilities, New Mexico	460,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Arbuckle project, Oklahoma	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Norman project, Oklahoma	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg.	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
The Dalles project, Western division, Oregon	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	642,000	642,000	642,000	642,000
Canadian River project, Texas	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	11,309,000	11,309,000	11,309,000	11,309,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	3,900,000	3,900,000	4,950,000	4,650,000
Spokane Valley project, Washington	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000	3,943,000	3,943,000	3,943,000
Denver office computer	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Reclamation office building			800,000	350,000
Subtotal	129,176,000	127,066,000	128,916,000	128,166,000
Missouri River Basin project:				
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Almena unit, Kansas	5,580,000	3,983,000	4,403,000	3,983,000
East Bench unit, Montana	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,787,000	1,787,000	1,787,000	1,787,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota	365,000	365,000	365,000	365,000
Transmission division	23,956,000	23,000,000	23,275,000	23,275,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,258,000	2,258,000	2,258,000	2,258,000
Investigations	1,824,000	1,557,000	1,717,000	1,717,000
Advance planning	1,343,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	78,613,000	75,650,000	76,505,000	76,085,000
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,322,300	3,180,000	3,180,000	3,180,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	81,935,300	78,830,000	79,685,000	79,265,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300	205,896,000	208,601,000	207,431,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	-15,361,300	-25,706,000	-21,176,000	22,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	185,431,000

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is discussing the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. I have before me the report of the conference committee, at page 22. I notice that under the heading "Kansas," for the Almena unit, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1964, for construction, was \$5,580,000, and that the conference committee allowed \$3,983,000.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if the reduction was made because the original amount included funds to be made available for the beginning of work on the irrigation project, and if the funds for the construction of the dam itself remain as proposed originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. While I had hoped that the bill would contain funds for the irrigation section, we are pleased that it contains funds for the construction of the dam. I assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that next year and in future years I shall return to ask for funds for the irrigation section as well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am hopeful that Congress will agree with the suggestion of my friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to title III, very little change was made by the conferees. As Senators know, that title deals with TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and so forth. Very little change was made in that title.

I have already submitted to the Senate the table indicating exactly what was done as to each agency in that title.

During the consideration of the public works appropriation bill, H.R. 9140, by the Senate, I discussed the meaning of the Senate committee language on the SPA continuing fund item. This language reads as follows:

The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration; or to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration. The Administration should give preference in the sale of power and energy to public bodies and cooperatives, as provided by law; but it should not participate directly or indirectly in the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is

available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

I stated during the discussion of the bill that in my opinion the Senate committee language is a restatement of existing law. The hearings on the bill disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee, therefore, felt it necessary to restate the law and the congressional policy.

It was believed that the language might cause an adverse effect on contracting which must be done by an ordinary distribution cooperative with SPA or might be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. It was suggested that the language be further discussed in conference.

There was no intention on the part of the committee to adversely affect the operations of REA and SPA, as those operations have been authorized by the Congress. However, to make certain that the language did not affect the contracts entered into with SPA by distribution cooperatives and to make certain

that it did not affect the right of preference users to public power, the committee on the conference has restated this language. However, neither the language of the Senate report nor of the conference report authorizes or gives consent of the Congress to arrangements which make the feasibility of an REA loan dependent on contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration. This is the kind of activity which the Senate committee believes is contrary to the law.

With respect to title IV, funds appropriated to the President. The conference report provides \$30 million instead of the \$45 million approved by the Senate.

The conferees of both Houses agreed that except for \$2 million for administration the funds appropriated should be limited to community facility type projects.

Personally, I would have preferred to have the House accept the Senate version. The House conferees felt that the Senate should have accepted the House bill. They contended that the House had sent the Senate a very good bill, as indeed it had. The Senate conferees waged a valiant fight to uphold the position of the Senate, and I believe they made an excellent showing in this respect.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish once again to salute the Senator from Louisiana for the hours and days and weeks and months that he has assiduously devoted to the problems of public works in this session of this Congress, as he has also so ably and expertly done in prior Congresses. He has performed a service not only for the people of a particular State, but also for all the people in the country. I thank him for a job that he has once again expertly done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from California in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and his conferees. He has performed magnificently. It was my desire to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, to pay our respects to the Senator from Louisiana. It would have been a unanimous vote, or close to it. However, my friend the majority leader has quite rightly said that he had given indication to Senators that there would be no yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. Therefore, I will not ask for one.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that in my opinion if there had been a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report, it would have been practically a unanimous vote, and in no small measure it would have been an expression of our appreciation for the good work the Senator from Louisiana has done on the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The

Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other members of the committee, and also to the conferees from the other body, who have worked on the conference in behalf of the control of the water runoff of this Nation.

We in Kansas are particularly indebted for the interest Senators have shown in the problems of our own State, and for their knowledge of the benefits of the program.

I am convinced that the future growth, not only of Kansas, but of the entire Middle West, will be determined by the amount of water that can be conserved and used for beneficial purposes. We have made a great start in this field, and I am indebted to the Senator for the work he and his committee have done in this field.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana deserves every tribute that has been paid to him for the manner in which he has handled the pending bill. This is one of the bigger appropriation bills, and certainly one of the most important bills, although it is not as popular in some circles as some of the other appropriation bills. The Senator from Louisiana has handled the bill in a unique way, and he should be commended for the very satisfactory and effective way in which he has handled it.

I want also to pay tribute to Ken Bousquet, who is probably one of the most able staff members that we have on any of our committees. Too, I want to commend Paul Eaton who handled title II of the bill. He always does a swell job.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am certain I speak for all of my colleagues who have saluted the Senator from Louisiana in also congratulating one of the ablest and most efficient members of an excellent and efficient staff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Words are not needed to express our wholehearted and unanimous appreciation for the outstanding work which the Senator from Louisiana has done, not only this year, but also down through the years. Every Member, regardless of party has had a fair opportunity to present his claim. All I can say is, "Amen."

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate these salutes very much. I am always vitally interested in preserving the water resources and the land resources of our country. I believe that what we are doing now will benefit generations yet unborn. I hope that I shall be in a position where I can continue to do this work. I assure my colleagues that I shall make every effort to do in the future what I have done in the past, that is, not to make provision for the conservation of resources in a particular area of our country, but for this to be done irrespective of State boundaries. I say this because it is my belief that a program of this kind must be looked at in that way if we are to succeed in doing a good overall job for the full protection of our water and land resources.

I wish again to pay my respects to the competent clerks and advisers on the committee staff, particularly to Ken Bousquet, who has been with this com-

mittee for some time, and also to Mr. Paul Eaton, who has been particularly responsible for the work on reclamation and other programs in title II of the bill. Both of these gentlemen have done yeoman work in assisting in the hearings and in the preparation of all the data that I was able to make available to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer specifically to page 24 of the conference report. This item is of particular importance to the Senators and people of Oregon, the Senators and people of Washington, and the Senators and people of California.

In the Northwest, there is the Bonneville Power Administration, capable of producing a great quantity of hydroelectric power. Unfortunately, there has been a waste of the water because of the inability of the Bonneville Power Administration, to sell power. The people of California need power. It has been recommended by Senators from the Western States, by the governments of the Western States, and by the executive branch of the Government that an appropriation be made under which the Secretary of the Interior could negotiate and determine a contract to build a power line from the north to my State and beyond, which would be in the public interest.

Written into the Senate report is language that reflects the public interest and would continue the authorization to the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of sound and solid competition, to make the best deal for the people of the United States. That language prevailed. It is a specific reason why the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues deserve an accolade.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall do everything I can to help get surplus Bonneville power delivered to the people of California, for the people of California. I shall oppose any attempt to have it delivered to Pacific Power and Light or any of the other private utilities in California, because I think it ought to be delivered over a Federal transmission line. That power is generated from streams that belong to all the people of the country and should be delivered for the benefit of all the people of the country over a Federal transmission line. The language in the bill permits that kind of transmission. I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana for retaining that kind of language.

I know of no issue that could be a hotter one in my State than the issue of the transmission of power, for Oregon is losing much industry to Washington, for example, which has public power transmission lines, in contrast with the domination of the economy of my State by private utilities. I do not want to aid and abet that situation any longer.

So I shall support the efforts of my good friend to put a public power transmission line into California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will translate those comments, in which the Senator from Oregon has joined with the Senator from

California, into a joint committee on the retention of that language.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] for his helpfulness in adding two worthwhile Connecticut projects to the bill this year.

I am very much pleased that he and his fellow Senate conferees were able to keep in the bill the \$50,000 for planning on the New London Barrier. This is a start, and a very important one, on a project to which the Federal Government will eventually contribute \$2,431,000.

Many people in the New London area join me in expressing our gratitude and our thanks to the senior Senator from Louisiana and to the other members of the committee for their help.

The second matter to which I wish to briefly refer is not such a happy one, especially to the people in Old Saybrook and to many boat owners in the States bordering the Long Island Sound.

The Senate conferees had to recede to the House and take out of the bill the \$578,000 initially approved by the Senate for the North Cove navigation project.

I realize the Senate cannot have its way on all of these public works projects, but I think it is especially regrettable that North Cove is one of the ones that was taken out of the bill. I say this because it was first authorized 18 years ago, in 1945, and because the \$578,000 would have permitted both the initiation and the completion of the proposed North Cove anchorage area and channel deepening.

The Corps of Engineers has stated that, "The cove may be reasonably expected to become one of the most used harbors of refuge for small boats in the northeastern part of the Long Island Sound."

It is a good project and the people of Old Saybrook are living up to the requirements for participation in the project by the Federal Government.

Because of the soundness of the project and the support given to it in my State, I wonder if the distinguished Senator could give me any idea as to the chances of including in an appropriations bill the funds for North Cove in the near future.

I do not wish to put the Senator on the spot, but I thought it might be possible to include the \$578,000 in the fiscal 1964 supplemental appropriations bill we will take up early next year. Or perhaps he could give an assurance that he will include it in the next regular public works appropriations bill, the one for fiscal 1965.

I would appreciate any help or hope he is able to offer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the two new projects that were proposed for Connecticut, we were able to save the one for planning the New London Barrier.

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am very grateful for that.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was impossible to persuade the House to agree to the second one, of which the Senator has just spoken. But I assure the Senator from

Connecticut that we will make another try in the public works bill next year.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful for the Senator's response.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe we may succeed in doing so at that time.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech on foreign aid,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make be placed in the Record prior to the action of the Senate on the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill, 1964, as adopted today.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under title IV—"Funds Appropriated to the President—Public Works Acceleration," the conference made the following statement:

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the \$2 million for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

That language refers to the public works acceleration program with respect to which the conference agreed to \$30 million instead of the \$45 million proposed by the Senate.

That particular limitation would impose an incredible hardship upon a large number of people in the northern regions of the United States. I deeply regret that the limitation has been placed in the conference report. I hope that somehow or other it can be totally ignored, because it so happens that today the temperature is about 10° below zero in northern Minnesota. It so happens that thousands of people in that area are without jobs. It so happens that the only job that they can get in the winter is work in the forests. We desperately need that work in the forests. It may be warm in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, or Florida, but in Minnesota, particularly in the northeastern section where our forest lands are, it is very cold.

To place the kind of limitation I have read in the conference report is cruel. In northern Minnesota in the wintertime we do not need community facilities. We cannot build them. Construction comes to a complete halt. It so happens that at Bemidji, Minn., it will be 35° to 45° below zero. At International Falls the temperature will go to from 20° to 50° below zero week after week.

The good people in that area are hard-pressed for jobs. They are the victims of seasonal unemployment in good times. For the past 5 years they have been the victims of chronic unemployment. All that those people have had in terms of help is a little assistance under the accelerated public works program for the forestry projects conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. Now the Congress has imposed a limitation which in effect states to hundreds of my people, "Starve," or "Get on relief," or "Get some food stamps and be happy."

Mr. President, I resent that. I am shocked to think that a conference committee would put such a crippling amend-

ment upon the use of public funds for the sake of public works to help people who are desperately in need.

On an appropriation bill a conference committee has a certain amount of authority, but it does not have omnipotent authority. I hope that the President of the United States, in administering the funds, will ignore that language.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree with the Senator more. I share his resentment. The problem is not one limited to Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, it is not.

Mr. MORSE. It is a problem that affects all of us.

I have several questions I should like to ask the Senator. The language in the conference report does not have the effect of binding legislation, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe so. It is a recommendation, but it is not even in the form of a proviso. The language of the conference report is as follows:

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated * * * shall be limited to community facilities type of projects.

But there is a limitation to what an Appropriations Committee can do. I hope that that limitation will impose some restraint upon that kind of harsh language.

I know that the President of the United States is carefully examining the budget for 1964. I assure him that in any way that we can save on resources and promote better administration he has my support. But I did not come to the Senate to give my assent and consent to provisions of law relating to the welfare of the citizens of our country that for all practical purposes condemn those people to relief and deprivation. That is exactly what the conference report would do.

I do not like it. I believe it is outrageous that the money can be limited when we know full well what the needs are. I have been before the Committee on Appropriations. We have had representatives of the accelerated public works program, including the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget, in meetings with Senators from the Northern States. Our people are jobless. They need work. It is cold. Community facilities cannot be built in northeastern Minnesota in the middle of the winter. The accelerated public works program is designed to be of some help to people.

Mr. MORSE. It is my interpretation—and I believe the Senator from Minnesota shares it—that the language really is a statement of recommendation on the part of the Appropriations Committee to the Forest Service, but it does not have the binding effect of law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope that will be the case. It would seem to me that, as the Senator from Oregon has explained it, it is the case. If it is not the case, I wish to redefine the term "community facilities," because in northeast Minnesota in the wintertime "community facilities" includes cutting trees.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the Senator from Oregon on the observation that if it should develop that the Forest Service would in fact be prohibited from the development of the facilities and the providing of employment in northern Minnesota—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wisconsin, Michigan, and Oregon—

Mr. MORSE. And elsewhere, where the same need exists, the President of the United States and the agencies of our Government should take an emergency look—I should like to describe it in that way—at all the programs that call for the allocation of funds by the various departments, and recommend to the departments concerned that wherever they can hold out a helping hand to those who are unemployed, as described by the Senator from Minnesota, they should proceed forthwith to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He is absolutely correct. Our greatest asset happens to be our forests. We can build something in those forests. We can build the kind of trails that are needed. We can clean out the forests and work in those forests. We can do constructive work that will produce dividends and money to the Federal Treasury.

Now we have received a sort of warm climate amendment. It happens that the United States does not all belong in the Torrid Zone. Some of it is in the Frigid Zone. I happen to represent a part of the United States which is cold in the wintertime. Perhaps my conferees friends would like to give us a little vacation down South so that we can have a little easier living for the winter months.

I wish to make the RECORD clear that I do not abide by that decision. I ask the President of the United States to put first the care of the people and second the budget. I am not at all sure I agree with all the things that are being done about the budget. I will get around to that subject a little later.

In the meantime, I rise to protest, in the name of humanity, decency, and compassion, a provision in the civil functions report that has no relevance to fair-play and no relevance to the consideration of the people who live in the areas of this country where it gets mighty chilly and mighty snowbound in the wintertime.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would not want to have the conference report adopted and action on it concluded without first expressing my deep appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues for their objective, and favorable consideration of several Alaska projects, notably the Sitka small boat harbor. I am most grateful for that action. Likewise, my gratitude extends to the House conferees, who accepted the proposal for the Sitka Harbor after it had been added by the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the report was unanimously agreed to.

AGREEMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY PASSENGER COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill was passed earlier today, at a time when I was unable to be present. I asked that the votes by which it was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, in order that I might offer a short amendment to correct an inadvertent injustice which is contained in the law.

Under the postal law, in fixing postal rates, it is provided that a special rate may apply to not to exceed one publication published by an official highway agency of a State which meets all the regulations of section 4354 and which contains no advertising. The only State magazine that is published by a highway agency is the magazine Arizona Highways.

Vermont has an official magazine published by its development agency. Under the law enacted a year or so ago, the State of Vermont is required to pay 1 cent a pound more postage than would the State of Arizona. So I ask that the bill be amended at the proper place by inserting after the word "highway" the words "or development". The bill as thus amended would read:

Not to exceed one publication published by the official highway agency or development agency of a State which meets all of the requirements of section 4354 and which contains no advertising.

The reason for the amendment is that the Arizona magazine is published by the highway agency, while in Vermont the magazine is published by the development agency.

Both magazines are about the same quality. I think Vermont's is a little better, but I met with some resistance when I tried to prove it. Neither magazine carries any advertising; both comply with the law in other ways.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that it will not be possible to act on the bill until the House returns it to the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the time

the bill is returned to the Senate, the colloquy which has been in progress since it was called up, inadvertently, be made a part of the RECORD, and that at that time the amendment be considered. For the information of the Senate, it is my understanding that this proposal meets with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the other members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is present. He can speak for himself.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks made by the majority leader in regard to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I visited with the Senator from Vermont regarding this amendment some time ago and assured him that I would offer the amendment in committee, when the bill was before the committee. I sincerely regret that I failed to do so. I hope the Senate will take action now. I heartily approve of the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the explanation made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas, I am sure it is understood by all that the bill will be brought up later in the afternoon, at which time the amendment will be offered and accepted, and the bill then passed by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, it is my understanding that Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179, and Calendar No. 737, H.R. 5778, have been returned from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the colloquy which occurred previously, I ask unanimous consent, in regard to H.R. 5179, that the Senate resume consideration of the bill and that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] may be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which would add the language:

Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

the word "highway" the words "or development".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 20, it is proposed to insert:

Sec. 4. Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "highway" the words "or development".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 5179) was read the third time and passed.

INCREASE IN AREA IN WHICH POST OFFICE STATIONS MAY BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 737, H.R. 5778, which has been returned from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is 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 (H.R. 5778) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his assistance in obtaining proper consideration of these bills, so that I might offer an amendment to correct what I am sure was an inadvertent injustice in the present law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was a pleasure.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963— CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, there be 2 hours of debate on the pending conference report on the foreign aid bill, with 1 hour to be under the control of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the other hour to be under the control of the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or any other Senator he may designate; and that the vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report be taken at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, of course I shall not object, for I shall be glad to have the conference report voted on. But there is an important amendment on which I wish to have a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from New York, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, December 13, beginning at 12 o'clock noon, during the further consideration of the conference report on H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or someone designated by him, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]: Provided, That the vote on adoption of the report be taken not later than 2 p.m.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not wish to interfere with the presentation by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am not worried about that, for it is early in the afternoon, and the night which will follow it will be long.

So I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, it is with considerable bitterness that I observe that the conference report demonstrates that the will of the Senate, as determined by a 2-to-1 vote, has been completely frustrated by the members of the conference committee.

During the Senate debate on the mutual security bill, I offered—on behalf of myself, my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the two Senators from

Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]—an amendment to prevent a recipient of assistance under the Alliance for Progress from continuing to flout international law and from continuing a foolish and fatuous attempt to arrogate unto itself complete jurisdiction over the open seas for a distance 200 miles seaward from its coastline.

For the past decade, three countries—Peru, Chile, and Ecuador—have made such a contention.

It is true that the question of jurisdiction over the area of the oceans immediately adjacent to a maritime nation is an involved problem. It is true that, in connection with the area facing the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, the United States of America makes the historic contention for a jurisdiction 3 miles seaward. It is also true that Senators from the Southern States which face the Gulf of Mexico continue to state on this floor that the jurisdiction of their States—by reason of a peculiar international history—extends 3 leagues seaward, rather than 3 miles. It is also true that some nations—as I endeavored to indicate in my comments on this floor, during the debate on this subject—contend, for reasons which to them seem relevant, for a jurisdiction to the extent of 6 miles; and some prefer to make their contention for 12 miles. But there are only four nations which have the temerity to endeavor to abuse the entire history of international law by attempting by their own ipse dixit, to maintain that, "We own the ocean 200 miles distant from our coast"; and for 10 years, free American citizens, as they have attempted to utilize the open seas for fishing purposes, when they arrived in the area 200 miles seaward or less—but clearly outside a 3-mile limit or even a 12-mile limit have been interfered with by officials of the governments concerned. In some cases they have been arrested and put in jail and required to pay fines. In other cases they have been shot at and forced into port where they have been unreasonably detained for days, with, I regret to say, hardly an attitude of vigor for their protection by the Government of the United States.

Paradoxically, it is a fact that almost a decade ago, the United States enacted a law which provided that when the freedom of the seas was so violated by a nation and when American ships were detained and their owners fined, the Government of the United States would reimburse those who had paid the fine from the Treasury.

But I do not believe that such a law is the proper antidote in that situation, and that once the owners have been reimbursed the United States can forget the incident.

Therefore, some of us in the Senate offered an amendment reading as follows:

(1) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which (1) has extended, or hereafter extends, its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this

subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement to which the United States is a party.

That language is really self-explanatory. But to turn for a moment to the last sentence of the amendment, it simply means that a country which in good faith and with reason attempts to extend its jurisdiction for more than 3 miles, or 3 leagues, which is the limit currently recognized by the United States, should participate in an international understanding concerning such a desire on its part; and if the Government of the United States is a party to such negotiations and agreement, the interdiction against aid will not apply.

I remember the debate. It was rather exhausting, and some novel parliamentary practices were engaged in, that afternoon, in this Chamber. But that did not prevent the Senate from establishing its position by a vote of 2 to 1. Fifty-seven Senators agreed with this agreement. Only 29 were opposed. Later, after the novel parliamentary practices, a vote was taken on the question of laying on the table the motion to reconsider. The motion carried by a vote of 50 to 33 and once again the Senate showed its support for the amendment offered by myself and my colleague from California. Thus, the Members of the U.S. Senate twice unequivocally demonstrated that they did not want any of their fellow Americans mistreated by any other country, when those Americans were simply endeavoring to use the open seas in a fashion long permitted by international law.

However, the conference committee disposed in rather short order of the amendment the Senate had overwhelmingly adopted; and I reiterate my resentment and my bitterness because the conference committee simply and blithely flouted the plainly stated desire of the U.S. Senate when it twice passed judgment on this matter.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As one of the conferees who dealt with this bill, I wish to say that when we came to the amendment offered by the Senator from California, and adopted by the Senate by a very substantial margin, we found the House conferees adamant in this respect. Also, the State Department registered very vigorous opposition to acceptance of the amendment—on the ground that there are underway negotiations in which it is sought to settle the very difficult matter of how far into the ocean the jurisdiction of any country may extend.

I suggested that the House write into its report that by not accepting the amendment the United States was in no sense withdrawing from its position that the countries to which reference has been made were exceeding their proper rights in claiming territory extending as much as 200 miles out into the ocean. I do not find that the House wrote such language into the report, but I wish to say for the RECORD that by failing to accept the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from California

and accepted by the Senate, the United States is in no way receding from its position that those countries are exceeding their jurisdictional authority in laying territorial claim to a considerable part of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I know of his activities in the conference committee in endeavoring to obtain an agreement to the principle involved in our amendment—if the amendment in its entire verbiage could not have been approved—and I thank him for it.

I hope and pray that the Government of the United States will take the precise position which the Senator from Vermont has laid down. If it does not, and if we ever travel south in the Pacific along the western coast of South America, we had better not go inside the 200-mile limit, because we will be violating the sovereignty of the three countries to which I have alluded, unless we comply with the rule of jurisdiction which they have laid down in complete disregard of international practice.

Two hundred miles. What would happen if the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, said, "We are going to take 200 miles out of the ocean"? What would we do with the important isthmus in this hemisphere, or in any other hemisphere, if the abutting nations said, "We are going to claim jurisdiction over an area 15 or 20 miles out"? Such action would close the approaches to the canal and be intolerable to all who wish freedom of transit on the high seas.

Certainly the U.S. Navy does not order its ships to veer 200 miles westward when they are plying the waters of the Pacific Ocean off of the West coast of South America and suddenly they reach the vast territorial waters claimed by Chile, Ecuador, and Peru. Then why should American fishermen?

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join in the comments of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] with respect to the position of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I share his views. To build the record in this case, I wish to ask the Senator from California whether it is not American taxpayers' money we are discussing.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. MORSE. If any Latin American country does not wish that money as aid, it does not have to take it, does it?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. MORSE. Do we not, as Members of Congress, have the right under the Constitution to prescribe the conditions under which the executive branch of the Government can spend the taxpayers' money?

Mr. KUCHEL. That is the theory upon which the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I say that in my judgment, Secretary Rusk should go back to high school and retake the

course in high school civics, since he held a recent press conference and sought to give the false impression to the American people that Congress is interfering with foreign policy when it seeks to lay down the terms and conditions under which taxpayers' money can be spent on a foreign aid bill. I do not know whether the Secretary of State has registered for that refresher course, but he sorely needs it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I must say to the Senator from Oregon that in my judgment—and I am sure the Senator shares my opinion—the Secretary of State is a very able man.

Mr. MORSE. He is uninformed in this field.

Mr. KUCHEL. We disagree with respect to the position he takes on this question.

Mr. MORSE. It is not a question of disagreement. It is a question of complete basic knowledge. The press interview revealed that he lacks basic knowledge in respect to the Constitution as to the rights of Congress.

If the Senator thinks I am going to let him off the hook, he is mistaken. I do not intend to let him off the hook in view of the ignorance he displayed at that press conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senator from Oregon referring to the Secretary or to me when he refers to "letting him off the hook"?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from California is too smart ever to get caught on a hook. I wish to proceed in my examination a bit further—

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that when the Senator from Oregon refers to not letting the Secretary of State get off the hook, he means in this case a fishhook.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary of State has no regard for a fishhook. This is the fishhook amendment that the Senator from California offered. The Secretary of State does not even recognize a fishhook, apparently.

Senators remember that when the chairman of our committee opposed the amendment of the Senator from California, he said something to the effect that it was one of the worst amendments he had ever observed in his years in the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I was resentful then and I am resentful now. The Senate, too, is resentful. The 2 to 1 ye-and-nay vote demonstrated that.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I am leading up to. In spite of the position taken by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who was also chairman of the conference, the Senate did not follow him. The Senate in effect said to the chairman of the Senate conferees that if countries do not wish to take our money under the terms and conditions which we lay down, they do not have to take it. Unless they are willing to accept our aid under the terms and conditions that they do not impose a 200-mile limit, it is our intention to see to it that they do not get American taxpayers' money.

I ask the Senator from California when—oh, when—will the Congress, in the field of foreign aid, start to impose some terms and conditions that will protect the taxpayers of the United States and stop the shocking giveaway of the taxpayers' money, because officials of foreign governments, who flout us and insult us take the position that they are not going to comply with reasonable conditions?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Oregon makes an excellent comment. I should like to recall with him that last year when, as the Senator will recall, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] offered an amendment to provide that in instances in which a recipient nation of American assistance expropriated the property of American citizens, without making any compensation for such property, American aid would be cut off. We had to fight to put that provision into the law. We put it in. It stayed there. Under that particular part of the present law, when Ceylon, for example, expropriated American property by taking it away, aid was terminated, as it should have been.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is not the Senator aware that the State Department vigorously opposed the Hickenlooper amendment and wished no part of it?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. If those in the State Department could have had their way, it would not be part of the law today.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Apparently the State Department labors under a misconception of the constitutional power of Congress, that we are interfering with foreign policy if we impose restrictions on the expenditure of foreign aid that protects the American taxpayer.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is exactly correct. I tried to make the point during debate that what we would attempt to do with our freedom of the seas amendment was related to what we did with respect to the expropriation of property. In effect, what the three nations in South America have attempted to do is to arrogate to themselves something that does not belong to them under international law and then exclude Americans and the nationals of any other country from that area.

Mr. President, I wish to allude to another bit of history surrounding the measure and the highly regrettable treatment which was accorded to this particular provision by the conferees.

I do not know Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, although I have noted over the past several months comments which have been attributed to him in the Capital, in my own State of California, and elsewhere. Addresses which have been made by him and have been printed thereafter appear under such attractive titles as "They're Throwing It Away Just

To Be Big Spenders" and "The Pork Barrel Polka."

I judge that Mr. Neilan is a very moral and righteous man who is honorably concerned, and rightly so, about the spending of the taxpayers' dollars and the future of our Republic.

I observe parenthetically that a few moments ago the Senate, without opposition, approved the conference report on the public works appropriation bill and did so because it was making an investment in America.

Now I wish to quote a few sentences uttered by Mr. Neilan before the West Side Association Chamber of Commerce in New York City on November 21 last:

This citation might better have been inscribed to all of the members and staff of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States who have worked alongside me in our campaign to restore a sense of decency to the conduct of our public affairs. With your permission, I should like to accept this honor for all of them. It will encourage us to continue this fight, to disregard the cynical abuse that is heaped on us daily, not alone by the politicians whom we have criticized but by many shortsighted or selfish businessmen who have their hands on the public purse and don't want to let go.

We will not have truly earned this honor unless and until our efforts produce results, until we see signs of a moral awakening in Washington. I think things will improve, not because our politicians' consciences are hurting; but because they're hearing the first rumblings of an aroused public opinion that could drive them out of office if they don't mend their ways.

The mailroom in our national chamber headquarters in Washington is still working overtime handling letters from citizens in all walks of life who are fed up with political corruption and want to do something about it. * * * It's up to us to keep this public indignation alive and to channel it into effective political action.

Let's face it: the whole corrupt system works only through the connivance of everyday citizens and some of our so-called community leaders, too.

It is our job, yours as well as mine, to see that the public is told the truth. Maybe we can light a fire that all the special wind in Washington can't blow out.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand this is a comment by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KUCHEL. The distinguished president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I wish to address myself, with my friend's permission, to my own comment.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator a question first.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I listened to the reading of the remarks. Do I correctly understand that the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce suggests that the politicians who do not agree with the chamber should be defeated?

Mr. KUCHEL. I would infer, I say to my able friend, that that is the simple implication of the comments he makes. In addition, he wants to lay it down his way. I shall come to the matter before

us and the position he took about it in a moment.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Senator from California. The Senator will stay as long as he wishes to stay in Congress, if his staying is dependent upon any votes the U.S. Chamber of Commerce may influence. I am a Senator in no small measure because they have always opposed me. Many times on the platforms of my State I have thanked them for U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposition. Nothing shows I am more correct than the fact that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is against me.

I congratulate the Senator from California. I only wish that more Democrats had his kind of support.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend.

Mr. President, the distinguished head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was talking about what he called the pork barrel process, which he claims exists in the U.S. Congress and which acts to the detriment of the public interest.

I suggest, however, that Mr. Neilan's comments might very well be applied to his own conduct and to that of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with reference to the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, which is now pending in the Senate.

As Senators know, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has a rather large staff, which is interested in a multitude of activities. It comes as no surprise to many Senators that the policies of that organization frequently do not reflect the views of the membership of the chamber in our own States and local communities. Nevertheless, in a strange, inscrutable way, policies and statements, like those of the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi, are evolved, and the word is spread by various means, covert and otherwise, to legislators and to members of the executive branch.

For example, on November 20, 1963, a five-page telegram was dispatched from the gray-stone headquarters of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which faces the White House across Lafayette Square, to all of the House and Senate conferees on the foreign aid bill. This telegram outlined the provisions which the chamber of commerce, in its wisdom, had deemed to support. It expressed great concern for a revolving Development Loan Fund, and approval of \$200 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund. It went on record in support of the Senate provision for long-range private enterprise development as a part of foreign aid planning. It advocated program evaluation committees with public members. It viewed with enthusiasm an advisory committee on private enterprise—to name but a few of the items which the chamber determined to support. Having made that determination, it alerted Senators and House Members who were conferees on the pending bill.

The chamber's telegram was signed by Theron J. Rice, legislative general manager for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the full text of the telegram be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 20, 1963.

Consistent with 1963 chamber House and Senate testimony and in best interest of sound economic development, private enterprise participation, and administrative logic, U.S. Chamber respectfully urges conference committee to adopt foreign assistance authorization not to exceed \$3.6 billion, with following provisions:

Urge adoption of House provisions for continued revolving Development Loan Fund (sec. 202(a));

For \$200 million Social Progress Trust Fund (sec. 401(b));

For required aid agency definition of "purposes," "objectives," and "priorities" of each foreign assistance program (sec. 102(b));

And for limitation upon use of economic development funds for short-term emergency assistance (sec. 102(d)).

Urge adoption of Senate provisions for long-range private enterprise development as part of aid planning (sec. 102(f)).

For program evaluation committees with public members (secs. 261-264); for advisory committee on private enterprise (sec. 601(c)).

The following Senate amendments appear inconsistent with basic foreign assistance program objectives previously endorsed by national chamber:

Section 620(e)(2) suspending aid to any nation "which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen or any corporation" appears to depart from clear definition of "expropriation" and "nationalization" inherent in section 620 of 1962 act, and goes beyond current House provisions designed to give added protection to U.S. investors against discriminatory or confiscatory acts of government. Section 620(m) suspending aid to any nation involved in territorial water fishing dispute with United States appears to hamper Alliance for Progress and self-help reforms in key cooperating countries.

Moreover section 620(e)(2) and 620(m) appear to go beyond economic development and security purposes of the act to involve unrelated questions of sovereign legal disputes.

Section 620(n)(2) suspending aid to any nation determined to be "preparing for aggressive military efforts" against any other aid-recipient nation appears impracticable of administration with respect to key countries in Middle East and southeast Asia.

Theron J. Rice,

Legislative General Manager, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the telegram noted that other "Senate amendments appear inconsistent with basic foreign assistance program objectives previously endorsed by national chamber." A number of worthwhile sections which were added by the Senate then came in for severe criticism by the chamber.

The chamber objected, presumably on behalf of its many members throughout the country, to suspending aid to any nation which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen or any corporation.

The chamber noted that this amendment departed from a "clear definition

of expropriation and nationalization inherent in section 620 of the 1962 act, and goes beyond current House provisions designed to give added protection to U.S. investors against discriminatory or confiscatory acts of government."

The chamber objected to still another section. It objected to Senate action authorizing a suspension of aid to any nation that was using American assistance to prepare for aggressive military action against another country that was also an aid recipient.

Then, thoroughly unbelievably, I am sure, to most of the membership of the chamber, it opposed an amendment which I and my colleague and other Senators offered. That amendment would prevent assistance to any country which attempted to arrogate to itself sovereign jurisdiction over the open sea 200 miles seaward from its coastline unless the U.S. Government were a party to the agreement by which the nation extended its jurisdiction.

The Senate agreed to that amendment on a rollcall by a vote of 57 to 29. It later confirmed that decision, by tabling a motion to reconsider, by a vote of 50 to 33. One could hardly describe either of those votes as hairline votes. Yet the conferees, in secret session behind closed doors, threw out the will of the Senate, and came back silent on a problem that has raged for the past 12 years—a problem, incidentally, which at least one department of the executive branch, the Department of the Interior, which has some jurisdiction over American fisheries, stated that the time has come for some action. Said the Department of the Interior in a letter to me on October 24, 1963: "These efforts to work out solutions through diplomatic channels, although in some cases useful, in general have not proved overly fruitful." The Department of the Interior thought it was "increasingly clear that the United States must take perhaps more drastic action to protect its fishermen than it has taken before."

I asked the representatives of the chamber of commerce if the telegram sent to the House and Senate conferees was approved by the president, Mr. Neilan, and by the executive council of the chamber. I was informed that it had been so approved. Mr. Neilan has been going across the country urging the public "to restore a sense of decency to the conduct of our public affairs." Decency in the conduct of our public affairs? How does the U.S. Government indicate a decent regard for American citizens? By permitting them to be shot at, arrested, jailed, fined, detained, and preventing them from using the open seas 200 miles off the coastline of any nation? Hardly.

I must say, Mr. President, I find it strange to appeal for honor in our public affairs on one hand and then vigorously oppose an amendment based on the historic principle of international law for which our country went to war in 1812 and 1917, known as freedom of the seas. Apparently the freedom advocated by the chamber of commerce at this

point includes freedom to deny needed public works projects in America as well as freedom to deny the right of American citizens to earn their livelihood on the high and open seas. What a strange and twisted concept of freedom. I only wish that some would spend less time theorizing on international relations and more time schooling themselves in the realities which face people in everyday life. I only wish, also, that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America had available to its membership that great series of democratic devices which we have in the California State constitution known as the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. I am confident that if this issue were taken to the membership of the chamber, just as I am confident that if the conferees of the House and Senate who deleted this provision took this issue to the American people, the amendment which I had the honor to offer in the U.S. Senate would be overwhelmingly endorsed.

I suggest that the position which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and its distinguished president took with respect to this amendment was an ugly assault upon the American public interest, and I am rather amazed that it could send such a statement of its own policy to Members of the U.S. Congress.

I am not one of those who seek to shackle the executive branch of our Government. But who speaks here, or elsewhere, in support of our fellow citizens who ply the seas for a living if Senators and Members of the House of Representatives do not speak for them? Thank Heaven, the Senate has spoken now, and the Senate has spoken overwhelmingly.

It is quite beyond my understanding that the conferees could have summarily sheared away what the U.S. Senate clearly wanted, as a result of a debate of several hours.

My able friend from Oregon is a valued member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I submitted my amendment months before the bill came to the floor of the Senate for consideration. I ask my friend if my amendment was ever considered by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. My recollection is that the proposed amendment was discussed and defeated.

Mr. KUCHEL. A decision that was rather elegantly overridden in the Senate itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Foreign Relations Committee should have been completed overruled, so far as a majority in the Senate was concerned. I am glad we were overruled on that amendment and a few others, but not enough.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I stand here trying to represent my State, along with my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], whose illness prevents him from being present today.

I am glad to say, on that score, that I received a letter from my colleague [Mr.

ENGL] only yesterday, in which he told me that he was improving, and that he looked forward to coming back before too long.

In a sense, I believe that Senators who joined in the amendment and voted for it represent something else—we represent the kind of dignity we want accorded to American citizens in exercising their rights. I would be recreant to my sense of duty if I did not rise on this occasion to denounce with all the vigor at my command what the conferees did to my amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his usual courtesy in permitting me to speak briefly on this matter.

Mr. MORSE. I am always delighted to yield to the Senator from California. It is a greater pleasure today than usual, because he spoke for me, as well as for himself.

COLUMNIST JOSEPH ALSOP AND REPRESENTATIVE KASTENMEIER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article published in the Wisconsin Capital Times, written by an able newspaperman, Miles McMillin, who pays his disrespects to the most superficial, superegotistical, supercilious pain in the neck in the press gallery, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

In the course of this article Mr. McMillin writes:

Alsop is never more painful than when he is accusing others of excessive vanity and "posturing."

Mr. McMillin also writes:

Alsop's problem is that he does not know the difference between being rough and being tough. Their kind think you are tough if you worship toughness, when, in fact, this simply makes you rough. When they run into a real tough guy, like KASTENMEIER, they don't recognize the product. He doesn't talk about how great it is to be tough. He is gentle and soft spoken, but all the king's horses and all the king's men in the White House and Congress can't move him away from the principles to which we all give lip-service but hate to observe. He wouldn't like it if you said he was tough.

He concludes his column pointedly by saying:

The worshippers of toughness are usually the worshippers of "realism." The only difference between them is that those who like to think of themselves as the "realists" have a great measure of conceit.

The word "conceit" is so applicable to Mr. Alsop.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, which I have edited in order to meet the rules of the Senate, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALSOP LECTURES KASTENMEIER ON REALISM (By Miles McMillin)

Among the Washington realists attacking Representative BOB KASTENMEIER for his civil rights stand is Joe Alsop, whose column formerly appeared in this paper. Alsop blew his stack because KASTENMEIER took the position that the civil rights bill ought to conform to the promises made in the cam-

paign; that it ought, at least, extend the right to vote in State and local elections. This, says Alsop, is a typical instance of the "empty, competitive posturing" of the liberals, proving that they are "vain, empty and impractical."

Alsop is never more painful than when he is accusing others of excessive vanity and posturing. During the 1960 presidential primary in this State, he came to interview former Governor Nelson. After about 5 minutes, Nelson was obliged to inquire of him whether he had come to ask about Wisconsin or to tell its Governor what was going on here. He has a massive addiction for lecturing politicians on the practicalities of politics, but he could not himself get elected keeper of the hangover pills in the National Press Club. It is especially farcical to note him zeroing in on KASTENMEIER who has three times been elected in a district which elected its last Democrat 30 years ago—a district which President Kennedy couldn't carry against HUMPHREY or Nixon and which Alsop couldn't carry against Dracula.

Progress has always been achieved over the prostrate forms of such self-proclaimed realists as Alsop. They were around in the slavery days proclaiming that the abolitionists were vain, empty and impractical. They were incensed at the empty, competitive posturing of those who wanted to abolish slavery. They admired the shrewd, tough men who defended slavery, as Alsop today admires the shrewd, tough men who are the enemies of civil rights legislation.

Alsop's problem is that he does not know the difference between being rough and being tough. Their kind think you are tough if you worship toughness, when, in fact, this simply makes you rough. When they run into a real tough guy, like KASTENMEIER, they don't recognize the product. He doesn't talk about how great it is to be tough. He is gentle and soft spoken, but all the king's horses and all the king's men in the White House and Congress can't move him away from the principles to which we all give lip-service but hate to observe. He wouldn't like it if you said he was tough.

Not long ago Alsop was hacking at Adlai Stevenson because he lacked the toughness Alsop thinks everyone should have. Stevenson had shown reluctance to risk the end of the world over Cuba. Stevenson's unrealistic attitudes are the despair of the unselected, self-appointed masters of realism. Dick Nixon, another tough realist, said in 1956 that Stevenson's views on a nuclear test ban were "catastrophic nonsense." To date—7 years later—the most notable achievement of the tough realists in the Kennedy administration is the test ban treaty. Maybe even Alsop someday will come to recognize that whatever substance is left in the civil rights bill is the result of the stand taken by the impractical liberals, KASTENMEIER and JOHN LINDSAY of New York.

The most pathetic people, if not the most dangerous, are the worshippers of toughness. They reached their most squalid depths in the cult that surrounded the late Ernest Hemingway. Alsop was one of the idolators who virtually ruined him by glorifying his boozing, brawling, and bloodlust. It seemed that they, aware of their own inability to booze and brawl on his scale, sought to prove something about their own manhood by worshipping what was worst in him. The worshippers of toughness are usually the worshippers of realism. The only difference between them is that those who like to think of themselves as the realists have a greater measure of conceit.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, introduced on behalf of myself and the Senator from

Missouri [Mr. LONG]. I ask unanimous consent that it lie over for 10 days, in the hope that we may have additional co-sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. LONG, of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is an attempt to deal at one time with the closely related questions of Presidential succession and Presidential inability.

Inasmuch as the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, wrote an excellent article, published in this morning's Washington Post, dealing with the need for investigating a charge in the present law in this respect, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lippmann be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAYH. Every reason and logic and sound organization calls upon us to deal simultaneously with the questions of death, resignation, removal, or inability.

Now is clearly the time to act—while the question of Presidential succession is uppermost in our minds, and we have just completed a smooth and calm transition. If we do not act in this time of sober and reasoned reflection, when shall we act? When will we be as close to the issue as we are today? Hopefully, never. But because history is unpredictable, we must provide for the unsought moments of national crises.

The joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If enacted through the congressional and State ratification processes, it would accomplish the following:

Section 1 contains the heart of the joint resolution. It provides that the Vice President become President for the unexpired portion of the term of a President who dies, resigns, or is removed from office. It eliminates the historical confusion as to whether the Vice President becomes President or Acting President.

This was the situation when Vice President Tyler assumed the position of the Presidency a long time ago, following the death of President Harrison. At that time many constitutional scholars felt that the Vice President became the Acting President. Vice President Tyler, after a while, decided he was tired of being Acting President and took over full authority as President. There has been no specific change made in the Consti-

tution itself, but it has been generally accepted that this is the case.

Further, it provides that the new President shall nominate a new Vice President within 30 days, and that the new Vice President shall take office upon confirmation of a majority of both Houses of Congress. It is this refilling of the office of Vice President which is the key provision in the proposal.

Section 2 provides for refilling of the office of Vice President, not upon the death of the President, but of the Vice President himself.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the mechanism for the assumption of office as "Acting President" by the Vice President in case of Presidential inability. Section 3 deals with the situation where the President is able and willing to declare his own inability in writing. Section 4 provides for the situation where the President is either unwilling or unable to make such declaration.

Section 5 provides for the mechanism whereby a President can resume his office after recovery from a disability. In case of dispute as to whether the President has recovered, the Vice President can retain his office as "Acting President" only with the written approval of the majority of the Cabinet and concurring vote of two-thirds of the Members present in both Houses of Congress.

Section 6 disposes of the case, which will be rare if the present amendment is adopted, where there is neither a President nor a Vice President due to death, resignation, removal, inability, or failure to qualify. The line of succession is modeled on that which was in effect between 1886 and 1947, designating a list of Cabinet members as successors in the previous order.

Mr. President, there have been a number of instances of succession to the Presidency on the part of the Vice President. Each case has demonstrated the weakness of a system whereby there is no replacement of the Vice President.

The accelerated pace of international affairs, plus the overwhelming problems of modern military security, make it almost imperative that we change our system to provide for not only a President but a Vice President at all times.

The modern concept of the Vice Presidency is that of a man "standing in the wings"—even if reluctantly—ready at all times to take the burden. He must know the job of the President. He must keep current on all national and international developments. He must, in fact, be something of an "assistant President", such as Vice President Johnson was in the fields of space and civil rights and in carrying the flag of the United States to foreign countries on good will missions and on matters of great diplomatic concern.

Provisions for filling the job are contained in sections 1 and 2 of the proposal. In addition to the other advantages, this system would provide for continuity in the office of President of the same party during any 4-year term.

The proposal also eliminates the historical ambiguity between President and Acting President: Upon the death, resignation or removal of the President, the

Vice President becomes President; in case of Presidential inability, the Vice President becomes Acting President.

The provisions on inability, contained in sections 3, 4, and 5, are the same as those worked out in previous proposals by Senators Dirksen, Hennings, and Ke-fauver in the past. Extensive hearings have been held on these proposals in the past and it is believed that most of the problems with respect to inability have been provided for.

The section on succession in the case of vacancies in both the offices of President and Vice President reverts to the state of the law prior to 1947. It provides for succession by members of the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State.

There is one remaining question. Why is this extensive proposal in the form of a constitutional amendment, rather than simple legislation? There are a number of answers.

Many constitutional authorities have questioned the authority of Congress to deal with the subject of inability in a statute. More important, both the questions of succession—which clearly can be dealt with in a statute—and inability are precisely the types of questions which should be incorporated in the Constitution, our basic charter of government. Not only are they exactly the type of provision which one normally finds in a constitution, but also, once so enacted—and this is important—they are not subject to the political whims of a particular day. These are problems which go to the very heart of our democratic form of government and they should be worked out in a period of relative calm, such as exists today.

The need for clarification and supplementation of our constitutional provisions dealing with the succession problem has seldom been clearer than it is today.

But it is important that any proposal dealing with a basic constitutional issue adhere closely to the design of our constitutional system.

By leaving the nomination of the new Vice President up to the President himself, and the approval of that nomination up to the representatives of the people in Congress, my amendment provides for a means of selection very similar to the one which now prevails in our nomination and election process.

There can be no question that when our two great parties meet in convention, the presidential nomination having been made, the presidential nominee of each party has a great voice in determining who his running mate for Vice President shall be. In addition, it is imperative that the President should have as his Vice President one with whom he can work and who can assist him in carrying the burdens of the Presidency.

Thus, this proposal follows the principles of the Constitution. It would provide, through the representatives of the people, those who represent their constituents in Congress, a method of going to the people to get the choice, as is done every 4 years in the election.

In regard to the succession laws, it is the purpose of my amendment to restore

succession to the executive branch and thus preserve the separation of powers so basic to our system.

Equally important, my amendment would insure political continuity by allowing the President to participate in the selection of his own potential successor.

In addition to the implications which the present Presidential succession law has on the executive branch of our Government, we must not overlook the impact which this law has on the legislative branch.

At a time of national crisis, such as that which always follows the death of a President in office, the legislative branch as well as the executive branch is faced with many critical problems. At such a time it is imperative that all branches of our Government be united and functioning at peak efficiency.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives under normal circumstances is carrying an extremely heavy burden. His efficient operation is necessary for the proper functioning of the House of Representatives. It is unwise during a time of national crisis to further overburden a man who is already one of the busiest individuals in the United States of America.

How can we expect a man who already is responsible for directing the energies of 434 of his colleagues in the House to assume the additional burdens of attending national security counsel meetings, of conferring with Cabinet officers and of assuming the other jobs which, as Acting Vice President, he will be required to do?

Representative McCORMACK, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, is a dedicated and well-qualified individual. The proposal I am making to the Senate today has nothing whatsoever to do with his qualifications to fill the office of Vice President or President. But no human being can accept and carry the responsibilities of both the Speaker of the House and Vice President of the United States. In my estimation, neither at this hour nor in the future, can our country afford to be without a Vice President.

I believe that the Congress should act on this proposal without delay. However, this proposal should be given the most searching consideration before proposing a solution to the States for ratification.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I shall see that a study in the Senate shall begin in earnest and as quickly as possible.

EXHIBIT 1

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Speaker McCORMACK, who now stands next in line to the President, is naturally enough diffident about discussing the problem of the Presidential succession. But the country cannot take his view that the matter is too horrible to think about, much more to talk about. The problem is of the highest importance and there should be no more squeamishness about discussing it than there is when a man or woman makes a will.

The law which has put the Speaker so unexpectedly where he now finds himself was proposed only in 1945 during the emotional upset following President Roosevelt's

death, and passed in 1947. What it did was to insert into the line of succession—President, Vice President, Secretary of State and so forth—two Members of Congress—the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. The theory of the bill was that the man who becomes President should owe his place in the line of succession to an election, not to an appointment. In fact the 1947 law did not adhere to this principle. For after naming the two Members of Congress it went back to the old line beginning with the Secretary of State.

Defenders of the 1947 law appeal to the principle of election on the mystical ground that because Mr. McCormack has been elected repeatedly from the Ninth District of Massachusetts he has become thereby anointed and qualified for President. Applied to the concrete facts, the "principle" is nonsense, and it has no relation whatever to any real choice of the President by the will of the people.

There are several very grave objections to the present law. One is that because the congressional system operates by seniority and whatnot it has provided a successor who is unprepared and unqualified to succeed. Nobody has ever given 5 minutes' thought to the qualifications of the man who may be the next President of the United States. Under the old law, where the next in line would be the Secretary of State, the fact that he might become President would become a great consideration in his appointment and his confirmation by the Senate. The reality of this was proved in 1945 when President Truman's accession left Secretary Stettinius as the next in line. Though Edward Stettinius was a nice man, he was manifestly unqualified to be President, and a great agitation arose at once which brought about his replacement as Secretary of State by a man of vast experience in government, James Byrnes of South Carolina.

There is another radical defect in the present law. In our system of government it has happened many times that one or both of the Houses of Congress is controlled by the opposition party. It happened, for example, both to President Truman and to President Eisenhower. Under the badly considered 1947 law, the whole administration of the Government can be transferred from one party to the other by the act of one sniper.

There should never be such a premium on the assassination of a President offered to criminal lunatics or conspirators to brood upon. The very thing that has sustained the country since November 22 has been the continuity of the Presidency, the undisputed accession of a completely qualified man. Had there been any intelligible purpose in the assassination, it would have been defeated.

The sovereign principle of continuity is sacrificed in the law of 1947, and we ought lose no time in wiping it off the statute books. We should return to the old law which would put Secretary Rusk next in line, and then we should let Congress and public opinion make it known to President Johnson, as they did to President Truman in 1945, whether they are content.

There is a way, undoubtedly an organic part of the intent of the Constitution, in which real deference can be paid to the principle of election. We know from James Madison that the authors of the Constitution meant to leave to Congress "a supply of the vacancy (in the Office of President) by an intermediate election of the President." Congress was to decide whether to call an intermediate election.

It would be quite feasible, and perhaps desirable, to provide that when the line of succession reaches the Secretary of State or the other Cabinet officers, the man who takes over the office shall be only the Acting President until a new election can be held at midterm or at the end of the 4-year term. I think myself that this ancient formula

should also apply to the Vice President when he succeeds. It would not affect President Johnson who must face the voters in less than 12 months.

If we arouse ourselves enough to deal firmly with the problem of the succession, we should proceed at once to repair the other great hole in our system, which is what to do when a President is incapacitated, as were Garfield and Wilson, and for a time Eisenhower. Nobody will, I think, propose that the Speaker of the House should, or that constitutionally he could, serve also as the Acting President.

CONFUSION OF GRIEF WITH GUILT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing the floor?

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I felt it necessary to speak from the floor of the Senate in an attempt to warn those who were confusing grief with guilt. Those who compound this confusion still speak out both at home and abroad. Last Friday some of our colleagues in the House made a strong statement clearing the confusion and pointing out the real source of our greatness as Americans. May I humbly express some further thoughts that occur to me.

America stands accused today by many critics, of sins of bigotry, hatred, and fanaticism in connection with the vile act that struck down President Kennedy. These accusations must find a strong answer. Sorrow cannot excuse, nor tears blind us to the real need of our Nation when its integrity and the fiber of its people are under unjust assault.

America stands also in peril of seeing its tragic moment cynically or unthinkingly twisted into a time when honest dissent could be stilled by unworthy and unfeeling statements, when undefined doubts could silence the need to question, when misplaced guilt could halt the quest for responsible answers to the future's challenge.

As representatives, not of a party, but of the people who are this Nation, we should speak now and always as our conscience dictates. We cannot permit ourselves even the luxury of a respectful silence in the light of the clamor of abuse.

We must speak out.

We should reject, and I sincerely believe that most of the people of this Nation do reject, the charge that it was a weakness, flaw, or bitterness of the American spirit that set the stage for the murder of our President. The murderer was not a product of our way, not of any part of our way, but of an alien way that is committed to our destruction.

Bitterness there is in American life, and hatreds too. But the people did not do this deed, encourage it, or make it possible. Violence there is in American life, but America has not nourished it. Instead it has moved steadily against it, abjuring it, not teaching it; rejecting it, not reaching for it. Violence as a way of accomplishing ends is characteristic not of America but of the alien philoso-

phy upon which the assassin fed and upon which the philosophy itself trades throughout the world even today.

And there is where the guilt must be placed, not for the sake of this Nation alone, but for the sake of all nations who live in the shadow of the same violence.

Beyond the guilt, there is the self-destructive, corrosive recrimination which would equate political opposition with political fanaticism, or which would demand, in expiation of an imagined sin, abandonment of dissent and honest argument. This, too, must be intolerable to a people who love liberty, just as it would have been intolerable to one whose office calls for leadership of such people, but carefully is guarded against coercion of the people. No honor is done the memory of a President by turning away from the very processes which make the Presidency meaningful.

And no service is done to the responsibilities of a free people by ill-defined admonitions, no matter the depth of the emotions that may impel the admonitions.

Americans do not need to be lectured on their love of country. It is this very love they are taught, or should be taught, from childhood. To say that hatred and fanaticism are the result of such lessons is to misread the people and misjudge their history.

Therefore, let us say these things:

The soul of America is sound. It was shaken, but not stained, by the killing of our President.

The people of America are sound. They are not haters, bigots, and fanatics; and those among them who are, stand scorned and at the ebb of their time, not at the flood.

The future of America is sound. It is the very strength of our political institutions which we have seen most dramatically demonstrated in these trying times.

The cause of America is sound. No reflection on that cause or reflection against it results from the ordeal imposed upon it by a way of thinking totally alien to it.

The way of America is sound. Let it not be barred or blocked by those who forget that the great business of the Nation must be threshed out in healthy discussion, in spirited debate, and in the great dialog of open dissent and open society. Those who would cry heresy at such debate today, as some seem to cry, would memorialize tyranny, not liberty.

We will not suffer the name of bigot for those who speak from conscience. We will not suffer the name of fanatic for those who decently believe in and decently strive for their causes. We will not suffer the charge that hatred is being taught in a land that always has been, and still must be, a symbol of the sort of humane order for which men have striven and died across the face of the earth and the face of time.

The business of this Congress must be carried forward by the judgment of its membership. The laws it is to consider are for the common good, and cannot be tokens of remembrance, no matter how earnest. They must be faithful to the lessons of yesterday, but must be

fashioned for today and tomorrow. Laws cannot be memorials to the past alone; they must be servants of the future.

This is our Nation and these are our people. We are proud of both. The time to tell the world we are proud is right now. Thus we will move to the end of hatred, by the triumph of truth and justice. Thus we will know the nature of those who oppose that triumph.

Let Americans say this now to all mankind, as indeed we are saying it, each to the other, here in our Nation's Capitol—the citadel of freedom.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS DAY IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the excellent address of the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, delivered before the 555 Club in Minneapolis on the occasion of Alliance for Progress Day in Minnesota.

I congratulate the farsighted Governor of Minnesota on proclaiming Monday, December 9, as Alliance for Progress Day, and for the excellent program of activities which focused the attention of Minnesotans on this joint endeavor between the United States and its neighbors in this hemisphere.

I want to commend the Time-Life Broadcasting Co. for their efforts in organizing the Alliance celebration and for bringing to Minnesota the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance, and also the Chilean Ambassador, Mr. Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos.

Through an hour-long TV program on station WTCN devoted to the Alliance for Progress, Minnesotans had an opportunity to hear Mr. Moscoso and the senior Senator from Minnesota discuss with a panel of reporters the principal problems confronting the United States in Latin America today.

Minnesotans were also treated to an exhibit of Chilean painting, brought to Minnesota by the Minneapolis people-to-people program as part of the "Image of Chile" program appearing in the United States this year. I congratulate the distinguished Ambassador of Chile on this contribution to our appreciation of Chilean culture. It is exactly what our late President Kennedy desired to promote: greater understanding between North American and Latin American peoples. As the President stated in his address proclaiming the Alliance for Progress:

We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need * * * access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.

Through programs like the Alliance for Progress Day in Minnesota, our people can learn what is going on in this hemisphere and thus better understand the mutual problems which both Latin Americans and North Americans share in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the address by Teodoro Moscoso before the 555 Club in Minneapolis; my speech, also delivered before the 555 Club; and two newspaper articles dealing with Alliance for Progress Day.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE TEODORO MOSCOSO

I

Governor Rolvaag, Senator Humphrey, Congressman Fraser, Congressman McGregor, Mayor Naftalin, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this has been a good day for the Alliance for Progress. Your Governor has dedicated this day to the Alliance, and many citizens of this great metropolis, led by your mayor, have manifested their support for the program, which our late great President initiated, and to which our new Chief Executive has dedicated himself.

You have shown today that you want this program to succeed; you are aware that it takes resources from this country to make it succeed; and you are ready to contribute your share to the common task of which our Latin American friends bear the main burden.

I am deeply grateful for your hospitality, and your understanding; I am gratified at the presence of your Governor, your mayor, your Representatives in the House, and of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. You rightly consider HUBERT HUMPHREY one of the great Senators this or any other State has sent to Washington. Latin America thinks of HUBERT HUMPHREY as the most courageous and effective fighter on Capitol Hill for freedom and progress in this hemisphere. Of the many things which he has accomplished in his career, little compares to the unremitting, virtually singlehanded effort he is making to secure the resources for the Alliance for Progress from this country without which the program cannot succeed. He has won a crucial round of that fight, and he is keeping it up down to the wire. The people of Latin America will never forget it; the people of the United States will come to understand it and appreciate it once the whole Nation realizes the importance of Latin America for our country's own security.

It is fitting, too, that we are observing this Alliance day as the Image of Chile presentation opens in your city. In producing this program, Chile's Ambassador Gutierrez acted on the 10th point of our late President's address of March 13, 1961, in which he proclaimed the Alliance for Progress. In that speech, the President said: "We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need * * * access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers * * * In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere."

John Kennedy always had the broad view of things. He conceived of the Alliance not merely as a job for economic planners and social programmers. He thought of it as a hemispherewide effort touching on the whole range of our many activities and interests. To him, the purpose of the Alliance was not merely to relieve hunger and cure disease, to provide jobs and curb illiteracy; it was also to enhance the dignity of every person in the hemisphere, and to give greater meaning to our lives through better understanding of each other's cultural accomplishments.

In his last foreign policy speech, 3 weeks ago today, in which he discussed the Alliance for Progress, this is the way he expressed

his vision: "For a hemisphere where every man, from the American Negro to the Indian of the Altiplano, can be liberated from the bonds of social injustice, free to pursue his own talents as far as they will take him, allowed to participate in the fruits of progress."

Latin America took our late President's death hard. With stunning uniformity, cities and villages throughout the lands south of us were engulfed by a great stillness, as word of the incredible deed spread. From Mexico to Argentina, from Venezuela to Chile, people shed tears just as our people did. And then the flags came out half mast, on public buildings and skyscrapers, in city slums and adobe huts, and in newly built homes which are monuments to his leadership. Then came the words, the torrent of eulogies expressing deeply felt sorrow for the loss of a great human being, a father, and a leader—and concern for the future which he had done so much to brighten.

The former President of Colombia, Alberto Lleras Camargo, a man who knew John F. Kennedy and who knows Latin America, put it this way: "Never has a President of the United States devoted so much and such affectionate interest to Latin American affairs, particularly to the affairs of the less fortunate * * * he was the principal author of the Alliance, its defender and supporter. His enemies sought to hurt him through the Alliance, knowing him to be more vulnerable there than in any other part of his program. For Latin America, Kennedy's passing is a blackening, a tunnel, a gust of cloud and smoke. Until it dissipates, until someone takes up the fallen banner, there will be uncertainty and danger in that part of the world."

Fortunately, Latin America did not have to wait long for someone to "take up the fallen banner." In his first foreign policy action, in the presence of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, and in the very room in which less than 3 years before John Kennedy had proposed the program, our new President spoke to the delegates from Latin America who had come to Washington for the funeral. Lyndon Johnson said: "Today, among you in this same room, I have come to reaffirm that Alliance (for Progress) and to pledge all the energies of my Government to our common goals * * *. Inspired by his memory * * * we will carry on the job. Let the Alliance for Progress be his living memorial."

So we know and Latin America knows that the watchword is: The Alliance moves forward. Now we must make good on this pledge. That is the greatest tribute we can pay John F. Kennedy. He was short on ceremony, and long on work. And he inspired thousands of others to act likewise. I doubt that so many people in Government worked so hard for so many hours in recent history as the people who worked for John Kennedy. Nobody asked them to do this. It was his drive, his example, and his leadership that made them do it. We can best honor his memory by keeping up the same pace under the new President.

II

Lyndon Johnson has forcefully reasserted our country's responsibilities under the program. His assumption of this responsibility coincides with a crucial moment in the development of the Alliance—the beginning of a new phase in its operations.

In mid-November, the Finance Ministers of the Alliance countries completed their second annual review of the program, and took some significant decisions which are likely to change the future shape and course of the program.

The most important decision taken at this meeting in São Paulo, Brazil, was to create a mechanism designed to make the Alliance in practice what it was conceived to be in its charter: a cooperative program.

Up to now, too many people in Latin America have viewed the Alliance for Progress as a conventional American aid program with a fancy new name. Consequently, they looked to Washington for funds, for policy decisions and for scapegoats. Disregarding the fact that it takes at least two to make an Alliance, many politicians, journalists and people at large defined the term to mean just one country—the United States.

This was due to a variety of factors—among them that the initiative to launch the program came from President Kennedy and that no single inter-American organization was available to give unified direction to the program. Thus, the United States was forced to make most of the judgments and decisions that should have been made jointly by the twenty member countries from the outset.

Inadequate involvement on the part of the Latin American nations—governments as well as people—in the work of the Alliance accounts for many of the problems we have encountered during the past two years. It slowed down political decisionmaking on such issues as changes in land tenure, tax reform and collection, the setting of priorities for the most effective use of national resources and many other actions that only the governments and people of the countries themselves can take. This slowdown in turn caused disappointments with the results of the program, disappointments sharpened by a highly exaggerated degree of expectation.

Now Latin America has decided to create an organ in which seven representatives, representing six regions of Latin America and the United States, and headed by a strong chairman, will take over many of the responsibilities that up to now have rested upon the United States alone. Instead of the United States judging development plans, evaluating performance in self-help and reform, and thus seemingly applying conditions for its aid, it will be this new Inter-American Committee for the Alliance that will do this job. Latin Americans will be evaluating each other's plans and performance, estimate the resources each country needs and can usefully absorb and suggest the most effective distribution of funds that become available from outside sources.

The members and the Chairman are to be selected by January 15, 1964, and hopefully the new Committee can start operations shortly afterward.

In creating this group, the Alliance nations have taken a leaf out of the book of success written by the Marshall plan. That program also got off to a slow start. Its pace increased after the creation of the Organization of European Economic Cooperation, which made it possible for the European nations to play a full and policy-making part in the revival of their economies and the renewal of their societies.

But an organization is meaningful and effective only to the extent that its members act to make it a success. The question is whether all of us—our Latin American friends and ourselves—have the will and the maturity to use the new tool with which we have equipped ourselves. The U.S. Government is determined to play a full and active role in the new body—neither to take a back seat, nor to dominate or control it; neither to escape responsibility nor to encroach on that of its partners; neither to weaken its own effort nor to inhibit the initiative of others. We approach our task in this new and promising stage of the Alliance for Progress with a strengthened will to convert the program into the truly cooperative endeavor that it is designed to be, and we are confident that our partners will do likewise.

The decision to create this new Committee tended to overshadow some other major actions in São Paulo. Thus, the conference adopted a resolution designed to give free labor a bigger voice in development

planning. It called for setting up Trade Union Advisory Committees for the Alliance in each member country, on which all major free trade unions will be represented. The job of these committees is to cooperate with national planning institutions, and to make sure that development programs are worked out and carried out with the fullest possible participation of the working people and their representatives.

The conference also recognized the growing effectiveness of cooperatives, which our Agency—The Agency for International Development—has done much to foster, using the skills and experience of many people from this and nearby States. In the spreading network of cooperatives in a wide variety of fields—credit, farm, consumer and housing co-ops, to name just a few—lies one of the best hopes for the economic and social development of Latin America.

The conference also decided to have a special study focus on ways and means to increase Latin America's exports to manufactured and semi-manufactured products, thus lessening the region's dependence on a few commodities which are subject to sharply fluctuating prices on world markets.

The São Paulo meeting took an important step to promote Latin America's interests at the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Between now and March, when the U.N. Conference opens, the Latin American countries will meet to coordinate their positions for that Conference and thus better represent their common interests in world trade.

These are some of the major actions taken in São Paulo. The results could not have been achieved without a strong sense of realism and determination on the part of most delegations.

Much has been written from and since São Paulo about criticism of the Alliance on the part of some speakers and delegations. Little, and I am afraid too little, has been written about the substantial accomplishments which I reported to you tonight.

In a similar vein, we have read for many weeks about the violent attempts of Castroite terrorists to prevent the Venezuelan elections, but less about the sustained, difficult and successful struggle of the democratic Government of Venezuela and its armed forces to foil the terrorist onslaught. Here is a triumph of democracy achieved by a people that braved threats and bullets to vote. It is also a triumph for the principles underlying our Alliance for Progress.

Turning to economic issues, there is generally blow-by-blow reporting of disputes between American companies and Latin American governments, but are you aware of the agreement we signed with Chile less than a week ago under which virtually all new American investment in Chile can be guaranteed against a wide range of political and commercial risks?

It is unfortunate that conflict makes news, while progress is taken for granted as the normal and appointed way of the world. These criteria reflect a confident and optimistic view of history, and perhaps this is all to the good. But now and then one wishes that people found some thrill and excitement in progress.

III

I do not wish to hide the serious obstacles the Alliance for Progress faces in its quest to revitalize the economies and societies of 19 Latin American nations—each different from the other, each facing a different set of problems.

In some Latin American countries, strong political leadership has created favorable conditions for action, but inadequacies in project preparation and shortages of skilled personnel hobble progress. In other cases, the resources for performance are available

in greater measure, but political indecision or opposition inhibits action.

On the extreme right in several countries, we encounter criticism couched in reasonable terms but motivated by deep-seated resistance to reform. On the other side of the spectrum, the Communists and their allies are laboring day and night to wreck the chances of the peaceful revolution sought by the Alliance so as to increase their opportunities for a takeover by violent revolution.

Here in this country, much remains to be done to gear our diplomacy to the changing requirements of economic and social development, and our economic relationships and investment patterns must be adjusted to the new political realities in the region. What was good and valid in a placid past is not necessarily right and effective in the turbulent present, dominated by a rising sense of self-assertion and nationalism.

But despite the problems, the Alliance has moved ahead. And it could not have achieved what it has accomplished in two years were it not for a great deal of dedicated effort on the part of many people throughout the hemisphere. Millions of Latin Americans have been affected by the Alliance in one way or another—be it that they own a home of their own, that they till their own land, that they have clean water to drink, a hospital or school to go to, or that they have a job in which they earn a decent living.

A beginning has been made. Now the need is to speed up the process we have set in motion. This means more rapid accomplishment of the difficult tasks to which our sister republics have committed themselves—the basic reforms they have pledged to carry out and the domestic resources they must generate for their development. Under the Alliance compact, it also means that we must continue to come through with timely and effective support.

It is in this connection that your senior Senator has rendered such outstanding service to the Alliance for Progress. We have suffered a sharp cut in our authorization for the fiscal year 1964, and we still have the appropriations stage ahead of us. Had it not been for Senator HUMPHREY, the cuts might have been so drastic as to endanger the very future of the program.

The administration's request for the Alliance—before any cuts were made—amounts to less than 1 percent of our total budget—less than 1 percent to assist 200 million people whose security is vital to our own. Most of the money will be spent right here in this country, for equipment and commodities to be used in the development of our sister republics. Eighty-five percent of the administration request is in the form of long-term repayable loans, and only 15 percent in outright grants.

We can ill afford not to make these funds available. For years, we neglected Latin America. In those years, we helped rebuild Europe, and then put out fires in other far-flung parts of the world. That we concentrated last on Latin America, the region closest to us, is not Latin America's doing. It is our own. The fact that problems in that region have been allowed to fester and build up to their present proportions is not the result of ill will but a fact of history. Now we have committed ourselves to face up to these problems, and to go back on that commitment is unthinkable.

It is unthinkable because the economic and social development of Latin America is both a human duty and an essential requirement for our own security.

People in Latin America live on average incomes of less than \$300 a year, and in some countries of less than \$100. Ten percent of the landholders own 90 percent of the farmland, even though this overall average hides significant differences in land tenure pat-

terns from country to country. Ninety million Latin Americans cannot read or write. Tens of millions die before they reach adulthood.

Now, after centuries of patience, the peoples of Latin America are making themselves heard—loudly and unmistakably. They demand to be recognized; they demand jobs; and they are determined to enjoy the fruits of their work. They demand to be integrated into their countries' national fabric—politically, economically, and socially.

This demand will not cease. It will become louder from year to year. And it will be met. It will be met either by totalitarian demagogues, whom the people may decide to follow in desperation, only to end up in despair. Or it will be met through the Alliance for Progress.

The purpose of this program is not merely to build. Totalitarians, too, can build. From the slaveworkers of ancient Egypt who built the pyramids, to Hitler's autobahn and the sputnik, there runs a thread of indignity and inhumanity which all peoples ignore at their peril.

The purpose of the Alliance is to build in freedom. Thus, what the Alliance seeks to accomplish cannot be described in mere statistics. The homes, factories, roads, and schools going up all over the southern part of our hemisphere are mere building blocks. They become meaningful only as all our people—minorities here and majorities in many of our Latin American sister republics—are truly integrated into each country's national life as free and first-class citizens with equal opportunity.

I believe this Alliance is the most inspiring endeavor ever undertaken by any group of nations: to develop a vast region of 19 independent countries, plagued by varying degrees of underdevelopment, into a modern community of nations, and to integrate this community into a hemisphere sharing the fruits of prosperity and shaped in the image of freedom.

This is the legacy of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Nothing would please the late President John F. Kennedy more than to know that interest in the Alliance for Progress program was spreading across his beloved country, and expressed through a special day designated as "Alliance for Progress Day."

I congratulate those responsible for this "Alliance for Progress Day" and I am honored to participate in it.

As the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress has indicated, there will be no change in U.S. policy in Latin America under the new administration. President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear that U.S. support for the Alliance for Progress will continue. President Johnson's first foreign policy speech after he became President was to the assembled Latin American delegates at the funeral of President Kennedy. Speaking to them in the East Room of the White House where President Kennedy had originally announced his plans for the Alliance, President Johnson pledged to carry on the job that his predecessor began.

At a meeting in my office one-half hour after the White House meeting, the Brazilian Foreign Minister told me of the profound impression President Johnson had made on the Latin American leaders. They returned to their countries reassured that President Kennedy's policy would be implemented.

The next year will be an important one in our relations with Latin America, and President Johnson will face some formidable problems before the year is over. In Argentina and Peru, new reform-minded Governments are attempting to effect radical social and economic changes in their societies, and in the process are calling into question

existing relationships with foreign investors, particularly U.S. oil companies. In Brazil, rampant inflation, a stagnant agricultural situation, and an increasing polarization of political life between the right and the left make the future of this developing giant highly uncertain during the next 2 years. In Chile, a Communist-Socialist coalition is one of the three leading competitors in the presidential election of September 1964. These are but a few of the situations that may erupt into crises during the next 12 months.

But we should not focus all our attention on the bad news that may come or the crises that may erupt. Too often the only news that gets to headlines is the bad news. The good news is buried on the bottom of page 14. We have heard far too much bad news about Latin America, far too much about the failures of the Alliance for Progress, and too little about its accomplishments.

Last week we had some good news about the Alliance. The presidential elections in Venezuela on December 1 resulted in a resounding victory for those two political parties whose programs are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress. The two parties of the Betancourt coalition government, Accion Democratica and the Social Christian Policy, were the victors—proving that a government like Betancourt's, a government that pursues a policy of economic and social reform, can win and hold the allegiance of the people.

The election revealed that in a wealthy, rapidly developing country like Venezuela, the two strongest political parties are precisely those two parties whose programs and objectives are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress. The two victorious parties in this election represent the two principal reform-minded, non-Communist groups in Latin America, the Democratic left group in the Caribbean, and the Christian Democratic group in South America. President-elect Leoni is a member of that movement, the Democratic left, which has provided the principal leadership in the last decade for progressive constitutional forces in Latin America. It is this movement that has come forth with astute leaders like Betancourt, Jose Figueres and Daniel Oduber in Costa Rica, and Luis Muñoz Marín and Tedoro Moscoso in Puerto Rico. The Social Christian (COPEI), headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, is typical of the Christian Democratic Parties, which, although a minor force in Latin America up until recently, are now rapidly growing in strength and are destined to play a major role in the political life of such countries as Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, and Peru. With the continued cooperation between Accion Democratica and COPEI that has characterized the Betancourt government in the past 2 years, Venezuela will be governed by a progressive, friendly government which will enjoy the firm backing of the U.S. Government.

From the events of the past week, it is clear that the new Venezuelan Government will need the support of its friends in this hemisphere to repel external attacks originating in Cuba. The evidence is clear and indisputable that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. The evidence has been presented to the OAS Council, which voted 16-0 to investigate the charges of interference by Cuba in the internal affairs of Venezuela.

The case of Venezuela demonstrates dramatically the nature of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere. In my "Report on the Alliance for Progress" issued in March of this year, I spelled out my view of the nature of this threat. I would like to quote one passage from that report:

"In considering the Communist problem in relation to the Alliance for Progress, we must therefore always bear in mind the distinction

between the two salient strands of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere: (1) the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; (2) the attempt of a Communist regime (i.e., Cuba) and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage, and propaganda.

"One cannot meet the appeal of the first with solutions appropriate only for the second. The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions—but rather by the programs which fall under the Alliance—effective mobilization of resources and accomplishments of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of foreign aid loans, food for peace, the Peace Corps, and technical assistance. The security problem cannot be met alone by the above economic programs, but by the political and internal security measures described earlier. The subversion and terrorism problem requires specific political and internal security measures. Violence and subversion in Latin America cannot be defeated by relying wholly on the elimination of hunger, poverty, and disease."

Today a government that has implemented the economic and social programs prescribed by the Alliance for Progress is under attack, is threatened with subversion from abroad. What is our policy? Our policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba to Venezuela. We have stated before that we will not permit the Castro regime to subvert the democratic governments of its neighbors through armed aggression, whether covert or open. We have repeatedly stated this as our policy. Today we have a clear, carefully documented case of arms shipments into Venezuela. The Venezuelan Government has presented convincing photographic evidence of the smuggled arms shipments.

What is our response to this situation? I believe we should mean what we say. We should take all steps necessary to prevent further arms shipments from Cuba into Venezuela. And I mean all measures. Mere words alone will be of little avail.

The new administration headed by President Johnson should serve notice on the Soviet Union that we do not intend to see friendly governments like that in Venezuela subverted by terrorists armed from Cuba. If action is needed to convince the Cubans that we mean business, then action should be the order of the day. Either we defend our friends in Latin America against armed subversion, or we may as well forget about a peaceful, democratic revolution in Latin American countries through the Alliance for Progress.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance. We should provide it—now.

By protecting progressive governments from external Communist threats from abroad, and by giving them our strong support for the Alliance programs in the economic and social fields, we can contribute heavily to the development of stable progressive societies in Latin America. We can insure that the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

Our own contribution to the success of the Alliance will be more effective if we translate into the machinery of the Alliance the uniqueness of the Alliance program. The Alliance is not just another part of the U.S. aid program. The Alliance for Progress program should not be merely one of four regional programs in the same agency. It is different, and on the U.S. end alone entails a wide variety of capital development loans, economic loans, social development loans and grants, and technical assistance.

The Alliance program in the U.S. Government should be more independent, should be more autonomous than it now is. Perhaps it should be a separate agency, like the Peace Corps. If this would pose too great a problem of coordination with the State Department, there should be some other steps taken to make the Alliance program more autonomous, independent, and visible.

In my report on the Alliance for Progress issued in April of this year, I suggested that we need to do more in terms of contacts with legislative bodies, both at the State and National level. I would like to repeat this suggestion.

I propose the establishment of an inter-American parliamentary body, somewhat along the lines of our NATO Parliamentary Conference, in which Members of Congress from the Latin American countries and the United States meet regularly and get to know each other's domestic problems. The Alliance needs more political content, and if some of our Senators and Congressmen had a better idea of the problems confronting their Latin American colleagues as they try to face up to difficult decisions in domestic reform, it would help all around. Similarly, such a body would give the Latin American Congressmen an idea of the problems we face in our Congress in voting on foreign aid appropriations.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS CHIEF, OTHERS CITE SUCCESSES IN U.S. FOREIGN AID
(By Beverly Kees)

The Alliance for Progress has had successes and failures although people seem to focus on its shortcomings. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance, said at a Minnesota League of Women Voters State foreign aid conference Monday in the Thunderbird Motel, Bloomington.

Latin American countries have agreed to certain reforms under a self-help policy with "only marginal help from the United States," he said. The United States provides about 10 percent of the funds going to those reforms "principally in the form of loans, not grants."

The U.S. faith in the program was rewarded in recent Venezuelan elections, he said. "The fact that there was an election was a success. This is the first time a democratically elected government has turned over the power to a new democratically elected government in Venezuela.

"Ninety-five percent of registered voters went to the polls despite Communist activity," he said.

Lloyd W. Woodruff, director of research and planning for the Minnesota Department of Taxation and former public administration specialist for Michigan State University program in South Vietnam, told the 150 league members that the university program was set up to help the government of Ngo Dinh Diem survive and to work on a reform program, dealing with public finance, civil service, and in-service training.

When the program began in 1955, Woodruff said, Diem was considered one of the great democratic leaders of southeast Asia.

The program was considered successful by the university team, Woodruff said, in that it increased administration efficiency, helped give the Vietnamese a more critical attitude in research and planning, raised educational standards and "planted the idea in public officials of responsibility and responsiveness."

Norman Craig, University of Minnesota assistant professor of public health and former regional adviser, health education for World Health Organization, said one great problem facing health educators in Latin America "was to know the cultural basis for beliefs of the peasants and to use those beliefs to help them improve their health."

In the afternoon, John Rielly, foreign policy assistant to Senator Hubert Humphrey, and Barbara Stuhler, U.S. League of Women Voters foreign policy chairman and assistant director of the World Affairs Center, answered questions from league members.

Rielly's comments were:

There is more social and economic rather than military emphasis today in foreign aid, which is concerned with such programs as health, education, housing, water pollution control, and irrigation. This emphasis gets the aid to lower levels of people with less chance of graft by local officials.

There is no need for heavy weapon assistance to Latin American countries, he said. "But there is a need for limited military assistance to meet the problems of internal subversion." Those countries need trained police, guerrilla forces, helicopters, and radios, rather than tanks, planes, and missiles.

Miss Stuhler said:

"We must judge the validity of a foreign aid program on its economic and political reality. We have learned in the United States that if there are many poor and few rich, the poor will drag down the rich. If the United States is to stay rich, perhaps the best thing we can do is to make sure there is a wider base of purchasing power" by raising the world's economy.

The political reality is "that if the United States is indifferent to the needs of those less fortunate, it is only logical that they will be indifferent to the values we want to share."

CULTURE STRESSED BY CHILE ENVOY'S WIFE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Katherine Evans, the former Katherine Winton of Deephaven, interviewed Mme. Gutierrez-Olivos before she left Washington, D.C., for a quick trip to Minneapolis Sunday and Monday, accompanying her husband, the Chilean Ambassador. They came to open the Chilean art exhibit Sunday at First National Bank of Minneapolis.)

(By Katherine Evans)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—You'd never guess it from her schedule—a constant round of lunches, receptions, and dinners—but Margot Gutierrez-Olivos, pretty, vivacious wife of the new Chilean Ambassador, has the novel idea that a diplomat can make more friends for his country with culture than with parties. And with good reason.

"The cultural approach is really better because culture is a common language which everyone understands," she says. She ought to know. She and her husband, Chile's dashing Ambassador, Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, have spent their first months in Washington successfully speaking the language of culture to Americans.

They've already produced a 6-week program on the Chilean arts called "Image of Chile." Since September they've invited 15,000 Americans to 20 performances by outstanding Chilean artists here and in New York—recitals, concerts, lectures, and round-table discussions.

Felicia Monteleagre has read Chilean poetry. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose versatility constantly amazes us, has discussed Chilean fiction and official Washington has flocked to hear Chilean musicians like pianist Claudio Arrau. It all winds up with a show of paintings by Chilean artists, now on exhibit at Howard University, which is now touring the country.

"Image of Chile" is a new wrinkle in the old art of diplomacy, and it's all the bright idea of Ambassador Gutierrez himself. He experimented with the idea when he was Chile's Ambassador to Argentina. A former professor of international law, he is not a career diplomat, which may account for his refreshing approach.

When we went to see his wife at the imposing gray stone Embassy on Massachusetts

Avenue, "Image of Chile" was coming to an end, but it was still very much on her mind.

We talked in the drawing room, which is filled with French furniture and with Signora Gutierrez' own tapestries and paintings, including a fine painting by Boudin and an old Italian bas-relief, which she brought to Washington with her. She also brought her Italian chef and practically the whole household staff from their last post in Buenos Aires.

Life in the United States has not always been well-appointed for Senora Gutierrez. When she first came here—back in 1949—she and her husband lived in a tiny, three room apartment on Cutter Mill Road in Great Neck, Long Island. At that time he was a hardworking foreign student on a scholarship at New York University and she was a hardworking young housewife who did all her own cooking and took care of their baby son.

"A very interesting year but for me a very hard experience. Of course I did everything in the house there was to do—from diapers to cleaning and cooking and frankly, I wasn't accustomed to any of it, because in Chile I did no housework at all. My husband so often brought his American friends home to dinner and, well, I had to learn in a hurry to cook a complicated Chilean meal."

CRITICAL YEAR FOR GRAIN FARMERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 9, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Grain Terminal Association, made his 26th annual report as general manager of this far-flung organization. I read it with a great deal of interest and felt it might be appropriately made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The minority has been very free in its criticism of administration farm policies but, frankly, if I were to comment in the same temper and to the same degree on farm policies as Mr. Thatcher, who has had generations of experience in that field, it might be regarded as captiously partisan.

I allude to only one sentence in Mr. Thatcher's report, for he says:

For grain farmers the next 12 months will be the most critical in at least the last 30 years. Your future on the farm and the future of your cooperatives hangs in the balance.

This is indeed strong and heady comment but it comes from one who has been an expert in that field for a long time and whose political sympathies generally have been toward, rather than away from, the administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the RECORD.

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

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER TO THE MEMBERS OF GTA, DECEMBER 9, 1963

TWO PRECIOUS VOTES

Our Nation has been profoundly shaken by the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy. The shockwave of events that follows the dastardly assassination reaches into the affairs of all men, even into those of your cooperative.

In the same moment that we express our sorrow, we pledge our support to President Lyndon B. Johnson, who now has assumed

all the cares and responsibilities inherent within the affairs of the greatest Nation in the world.

No one in Government could have more earnestly wished for parity of income and opportunity for American farmers than did President Kennedy. This I know. I am certain that our new President has that same desire.

But, as Mr. Kennedy himself often said, the President does not run the United States. He can only make his recommendations to the Congress, which then must express itself within what it assumes to be the will of the people.

Because the basic ingredients of democracy are attitudes and opinions and convictions, no one knows at this moment what direction the new administration in Washington will take in the carrying out of the Nation's affairs.

This uncertainty, coupled with the events of the past several years, makes it unalterably true that your cooperative now stands, more than ever, a vigilant and determined trustee of the farmers' economic interests.

Your GTA was founded to help improve your position as a family farmer in the business of providing vital food for your Nation and the world. It has no other purpose. We have never aimed at making a lot of profit. On the contrary, by our cooperative competition we have aimed to hold down the profits made in grain handling. We have succeeded. Today, grain is handled on the lowest margins in history.

There is no need for me to recite here the details of the assets and liabilities of GTA, or its operating income and expenses, which are contained in other sections of this report. I want to discuss with you, within the limitations of the space allotted here, the fact that your co-ops and your GTA are the tools that give you power and influence in the marketplace and in the affairs of your State and Nation.

For grain farmers the next 12 months will be the most critical in at least the last 30 years. Your future on the farm and the future of your cooperatives hang in the balance.

If, within the coming year, we do not get a change in the trend, 12 months from now you will be well on your way toward losing title to your farms or will be off the farm altogether.

This is a peril that threatens every farmer and every businessman on every Main Street in every town and village throughout our land.

These dangers include falling farm prices, rising costs, falling net income, and an uncertain future for every aspect of farming. Your grain marketing cooperatives are threatened as never before by a governmental marketing agency that overshadows us and takes away from farmers' cooperatives the business for which they were set up to handle. This agency has all the elements of a Frankenstein which, in time, could destroy all of our grain cooperatives.

As far back as 1961 I wrote Secretary of Agriculture Freeman about this as follows: "If the Government wants to take over the marketing, and there is every indication that's on the way, then we should negotiate between our farmers as owners and the Government as to the best way of handling this, either by leasing the properties to the Government for a period of years or selling them outright."

Since January of 1961, the Federal Government has taken over a large part of the grain business. In that time it has sold the stupendous total of nearly 3.5 billion bushels. That's between one-third and one-half of all the grain moving in commercial channels. This has been accomplished through a vast organization that has offices in almost every county, unlimited finances, giant central

computers, and arbitrary control over all the rules.

Millions of dollars of income that should have sustained the private enterprise marketing system, which is essential year in and year out to your marketing service, are building this vast government machine.

This must end. Either farmers must get out of the business of grain marketing, or the Government must get out.

The Federal Government could not do such a thing to any other group in the country. Banks, or labor, or transportation wouldn't take such mistreatment. The voice of protest would be so loud and the resultant political fear so great that Congress and the administration would make prompt corrections.

We need a definite official policy on the Nation's grain reserves. It must spell out the kinds and amounts and locations of the Nation's reserve supplies of grains and oilseeds. This policy must be for a stated period of years so that farmers, their co-operatives, processors, and the entire grain trade may know where they are. The costs of such a program should be placed upon the Nation's general welfare, national defense, commerce, and other appropriate budgets. Reserves must be frozen, so that the Government cannot continue, as it does today, to put surplus commodities on the market, which unjustly depresses farm prices.

Much makeshift storage capacity, temporary and second rate, still exists throughout the country, a holdover from times of war emergency. The Government has a responsibility to get such storage out of use and leave the system of distribution to private enterprise.

We must continue to open up and expand the avenues of trade for U.S. grain farmers by encouraging foreign sales and the use of our grain and oilseed surpluses, just as other commercial grain nations are doing around the world. This means sales to the Communist bloc and to anyone else who wants to buy, and it means more food for peace, including the surplus vegetable oils.

Many steps can be taken, if taken in time, to keep wheat income from collapsing in 1964. These include going back to the policy followed from 1938 to 1951, when no reduction was made from crop loans for storage and farmers were given the full support called for by law. Since then, 10 cents per bushel, on the average, comes out of every grain loan, thus lowering the floor price by that amount. Commodity Credit Corporation selling prices for all grains and oilseeds should be lifted from 105 to 115 percent of the loan, plus carrying charges. This would greatly lessen the amount of grains and oilseeds annually taken over by CCC. Carrying charges must include costs for storage and handling, and interest at regular commercial rates.

The present system of CCC sales at only 105 percent constitutes a ceiling which kills any chance of farmers redeeming grains or oilseeds in surplus and marketing them through the private enterprise system. Such a policy was not the intent of Congress, and it destroys the whole purpose of our farm laws. The present CCC system keeps the bulk of the inventory of grain in the possession of the Federal Government, at unwarranted expense. Much of the inventory could and should be borne by the commercial marketing system.

Grain farmers; dairy, poultry and livestock producers; cotton and tobacco growers; all are in common danger today. Their programs designed to protect price and income are collapsing. They stand desperately in need of a practical and realistic program on which to unite.

Secretary Freeman, of course, knows this, and he desires to see parity of income for farmers.

As history tells us, the goal we seek must be a self-run, self-financed program, commodity by commodity. It should provide an American price in the American market and an export program to carry our abundant production to all corners of the world.

Farmers' bargaining power must not change with each passing change in administrations or with each new Secretary of Agriculture or bureau chief. We must be given this bargaining power through the same method that it has been attained by others, by State and Federal law and by our own organizations under that law. Then we can run our own business, just as others do, subject to the needs of public welfare. That means putting a fair price on our products, and doing so without burdening the taxpayers. Then, and only then, can we assume full responsibility for our business of furnishing the basic food and fiber needed by our Nation.

A step in this direction would be the passage of the Humphrey direct-payment plan, which uses appropriations out of the Federal Treasury, or the McGovern voluntary certificate plan, which depends on the marketplace for its funds.

As always at GTA, our minds are on the things we can and must do to get better prices and more income for the farmers who produce the grain, oilseeds, and other commodities that we market. GTA is an instrument designed to reach those ends.

Your GTA has its vast system of communications to keep farmers in the central Northwest constantly informed on agricultural news and markets. We maintain a corps of men in the country as superintendents and field representatives. We have a line of more than 200 elevators in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, and we have almost 500 local cooperatives that market their grain through GTA. We have subterminals in the country, and we have large terminals at Minneapolis, St. Paul, Superior, Sioux City, Great Falls, and St. Louis.

In addition to these institutions we have a number of processing plants. Durum wheat is processed in our mill at Rush City, Minn., which makes us one of the important stabilizing influences in the premiums connected with Durum. We have the large flaxseed processing plant in Minneapolis, the Minnesota Linseed Oil Co., where we process many millions of bushels of flaxseed every year. We are probably the most stabilizing influence in the flaxseed market. This also is true of the Honeybead Products Co. at Mankato, Minn., where we process about 20 million bushels of soybeans each year.

We operate 125 lumberyards as Great Plains Supply Co., with a large number of service people in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North and South Dakota.

All these institutions function under the direction of a single board of directors and one general manager.

This was all started out of nothing. We can literally say that out of the farmers' patronage of his own institutions we built this huge business machine. We like to refer to this machine as a tool we need to get the farmers' job done.

The year 1964 is the year in which our Nation, through its political conventions, its candidates and its elections will decide what you'll get. In less than a year the Nation will elect a President and a new Congress. Your future farm prices will be made in Washington by them.

Under the present farm laws as they have been administered for the last 10 years more than half of our farmers will be out of business within a very few years. And that's the guarantee of a national depression, not just a rural one. So it becomes an all-important question of what policies the new Congress and the President are to follow.

The farmer has two precious votes. He votes as to where he will take his business—to a cooperative or not—and he votes for the men he wants at the Capitol and in the White House.

This is the year of decision for you. Your future is in your hands.

ANTITRUST LAWS AND PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican on the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I joined the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], in cosponsoring a bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes. This bill is almost an exact duplicate of S. 4070 of the 85th Congress, 2d session, which was cosponsored by a majority of Senators at that time. Hearings were held between July 9 and July 31, 1958. A corresponding bill, H.R. 10378, passed the House of Representatives on June 24, 1958, but the time ran out in the 85th Congress before either the House-passed bill or S. 4070 could have been reported to the Senate for action. This bill had and still has bipartisan support and it would be consistent with other congressional action to give certain exemptions to the antitrust laws when good cause is shown. The Supreme Court of the United States in 1922, in the *Federal Club* case—259 U.S. 200—held that baseball was not subject to the antitrust laws on the ground that the business of presenting baseball exhibitions, being "personal effort not related to production, is not the subject of commerce."

Following that decision, baseball grew and developed under the protection of this judicial exemption. Again in 1953, in the case of *Toolson v. New York Yankees* (346 U.S. 356), the Supreme Court upheld the rationale of the Federal Club case in an opinion and declined to reverse the Federal Club case.

However, in 1957, the Supreme Court in *Radovich v. National Football League* (352 U.S. 445), held that professional football was not exempt from the antitrust laws and distinguished this case from the professional baseball case. The objective of this bill would be to give to the professional sports, football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, the same exemptions that were enumerated in the two baseball cases referred to above.

Professional baseball is included in this bill so that all four of the enumerated sports would be treated equally by legislative action. We believe it is fair to say, from the evidence of the previous hearings before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the House Judiciary Subcommittee, that practically all of the witnesses representing management and the players themselves, as well as the public, agreed that this bill is needed.

It should be noted that Congress recently exempted professional team sports from the antitrust laws pertaining to entering into collective agreements in televising professional team sports.

DRUGS IN SOUTH AMERICA—RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, adopted a resolution, submitted by me, dealing with the rather controversial proposed investigation of "Drugs in South America."

This matter has been one of continuing controversy, and was initiated in the first instance by the late Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, who caused the issuance of all-inclusive subpoenas on the basis of allegations by a single drug distributor.

The subcommittee has wrestled with the jurisdictional problems involved, and also has conferred with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, because of the delicate international factors which might be involved.

The resolution which I submitted, and which was adopted by unanimous vote of all members of the subcommittee, and subsequently was ratified by unanimous vote of the full Judiciary Committee, reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, That the proposed investigation in the matter of "Drugs in South America" be submitted to the Department of State and the Department of Justice for further action and that the data and information collected by the subcommittee be turned over to the Department of Justice; and be it further

Resolved, That further action be deferred at this time on the matter of "Drugs in South America" and the outstanding subpoenas issued by the late chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Kefauver, be extended for 90 days; and be it further

Resolved, That at a later date the subcommittee reexamine said matter to determine whether an investigation broader in scope concerning the application of antitrust laws to matters in foreign field be undertaken.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], provided it is agreed that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

"THE CONGRESSMAN—HIS WORK AS HE SEES IT"

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his customary courtesy in yielding.

At this time I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable book, recently published. It is entitled "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It."

The book deals largely with Congress—Members of Congress, the House of Representatives; it also deals with the Federal Government. The title of the book really should be "The Congressman—His Work and His Worries," because it deals more with the work of Congressmen and also with the sur-

roundings and environment of the Members of Congress who participated in the discussions which led to the writing of the book.

The book was written under the sponsorship of the Brookings Institution, as a result of a grant by the McKinsey Foundation for Management Research, Inc. The book was developed as a result of eight dinner meetings at which Congressmen of the Republican Party and Congressmen of the Democratic Party discussed specific problems, which are listed as chapter headings of the book, as follows:

1. The Member and His Colleagues.
2. The Congressman and His Constituents.
3. The Congressman as Legislator.
4. Pressure Groups and Legislation.
5. Committee Assignments.
6. The Committee System.
7. The Leadership.
8. The Problem of Being Returned.
9. Congressional Wives and Congressional Life.
10. Is It Worthwhile?

As a result of the discussions which were held, tape recordings were made of the various comments by the participating Congressmen on the issues under discussion.

The book has been edited by Charles L. Clapp, now a member of the staff of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and in connection with the book, Mr. Clapp has made appropriate comments.

I was privileged to be one of the Democratic members of the group which participated in the eight roundtable discussions. That was a most rewarding experience. It was illuminating; and I learned—and am sure that my associates also did—a great deal more about the functioning of the House of Representatives and some of the mysteries in connection with the operations of that strange body.

The experience was also rewarding because the Brookings Institution group became a special one which became part of a very special fraternity which reached across party lines.

With apologies to Mr. Gunther, the book perhaps should be entitled "Inside Congress," because it really was made by Members of Congress.

Mr. President, this book is very critical of some of the institutions of the House of Representatives. At the same time, it is critical of some of the critics of the House of Representatives. It presents problems of government which at this time are of great interest to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who participated in the roundtable discussions leading to publication of the book "The Congressman—His Works As He Sees It."

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

Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives participating in roundtable discussions on "The Congressman and His Work."

The Honorable Perkins Bass, of New Hampshire.

The Honorable John F. Baldwin, of California.

The Honorable Richard Bolling, of Missouri.

The Honorable John Brademas, of Indiana.
The Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church, of Illinois.

The Honorable Frank M. Coffin, of Maine.
The Honorable Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri.

The Honorable Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma.

The Honorable Carl Elliott, of Alabama.
The Honorable Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan.

The Honorable Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey.

The Honorable Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan.

The Honorable Byron L. Johnson, of Colorado.

The Honorable Charles Raper Jonas, of North Carolina.

The Honorable Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland.

The Honorable John V. Lindsay, of New York.

The Honorable George S. McGovern, of South Dakota.

The Honorable Lee Metcalf, of Montana.
The Honorable John E. Moss, of California.

The Honorable Richard H. Poff, of Virginia.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota.

The Honorable James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania.

The Honorable Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.

The Honorable John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.
The Honorable Paul C. Rogers, of Florida.

The Honorable Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York.

The Honorable Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.

The Honorable Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi.

The Honorable Keith Thomson, of Wyoming.

The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona.
The Honorable Al Ullman, of Oregon.

The Honorable Jessica Weis, of New York.
The Honorable Bob Wilson, of California.

The Honorable James C. Wright, Jr., of Texas.

The Honorable Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks, I wish to mention one other facet of the book, which I especially commend to the attention of my colleagues. I refer to the chapter of the book which presents the views of the wives of the participating Members of Congress on their work and their problems and attitudes and in regard to what happens to them as a result of their husbands' coming to Congress. I believe that everyone who reads the book will obtain a new insight in regard to how the difficult job they have affects the family life of Members of Congress.

I also commend to the group of Senators who are not alumni of the House of Representatives—about half of the Members of this body—a reading of some of the comments by Members of the other body in regard to their attitude toward this body. That will also be a rewarding experience.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a paragraph from the introduction of the book which refers to its editor, Charles L. Clapp. He has done a remarkable job in analyzing a great many tape recordings, in

making excerpts from appropriate remarks on various subjects, in tying together the various parts, in adding his own comments, and in bringing the book up to date with observations on personal experiences and events of the day. I think this book ranks alongside the book by Mr. Neil McNeil, as regards an understanding of Congress, especially the House of Representatives.

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

Charles L. Clapp, then of the governmental studies staff, served as executive secretary, and had the principal part in organizing the conference and preparing the agenda. George A. Graham, director of governmental studies at the Brookings Institution, served as conference chairman. Mr. Clapp subsequently prepared this book from the recorded discussions, from additional interviews, and from other relevant materials. A political scientist with teaching and governmental experience, he had worked in both the House and the Senate, in the offices of Members of Congress, and for congressional committees before joining the Brookings staff. He has now returned to Capitol Hill where he is legislative assistant to Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts. The Brookings Institution is indebted to him for the skill with which he has brought the material together and prepared the manuscript.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President—

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I was the other Member of the Senate, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives, who participated in the discussions which led to the publication of this book.

The Senator from Montana mentioned the recently published book, by Neil McNeil, on the operations of the House of Representatives. That book stands in contrast to this one, in that in the book edited by Mr. Clapp the Congressmen themselves speak and offer their views on the problems and also the rewards of service in the House of Representatives.

The two books make a very fine set of volumes on the work and scope of Congress, both as an institution and on the problems and opportunities of Representatives. I believe Mr. Clapp, the author of the book to which the Senator from Montana has referred, is especially endowed to write such a volume, not only because it comes in the wake of long conferences with Members of the House of Representatives, but also because he himself is a trained political scientist—not merely a theoretical political scientist—but one who has worked both in the House of Representatives in committees and on congressional staffs, but also has had experience on the Senate side.

I commend the book to Senators. I believe it is well worth reading by all Members of Congress and by anyone who is interested in government.

I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I believe it should be called to the attention of Senators and to all Representatives who are not familiar with the work of the Brookings Institution that their publications on government are available to every Member of Congress—one copy each—upon request.

Again, as the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned, I, as one who served in the House of Representatives, suggest that it is a fine book to provide even a greater understanding of that body. Those of us who have not served in the House will obtain a better understanding of the mysteries of the other body.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. I was anxious to comment on the book which has been discussed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

I commend to my colleagues this new and excellent work from the Brookings Institution, written by a former staff member there, Charles L. Clapp, who is now legislative assistant to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I believe the book deserves attention both in the Congress and in the Nation because it explores, through interviews with Congressmen, an all too little understood aspect of our governmental system—the human workings of the legislative institution, how a Congressman operates in his various official functions and how he feels about his work.

Reform of outdated congressional procedures has long been a goal of mine, a goal which I share with an ever-increasing number of Members as public disenchantment with congressional inability to act on certain types of vital legislation grows and as the burden upon the executive and judicial branches grows. Meaningful reforms will not, in my judgment, really be possible until the public gains greater insight into how the Congress works than the existing textbooks impart. This book is a valuable step in the direction of greater public information about the basic elements of congressional life—preparation of legislation, voting, constituent mail, the committee system, congressional leadership, reelection. I hope that it is widely read.

The book deserves the attention of Congress and the Nation because it explains, through interviews with Representatives, the human workings of the legislative institution, and the Representative as an operating human being. I know how important that is from my own service in the other body, and also in the Senate.

It bears upon the need for bringing up to date the outdated congressional procedures to which I heavily attribute our apparently getting so involved that we are not able to do all we should be doing here. But we have a big stake in what the public thinks of Congress. We have suffered in public esteem. That is bad for a system of freedom and for our Republic. So, for all these reasons, I hope very much that the book will be

widely read by all Senators and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as one who served 16 years in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate, I was particularly impressed by the scope and depth of a book just published by the Brookings Institution, "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It," by Charles L. Clapp.

The complexities of a Congressman's duties and responsibilities are far too frequently misunderstood by the public. Indeed, I know from my own experience in the House that Congressmen themselves sometimes have difficulty in diagnosing their numerous areas of responsibility, and even more difficulty in covering their field.

Although the legislative process can be frustrating and cumbersome, and many of us both in and out of the Congress have long advocated change and reform, we must never lose sight of the fact that it is one of the three great pinnacles of our free society. It is both our lawmaking body, and an irreplaceable part of our unique system of checks and balances.

Mr. Clapp has performed an invaluable service both to the public and to the Congress itself. Anything which furthers understanding of the Congress and of its mounting problems is of great importance to us all. Mr. Clapp's book does this admirably.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It," by Charles L. Clapp, is an excellent treatise on the work of the Congressman and the environment within which he functions. It provides a clear discussion on the pros and cons of being a Congressman. There are the satisfactions that come with being a part of the Government of our country, the opportunities to meet interesting and able colleagues and their wives, the chances of seeing world leaders and hearing vital domestic and international difficulties discussed firsthand. On the other hand, there are the problems of getting elected, the difficulties of educating one's children while shuttling back and forth between one's congressional district and Washington, the personal financial questions, the little time available to give to the study of legislative bills because of the time devoted to serving and entertaining constituents. All these points and many more are clearly brought out with apt quotations from the actual Members of the House of Representatives.

Charles L. Clapp is a careful and thorough researcher. I know because he has served as my legislative assistant for the last 2 years. The Brookings Institution gave him the job of writing a treatise about Congress from the Congressman's point of view. He has succeeded very well. The result of his research, stimulatingly set forth, gives everyone interested a chance to understand what a Congressman really thinks and does from the lips of the Member himself. Clapp conducted well-attended roundtable meetings in which 36 Members of the House participated. He met individually with many Members of Con-

gress. He did further research on many of the subjects discussed in these sessions. This book is the result of the roundtable discussions and meetings, and the author's research. As a Member of Congress, I find many of my own thoughts clearly portrayed through the chapters of this book. In a manner of speaking, it is a study in psychology.

The Brookings Institution has made a contribution to the knowledge of the legislative branch of our Government and the way it carries on its work by describing it in the words of those actually doing the work. Mr. Clapp can be congratulated on the clear and accurate way in which he has reflected the many sides of the Congressman—his hopes, his successes, his difficulties, and his frustrations, and above all, in depicting the importance of the job the Congressman does for our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in bringing to the attention of the Senate and, indeed, all thoughtful students of government throughout this land a most worthwhile book which has just been published by the Brookings Institution. "The Congressman," by Mr. Charles L. Clapp, is a distinguished contribution to a rather limited number of outstanding works on the Congress.

Mr. Clapp based his extremely well-written and perceptive study on a series of roundtable conferences with a select group of Democratic and Republican Members of the House of Representatives. Several of the participants are now Members of the U.S. Senate. He followed these discussions up with careful and detailed interviews with still more Representatives as well as committee and office staff members. However, Mr. Clapp brings to this most impressive study—which ranges across the board from the daily overwhelming detail and busy work which confronts Members in both Houses to the broader philosophical problems of the appropriate role of an elected Representative to his constituency in our Republic—not merely deft handling of many opinions but also a deep understanding which he has gained by working with a congressional committee, in a Congressman's office, and now in his responsibilities as legislative assistant to Senator SALTONSTALL.

This book will provide invaluable information for all who want to understand the environment and the problems of Congress, which I think many of us feel is only infrequently understood and often much abused sometimes by people who should know better. Before one seeks to reform Congress he should seek to understand it. Mr. Clapp has provided this understanding. His comments and the comments of Members which he faithfully relates will, I am sure, offer insight to even the most hardened legislator who has spent many years here. Most appropriately, Mr. Clapp in seeking to explain the motivation of Members of Congress whose days are filled with much work and sometimes with little appreciation but who on the whole would not trade their opportunity to serve the American people with any

other person, concludes with the words of Daniel Webster, which appear above the Speaker's rostrum in the House of Representatives:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Clapp has met this standard in the field of political science with his work, "The Congressman." It is, also, a worthy standard to guide all of us in the days ahead.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we hope in the very near future—today, if possible, if not tomorrow—that the conference report on the vocational education bill will be before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon has been a leader on that bill, and, as on all education measures this year, he has done a marvelous job.

The other day the President said that the present session of Congress would be remembered, at least in large part, because of the great contribution which it has made to our Nation's educational problems. There is no question about that in the mind of any Senator who knows anything about what is going on in the Senate. The Senator from Oregon is a leader in this regard, and has done a masterly job in this connection.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I share his hope that the conference report on the vocational education bill will be before the Senate tomorrow. I sincerely hope that the rumors to the effect that there is even a possibility that the conference report might be rejected in the House will not prove to be true, because I see no hope of the subject ever being considered again in conference if that course of action is followed.

The bill is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. I understand that those who are objecting to it claim to be objecting chiefly on the ground that they believe it would authorize too much money. I happen to believe that we cannot authorize too much money to meet the great needs of the 15- to 21-year-olds in this country who must be vocationally trained if they are ever to be employable.

It is a bill that has connected with it all of the impacted area money and the National Defense Education Act money. All I can do is express the sincere hope that if there are those in the House who believe the bill authorizes too much money, they will remember that it is not an appropriation bill and that they can reserve their objections to a fight on the appropriations.

I most respectfully point out to the House that I see no opportunity whatsoever of any further consideration of the bill prior to adjournment. I know nothing more that Senate conferees can offer. In the average we have cut by two-thirds those parts of the program to which certain House conferees objected.

We have come more than half way. I shall ever be proud of the fact that the Republicans on the Senate conference, save one absentee, stood shoulder to shoulder with me in my endeavor to get a conference report on vocational education.

At the present moment, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], whose yeoman service, in my judgment, spelled the difference between a conference report and no conference report, stands near. All we can do is bide our time, wait and hope. I hope that a majority of the Members of the other body will see the merits of the comments I have made, which are shared by many other members of the conference, and will approve the conference report.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee, but I am interested in education. I am a member of several economic committees. There is no more important contribution to our economy that Congress can make than the vocational education bill.

We know the No. 1 economic problem is unemployment. The heart of that unemployment problem is lack of skill. The bill is designed explicitly to solve that tough problem.

The Milwaukee Journal reports that the high schools of Wisconsin have the lowest dropout rate in the Nation—only 8 in 100. This means that 92 out of 100 high school students finish high school.

I am proud that the State I represent is No. 1 in the country.

There are many reasons, but the primary reason is that, unlike most States, Wisconsin has a law which requires students to remain in school until they are 18 years of age. Some students attend a vocational school under the law.

I have a resolution before the subcommittee, of which the Senator from Oregon is chairman, which would call for a national showing of sentiment on the part of the Senate favoring this kind of law for adoption in all States.

As I indicated a moment ago, I strongly feel that the toughest problem we have is unemployment, and that the most constructive way to deal with the unemployment problem is to provide for a substantial amount of vocational education so that the unemployed, who are largely concentrated among the unskilled people, can develop the skills they need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "State Lowest in Dropouts—Only 8 of 100," may be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE LOWEST IN DROPOUTS—ONLY 8 OF 100

Wisconsin leads the Nation in the percentage of high school students who graduate according to the results of an educational survey, announced Monday.

Of 100 Wisconsin students who were in the eighth grade in 1958, 92 completed high school in 1962. The national average is about 71.

This report was made in Washington by the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools.

In median years of schooling, however, Wisconsin was lower. The State ranked 35th, with a median of 10.4 years of school. This figure takes in all of the population, showing that 50 percent of the people have completed more than 10.4 years, and 50 percent have completed less. Nationally the figure is 10.6.

Unlike most States, Wisconsin has a law that requires students to remain in school, at least part time, until they are 18. Some students attend a vocational school part time under this law.

Wisconsin was 14th in financial support, measured by amount spent per year per pupil. Wisconsin spent \$487 per pupil in 1962-63.

The report said:

"A geographical financial pattern becomes readily apparent in the fact sheet. Twelve of the thirteen States with the lowest holding power are in the southern regions, and all of these are below the national average of \$432 in estimated current expenditures per pupil."

REDUCTION OF COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense deserves great credit for the drastic reduction of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by the Defense Department as great news for the taxpayer and excellent medicine for the free enterprise system.

Secretary McNamara's cost-slashing campaign has achieved in the first quarter of fiscal 1964 an astonishing reduction in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to only 12½ percent of total procurements.

This represents the eventual 3-year goal aimed at by Secretary McNamara when he first announced this program in mid-1962, putting the Defense Department a happy 2 years ahead of schedule.

This is a sensational reduction from about 40 percent of defense procurements which were cost-plus-fixed-fee when Secretary McNamara took over the administration of the Defense Department 3 years ago.

This is really an amazing accomplishment, because there has been great resistance on the part of industry, and, of course, it involves great benefits for the taxpayers.

Cost-plus is the worst kind of a contract. It gives the taxpayer no protection whatsoever from cost padding, unnecessary, inefficient personnel, fat contracts with subcontractors, and a general "why-worry-about-costs-Uncle-Sam-pays-it-anyhow" attitude that skyrocket defense costs and the taxpayer's burden without increasing our military strength.

At the same time cost-plus is sometimes necessary, especially with rapidly changing research and technology, when neither the Government nor industry can arrive at a fair estimate of likely eventual cost.

Of course, it is also the easiest as well as the softest policy. It requires no tough Government negotiation, no rigorous competition, no painful pressure for ingenuity to keep costs down.

Defense procurement, amounting as it does to a huge proportion of American manufacturing production, has an immense impact on the efficiency and productivity of American industry.

The drastic reduction of cost-plus in favor of more competitive procurement is certain to improve the efficiency of American industry significantly.

This achievement is also sure to save American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY MAY ERR BECAUSE OF FAULTY STATISTICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the October issue of Fortune magazine there appeared an article by Prof. Oskar Morgenstern entitled "Qui Numerare Incipit Errare Incipit." Freely translated from the Latin I had as a freshman in college, this means that he who begins to rely on statistics for action begins to make mistakes.

The article raises a large number of questions about the quality and usefulness of our Federal statistics. As chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I am very concerned about this matter.

It is an axiom that no military operation can be better than its intelligence. It is equally true that no economic policy can be better than the reliability of the statistics on which it is based.

Since the Morgenstern article appeared, Congressman TOM CURTIS, a member of the Statistics Subcommittee, has had a considerable amount of correspondence in support of the Morgenstern article. This correspondence appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 27 on pages 22849-22852.

Mr. President, I think that there is much of merit in the Morgenstern article. I believe, in fact, that it would be very useful for the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee to reexamine our general economic statistics to be sure that we fully understand their weaknesses as well as their strengths, and their margins of error as well as their precision.

Since I became chairman of the subcommittee a couple of years ago, our subcommittee has held a series of hearings on statistics. By and large the hearings have been reassuring. We have invited to appear the strongest critics. It is apparent there is still plenty of room for improvement. There is no question that our statistics are the best statistics of any government in the world. They should be. They are still not nearly good enough.

I have recently received a copy of a letter from Mr. A. Arthur Charous, chairman of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference, to the editors of Fortune magazine, commenting on the Morgenstern article. I think the points made by Mr. Charous in this letter are excellent. In particular, he indicates

that there is no reason to doubt the honesty or the conscientiousness of those Federal Government civil servants who construct and produce the Federal statistics. Quite the contrary, they have done an excellent job in the past.

Mr. Charous also points out in this letter that many publications have been produced by Federal Government agencies indicating the qualifications and characteristics of the statistics which are available.

I still believe that it would be useful for the Statistics Subcommittee to draw this material together and make it generally available so that all users of Federal statistics, including those of us here in the Congress, can be aware of the limitations which should be associated with the statistics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Charous be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DECEMBER 10, 1963.

EDITOR, FORTUNE,
Rockefeller Center,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It is unfortunate that Professor Morgenstern's article ("Qui Numerare Incipit Errare Incipit," Fortune, October 1963) did not begin with those paragraphs with which it concludes. His last page states the essential argument in a nutshell: the economic statistics with which we operate are not completely satisfactory. We should make them better. We should cast out data which are deliberately falsified by the reporter.

These are truisms which all can accept. But one does not have to accept Professor Morgenstern's assertion that many of our statistics are based upon information which is false to begin with. There are, no doubt, individual instances of basic information having been deliberately falsified by householders or by businessmen, but this unjustified general indictment of Americans as individuals or as businessmen has no place in any article dealing with Government statistics unless there is at least some modicum of solid evidence to back it up. Unless there is wholesale moral decay in this country, we can have confidence that the information supplied for statistical purposes is not deliberately falsified. This confidence is buttressed by the knowledge that the Government's statisticians carefully review data reported by respondents. Many inaccuracies are noted in this review process, and many reports are amended by respondents before the data are included in the Government's published statistics.

Nor is it necessary to accept Professor Morgenstern's judgment that economic statistics are presented to the public as if these were free from fault. Such is simply not the case. Many current Federal statistical programs, especially those emanating from the Bureau of the Census, explicitly detail the limitations, shortcomings, and standard error of sampling. Very considerable sums of money are spent to evaluate the effectiveness, shortcomings, inaccuracies, and other deficiencies of our vast Censuses of Business, Manufactures, Mining, Population, Housing, and Agriculture.

No one can fault the Office of Business Economics for failing to describe either the methods of the compilation of the National Economic Accounts or their limitations and deficiencies. These are spelled out in detail in "National Income," 1954 edition, and "U.S. Income and Output," 1958.

And the Office of Business Economics has been trying for years to educate us away from relying too heavily upon the gross aggregates of GNP and national income. Especially in this last year, it has made substantial strides forward.

It is true that no estimate of error is attached to the figures presented in the national economic accounts. The task is probably impossible because of the wide variety of sources used in compiling these summary figures. It is worth noting, however, that the figures for national income and gross national product are developed independently, largely from different sources of original data. Yet, when they are compared in true bookkeeping fashion as the right and left sides of a ledger, the statistical discrepancy has been remarkably small—well under 2 percent in every year since World War II. While this is not a test of statistical accuracy as demanded by Professor Morgenstern, it is a test of reasonableness.

The vast amount of detailed economic information available from other sources also provides a test of reasonableness for the reported figures for national income and gross national product. It is highly unlikely that national income and GNP can be as wildly inaccurate as Professor Morgenstern suggests. Current information on retail sales, on tax receipts, on unemployment, on industrial production, on bank deposits and loans, on manufacturers' sales, on commodity exports and imports, etc. which reflect what is going on in all aspects of economic life are simply too numerous to allow egregious errors in the national economic accounts.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains continuing efforts to improve the adequacy and accuracy of its price information. The concepts it uses, its methods, and the limitations of the data are very clearly spelled out in a number of places, including a very extensive series of Congressional hearings. Likewise, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made very considerable efforts to improve our understanding of the nature and extent of unemployment. In doing so, it has tried to educate users away from over-reliance upon the aggregate figure expressed as a percentage of the labor force unemployed.

Annually, the Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes a brief summary of its major statistical series, together with their limitations. For more detailed study, one may consult the detailed descriptions and critiques contained in "Techniques of Preparing Major BLS Statistical Series."

The Department of Agriculture has a nine-volume handbook—"Major Statistical Series of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, How They Are Constructed and Used"—which describes in painful detail how each of these major series is developed, what the shortcomings and limitations are, and what needs to be done to improve them.

Finally, the "Historical and Descriptions Supplement to Economic Indicators," a cooperative effort of the "Joint Economic Committee" of the Congress, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, clearly states the limitations of and needed improvements to those major series included regularly in "Economic Indicators."

No one questions the need to improve our present statistics, but everyone questions the cost of doing so. It has been pointed out that the demands for statistical improvement are almost infinite. There are only limited funds available, or likely to be available, for making statistical improvements. The talents available to bring these improvements about are limited. And the patience of respondents who fill out questionnaires is limited. For these reasons, it is extremely important that we diligently seek a consensus as to which improvements are most needed.

Then, with adequate public support, it should be possible for the statisticians to get on with the job of providing better data in those areas where the need for improvement is most critical.

Sincerely yours,

A. ARTHUR CHAROUS,
Chairman.

THE "FED" WOULD MAKE TAX CUT WORTHLESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testified before the Senate Finance Committee on the monetary policy which he thought should be associated with the proposed tax cut. Copies of his statement are not available but one résumé of his statement appears in the Wall Street Journal for Wednesday, December 11. I ask unanimous consent that this résumé article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe Mr. Martin provides one of the most effective arguments that can be given against adoption of the proposed tax cut. He indicated clearly before the Finance Committee, as he has on repeated occasions in the past, that any budget deficit resulting from a tax cut should be financed—of course, he has the principal say as to how it will be financed—primarily from borrowing funds from individuals and institutions. He obviously does not believe that the national debt should be increased by additional sales of Government securities, either to commercial banks or to the Federal Reserve banks; in other words, monetizing the debt.

In effect, therefore, Mr. Martin is saying that the money supply should not increase in order to finance the greater level of economic activity which is anticipated as a result of the tax cut.

One brief example shows what that could do. If all the tax cut were financed by borrowing, the situation would be the same as if a typical John Q. Public got a \$400 tax cut and then used the money to buy Government bonds. The effect on the economy would be nil.

When I have called Mr. Martin in the past he has indicated, "Yes; but with extra money in his pocket he is more likely to spend other income." There is no indication that he would do so. I know of no study which suggests that he would do so.

It is extremely important, if we are to have a tax cut, that the monetary and fiscal policies march step by step.

I do not believe there should be a tax cut now. If the money supply is not increased, even though economic activity increases, the effect will certainly be higher interest rates; and what is even more important, no additional credit available to finance an expanding economy.

The effect of higher interest rates and no additional credit, of course, will be

to curb any stimulating effects that may stem from the tax cut. Therefore, the Government will be doing with the left monetary hand exactly the opposite of what it is attempting to do with its right fiscal hand. Under these conditions, Mr. President, it seems a much wiser policy simply to increase the monetary supply without a tax cut. The lower interest rates that would follow could stimulate the economy without incurring the deeper budgetary deficit which would otherwise take place as a result of the tax cut.

If a bill is enacted to cut taxes by \$11 billion and we then sell that much in bonds to individuals and institutions, there will be no economic stimulation. There will be a deeper deficit and a deeper burden on the taxpayers of the future, without the benefit the tax cut would otherwise provide.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for so graciously yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

FEDERAL RESERVE HEAD TELLS PANEL TAX CUT COULD STIMULATE HIGHER INTEREST RATES

WASHINGTON.—The Government's top money manager told Congress a tax cut won't necessarily spark a new round of inflation but warned it may lead to higher interest rates.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the credit-regulating Federal Reserve Board, testified before the Senate Finance Committee on problems involved in handling the increased Federal budget deficit that would result from the administration's \$11.1 billion tax-cutting bill. Mr. Martin was the committee's last public witness on the House-passed measure; the 17-man committee will begin closed-door consideration of proposed Senate amendments to the bill today.

Mr. Martin repeated his oft-declared admonition that the Government should cover a Federal budget deficit mainly by borrowing funds from individuals and institutions that hold supplies of savings. He warned that inflation would result if the Treasury relies on the commercial banking system to buy its I.O.U.'s, especially if the Federal Reserve tries to expand the supply of funds with which banks can buy the securities.

FINANCING DEFICITS WITHOUT INFLATION

He said the Government so far has been able to finance recent budget deficits "without producing inflation," mainly because a big supply of savings was available for lending to the Treasury. But if the Federal Reserve "inordinately" increases the Nation's money supply just to cover a Treasury deficit, "it's just a matter of time before prices begin to rise again," Mr. Martin warned.

Mr. Martin said the Federal Reserve Board doesn't intend to allow a big increase in the money supply in the wake of a tax cut. Thus if tax reductions stimulate the economy and spur new business demands for credit, he said, "it may lead to higher interest rates." He predicted the board probably will be criticized for not staving off higher interest rates by expanding the supply of credit, quipping: "We're always put in the position of a chaperone who takes away the punch just when the party's getting good."

Mr. Martin gave carefully hedged approval to the idea of cutting taxes now, saying it's a "risk worth taking" if strong pressures are applied to control Government expenditures. Beyond that, Mr. Martin refused to say what he thinks about specific features of the House-passed bill.

COMMENT ON CURRENT "WHODUNIT"

Under committee questioning, the Federal Reserve chief's testimony sometimes strayed far from the subject of taxes. In answer to a question from Senator WILLIAMS, Republ-

can, of Delaware, Mr. Martin said he thinks there should be some form of Federal control over credit margins in trading on commodity markets. The Federal Reserve Board currently restricts the amount of credit that can be extended to buyers of stock, but no Government agency has similar power over commodity market trading.

Mr. Martin said he's felt for some time that Government margin requirements should be established for commodities trading, remarking that the current "whodunit" involving missing salad oil at a Bayonne, N.J., tank farm is the latest illustration of that need. He said he wasn't prepared to tell Senator WILLIAMS what kind of margin controls are needed or what Federal agency should administer them. But he promised to give the Senator a written report on the matter.

Answering another question, Mr. Martin said he might favor at some future time a reduction in the amount of gold required to stand behind U.S. currency. Present law requires 25 percent gold backing for Federal Reserve currency and other liabilities. "I don't think there's anything sacred" about this percentage, Mr. Martin declared, noting it was reduced in 1946 from a previous level of 40 percent.

Mr. Martin said that once the U.S. eliminates the persistent deficit in its balance of international payments "the time may come again when we want to make an adjustment" in the 25-percent gold requirement, but he repeated his earlier opposition to taking any such step now. The balance of payments represents the difference between what is loaned, spent or given away abroad and what is received.

Finance Committee Chairman HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, said his group will begin considering today some of the 30-odd amendments introduced for attachment to the House bill by various Senators. He said he hoped some of the pending amendments could be disposed of one way or another before Congress takes its Christmas recess, but he declined to predict flatly how much progress could be made.

In a separate discussion with reporters, Republican Senate Leader DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he thinks the committee can make "very little" progress before the Christmas recess. Chairman BYRD has pledged that his panel will resume consideration of the tax bill when Congress returns in early January.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether he proposes any other business for the Senate today, and whether there is likely to be any rollcall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In reply to the distinguished minority leader, there is an order that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow. It is my understanding that an agreement has been arrived at as to an hour to vote on the foreign aid conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be no votes tonight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No votes tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the Senator inform the Senate what will be considered after the vote is taken on the foreign aid conference report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We hope that by that time the House will have acted on the vocational education conference report, which will be handled in the Senate by the Senator from Oregon. We will consider that after the House acts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that is before the House today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator. During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, with the understanding that the colloquy will be printed elsewhere?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If there is no impertinence involved, I should like to inquire how long the Senator will engage the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. A couple of hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A couple of hours.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have agreed with the leadership to make my speech in opposition to the foreign aid conference report this evening, in order that the Senate might enter into its unanimous understanding, that debate shall be limited tomorrow to 1 hour to each side, with the vote at 2 p.m.

The record against the conference report on foreign aid really was made during the 3-week period of debate on the foreign aid bill of the recent past. Nevertheless, Senators who feel strongly about our opposition to the conference report should make this record, for the reason that the remarks today and during the 2-hour period tomorrow are not the last that will be heard of the foreign aid problem which confronts this country. When the Senate reconvenes in January Senators will have been in close touch with their constituencies over the holidays.

I am satisfied that Senator after Senator and Representative after Representative will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people want no part of this conference report, and they want no part of the foreign aid policies that prevail in this country at the present time. The senior Senator from Oregon has said many times in the historic debate this year on foreign aid that they will support a foreign aid program; but they want that program reformed. They want to put an end to the shocking waste and inefficiency, and downright corruption—and I use that word advisedly—that has come to characterize so much of foreign aid in so many places in the world.

Therefore, I feel that I owe a trust to the people of my State to make this address tonight in the Senate for the Record.

I wish to associate myself with the brilliant and eloquent speech that was made earlier today by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in opposition to the conference report. He expressed

many of the views that the senior Senator from Oregon will express tonight.

I am pleased and delighted to know that my good friend ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, will vote against the conference report. He helped immeasurably in the debate in which we sought to amend the foreign aid bill.

As I told him, I was disappointed that on the final vote on the bill he saw fit to vote for it; I respect his reason for so doing, but disagree with it.

He seemed to feel that voting for it might be helpful in obtaining a better conference report. But I have been in the Senate long enough to know that that never happens—that a better conference report is obtained if a Senator continues to oppose a bill that he believes is wrong in its major parts. The foreign aid bill, in its major parts, has been wrong from the very beginning; and it is wrong now; and it should not be approved by the adoption of the conference report.

So I say, in the opening of my address, that the conference report on the foreign aid bill should be rejected.

I am very much disappointed in the procedures that were followed by the Foreign Relations Committee in the handling of the foreign aid bill. I am disappointed that the Foreign Relations Committee sent to the floor of the Senate a conference report on foreign aid that most of us on the Foreign Relations Committee never saw until we picked it up on our desks on the floor of the Senate prior to the beginning of the debate—a Foreign Relations Committee report, Mr. President, not even seen by the members of the committee.

What kind of procedure is that? It is not pleasant to criticize the policies of a committee of which I am a member. When I find myself in such thorough disagreement with so many of the policies of the committee of which I am a member, it seems to me necessary to bring those criticisms of the policies into the light of public gaze, because I have given up any hope of trying to change the procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee behind closed doors. The procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee are going to have to be changed, in my judgment, by the mandate of the Senate. I have already announced to the Foreign Relations Committee, behind the closed doors of the committee, my unhappiness with a good many of its policies and procedures. I intend now, in the months ahead, to express my dissatisfaction with the procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee on the floor of the Senate, if it is true that we have reached the point where we cannot obtain changes within the committee itself.

I am very unhappy about the selection of the conferees for the conference on the foreign aid bill. It was very interesting where the line was drawn this year in the selection of the conferees, a selection based on the inexcusable principle of seniority that prevails in the Senate, behind which are so often hidden many disservices to the American people in conducting the affairs of the Senate.

The line was carefully drawn, in selecting the conferees for the conference on the foreign aid bill at a point where not a single Senator opposed to the bill was selected. That is an interesting commentary, because when we find that kind of stacked procedure, we cannot expect the conference to have had presented to it very effectively the point of view of the opposition. There was no effective presentation of the views of the opposition.

We listened to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] this afternoon make a speech expressing his great disappointment because the amendment forbidding aid to countries that seize vessels in international waters was dropped in conference, although it passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote. I do not think anyone need be surprised about it. The chairman of the conference in Senate said, in effect, during the debate on the Senate floor, that he considered it to be—and I paraphrase him; I do not quote him—one of the most unsound amendments or proposals that had been made in his time in the Senate. But the overwhelming majority of Senators disagreed with him.

It is interesting that the Senate conferees dropped, in conference, policy reform after policy reform on foreign aid that was adopted in the Senate. I speak only for myself. Other Senators can interpret the action of the conference, but I tell the Senate how I interpret it. It is exactly the result we should expect when the number of conferees is so limited, so far as the Democratic side of the conference was concerned. The result is not surprising when the three Democrats who were selected, on the basis of the outworn and unsound principle of seniority, were ardent proponents of the bill, who made clear time and time again throughout the debate on the bill their general opposition to most of the reforms we sought to bring about.

Mr. President, there will be another day on which legislation dealing with foreign aid will be before the Senate. If anyone believes that I will in the slightest relent in my opposition to foreign aid as now administered, he could not be more wrong.

The American people are being fleeced, rooked, cheated, and defrauded by much of the foreign aid program.

So long as I serve in the Senate, I intend to make reform of foreign aid one of my major legislative objectives.

The reasons for my objection and opposition to the pending conference report on foreign aid, as now before the Senate, are basically two: The amounts to be authorized are too high, and some significant policy provisions added by the Senate were omitted or so drastically changed as to make them meaningless.

So important do I consider a statutory restriction on aid to military juntas that have deposed constituted governments in Latin America, that I would vote against almost any foreign aid bill that lacks such a provision; this one lacks it. Even the weak and feeble Senate language is sunk without so much as a mention in the conference report.

I believe it particularly apropos at this hour—and I predict that events in the very near future will show how apropos what I am saying now is—to a discussion of this subject matter that I now write into the history of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the source of the Morse amendment on juntas which I finally agreed to offer.

I fought for a junta amendment which would provide that the President of the United States could not make foreign aid available to any country whose democratically elected, constitutional form of government was overthrown by a military junta, unless the President reported to Congress that in his judgment it was in our national interest to do so, and Congress passed a concurrent resolution approving of the President's recommendation. That is the democratic process. That is representative government put to work. That is carrying out our check-and-balance system under our form of government.

The administration found that there were many in Congress who shared my point of view, many in America who shared my point of view, and many of the leaders of our friendly neighbors to the south in Latin America who shared my point of view.

I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters and cablegrams and expressions from some of our best democratic friends who are leaders of democratic regimes in Latin America.

I am advised by the majority leader that at one of the Tuesday morning breakfasts of the leadership at the White House the position of the senior Senator from Oregon and some of his other objections to foreign aid were discussed.

As a result of that discussion, the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, called me to the White House. I conferred with him for approximately 45 minutes regarding some of my major objections to the foreign aid bill, but particularly with regard to my junta amendment.

If the majority leader were present, I would call him as my witness, because he knows what the President subsequently told him about this matter. In that conference the President expressed concern as to whether or not my amendment would interfere with his Presidential right to recognize a government.

I said, "Mr. President, I taught the separation-of-powers doctrine for years, and I would not walk out on it now merely because I am in the Senate. I would be the first in the Senate to take up the forensic cudgels to defend your right under our Constitution to recognize any government that you wish to recognize. My amendment has nothing to do with your right to recognize a government. But, Mr. President, your right to recognize a government does not give you the right to spend a single taxpayer dollar to aid any government merely because you have recognized it. I do not think you should aid any government that was created by a military junta overthrowing a democratically elected, constitutional government."

The President was not aware that that was the position of the senior Senator

from Oregon. He was pleased. Then we discussed my amendment. He asked me if I would modify my amendment by putting it in the negative form rather than in the affirmative.

He asked me if I would modify my amendment by providing that if the President filed a report with Congress asking for aid to be given to a so-called junta government which, in the opinion of the President, it was in the national interest to aid, he would be allowed to grant such aid provided Congress, within 30 days, did not pass a resolution forbidding it.

I made it clear to the President that I would prefer the affirmative form. I said, "You would be in a much stronger position if you were to accept an amendment providing that you would give no aid unless Congress affirmatively joined you in the approval of such aid. Furthermore, the affirmative form would make it possible, in my judgment, for you to obtain aid in a matter of hours, whereas your suggestion would require the passage of at least 30 days. If you took it in the negative form, I do not believe 30 days would be long enough."

He said he would talk with the Secretary of State about it. He expressed the view that he saw the merit in my proposal; that he was concerned about it; but that he had felt it would be preferable to make the approach that he was recommending, which was that he could grant aid after 30 days if Congress, in the 30-day period, did not pass a resolution forbidding the granting of the aid.

I shall always be glad, because it will be one of my most cherished memories, that my last conference with President Kennedy was that conference. It was a delightful one. It was a most friendly and pleasant one. All the President sought was my point of view on the issues that are in conflict on foreign aid at the present time.

The day of the conference was a beautiful day. The President walked with me from his Office, down the sidewalk to the pavement within the White House grounds, and part way down toward the southwest gate, where I was to take a car. In that walk, having finished our discussion of foreign aid, we discussed the two major education bills—the bill on higher education and the bill on vocational education. The President was most kind in his reference to the work that we had done on those two bills. He made clear to me, as I pointed out on the floor last Friday, I believe, his complete and enthusiastic endorsement of the vocational education bill, which carries out his recommendations, and particularly his supplemental report on education, which he filed on June 18 of this year.

He also asked me about the status of the higher education bill, and I explained to him the position I had taken, as I subsequently explained, that, as chairman of the Senate conferees, I preferred to bring up the higher education bill after the conference report on the vocational education bill had been agreed to. The President completely agreed with my legislative procedure in that regard.

After a few days—and I presume that during that period of time the President spoke with the Secretary of State—the administration sent to the Senate its junta amendment. The carrier of the message was the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, Mr. Dutton. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is in the Chamber as I give this account, for the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon met with Mr. Dutton in the Senate restaurant and there discussed the administration's proposal, which was the President's proposal. The administration's proposal contained the identical language that President Kennedy presented in his White House Office in the last conference I had with him.

In the conference with Mr. Dutton, in the Senate restaurant, I said that I would prefer 60 days, rather than 30 days. At that time the Senator from Minnesota agreed with me that such a recommendation should be made to the Secretary of State. The Senator from Minnesota could not commit the administration; he could only recommend. At that time he felt that that recommendation should go back to the Secretary of State, and it did go back.

Then the day for the final vote on a junta amendment was reached. I reached the conclusion that we could not get the 60-day provision for after all, in the legislative process it is necessary to count noses. I felt we could get the President's language, and I announced on the floor of the Senate that I would take the language that was sent to the Senate from the State Department. I tried to respect the officials of the executive department. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I did not seek to take advantage of my conversation with the President. So I did not make the argument I am making now. But this is a very important piece of legislative history.

However, it was pretty well known in the Senate at the time it voted on the junta amendment that it was an amendment that the administration was willing to accept. I do not mean, as I made clear then, that the administration would have preferred my amendment to no amendment. But faced with the serious possibility that they would have to accept an amendment, this was their proposal for compromise, and this was the President's own language, as he stated it to me in my last conference with him.

When the vote was taken on the final Morse junta amendment, the amendment was defeated. The Senate had a right to work its will in that respect. In my judgment, the Senate made a serious mistake, particularly in view of the oncoming problems in Latin America. Time will prove the significance of my statement.

Now we have a conference report which does not contain a single word that will be helpful in connection with the junta problem that faces us in Latin America. The conference report says not one word about the problem. That is one reason why I oppose the conference report, for, in my judgment, the

problem of coups in Latin America probably has to be placed at the top of the list in any evaluation of U.S. relations with Latin America.

Either this great Nation must make it crystal clear to Latin America that it will not aid, directly or indirectly, military juntas in overthrowing democratically elected governments in Latin America, or the United States will have to assume a larger responsibility for the loss to communism of one Latin American government after another in the immediate future.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is not this a principle that was deeply enshrined in the agreement at Punta del Este? Were not the principles of evolution in economic progress under democratic forms the principles repeatedly set forth by President Kennedy?

Mr. MORSE. I believe so. That was always my understanding. I believe that if we encourage military juntas, by recognition of governments set up by military juntas, we shall be doing Khrushchev's job for him.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, if the United States recognizes military-junta governments set up in the Dominican Republic or in Honduras, the United States will be doing Khrushchev's job and Castro's job for them, will play directly into the hands of the Communist elements in Latin America, will discourage our democratic friends in Latin America, and will provide, in regard to Latin America, another example of American hypocrisy. Unhappily, throughout Latin America our record is pockmarked with hypocrisy.

Mr. President, I believe it is regrettable that we are confronted with a conference report which says nothing about this urgent problem of juntas in Latin America. For that reason, I am opposed to the conference report, and I am satisfied that our democratic friends in Latin America have been dealt a serious blow by the conference report.

I would that we had adopted at least the language proposed by President Kennedy, although again I make clear that I am not saying that he would have preferred that language to no language at all. But I think time will prove that at least language as strong as that which President Kennedy was willing to accept would have been one of the great weapons we could have used against junta takeovers.

Equally important is the determination that when nations are economically capable of financing their own development and their defenses, the American taxpayers shall be relieved of the burden of financing them. The Senate amendment defining such nations was eliminated.

The necessity for a complete country-by-country review of foreign aid next year was emphasized in two Senate provisions, neither of which now remains in the bill. The first was my own amendment repealing the authorization for the Development Loan Fund for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. That provision was

entirely eliminated. The second Senate amendment was that offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], requiring the President to set up committees to review economic aid in each country. These committees were to be of three to five members, with a majority representing the public, and reporting to the President and the Congress whether the recipient country has a practical development program, is providing the maximum amount of self-help, has adopted reforms necessary to the success of the program, and whether the projects being financed by the United States contribute materially to the needs of that country's development and to the purpose of the United States in strengthening democratic processes.

This Senate amendment was similar in purpose to my own amendment which would have canceled all foreign aid at the close of the fiscal year 1964 and started over with criteria very much like those outlined in the Cooper amendment.

The conference gutted this amendment, by making the appointment of these committees permissive, rather than mandatory, and by allowing the President to determine the makeup of the committees, if he appoints any at all.

I submit that this issue, while it does not go to the heart of the current program, does go to the heart of the future of foreign aid. The language of the conference report is a clear indication that those who wrote it and signed it have no intention of requiring a reevaluated and revamped program from the administration. Virtual elimination of these two Senate amendments is the proof of the pudding that the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, calling for a revamped program for 1965, is nothing more than window dressing.

MAKEUP OF CONFERENCE

To begin at the beginning, however, I would call attention to the makeup of the conference itself. Last year, the Senate was represented by seven conferees. They were Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Capehart—who replaced Senator Wiley—Hickenlooper, and Aiken. This year the Senate was represented by only five conferees. They were the same gentlemen, except for the absence of Senators Capehart and MANSFIELD.

In other words, there was not represented among the majority side of the Senate conferees the clear and unequivocal demand by Senate Democrats—which I think was clearly demonstrated in the floor action on this bill—that foreign aid be revised and reduced. Not a single serious critic of foreign aid represented the Senate in the conference. At the rate we are going, however, the Senate representation is going to have to be even smaller next year if it is going to continue studiously avoiding Democratic Senators on the conference committee who will demand meaningful changes in the program.

MONEY FIGURES OF BILL

The introduction to the statement by the House conferees points out that the final money figure in the conference report is \$100 million more than the House

approved and \$100,290,000 less than the Senate approved. The only substantial increase in the Senate figures was for the Social Progress Trust Fund, which put the amount at \$180 million, compared to \$155 million allowed by the Senate and \$200 million allowed by the House. There was also a \$2 million increase in AID administrative expenses over what the Senate provided.

I shall always be at a loss to understand that. If there is any group whose wasteful administration is so flagrant that it is known around the world, it is the group responsible for the military expenditures of AID. If there is any place where we had a better opportunity to save the American taxpayers great sums of money, I do not know where it could be found. However, instead, the conferees recommend a \$2 million increase.

But with the possible exception of the funds for Latin America, I believe the House figures were more realistic throughout than were the Senate figures on the items in disagreement.

The authorizations for development loans, for supporting assistance, for military assistance, and for the contingency fund are still far in excess of what should be spent in foreign aid. I do not even exempt the Latin American program from that statement. There are increasing signs that the largest recipients of U.S. aid in Latin America are drifting away from the objectives of the Alliance and are failing to fulfill their own obligations under it. In Argentina, we have seen every U.S. dollar of private investment there held hostage for more foreign aid dollars. Senators will recall that the Senate had no more than adopted the Hickenlooper amendment suspending aid, when contracts with private investors were canceled without fair compensation, and the Government of Argentina pointed out that there was far more American wealth in Argentina that it could seize than was represented in the oil contracts, if the United States made good on the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. President, my position in regard to threat is this: Let us call Argentina's hand. So far as I am concerned, until Argentina submits a plan, under the Alliance for Progress program, as called for by the Act of Punta del Este, I favor not giving Argentina one dollar of aid under the Alliance for Progress, or any other U.S. source.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In line with the Senator's discussion of the conference report concerning the junta amendment, lest the record be in doubt, the Senator's discussion is accurate. The Senator from Oregon was rightfully put out with me for not having supported that amendment.

I say to the Senator that my reason for my vote was that the administration preferred not to have his amendment. They thought it was preferable to what they thought they might get. The Senator related the situation accurately.

It is a regrettable mistake that the bill is without the junta amendment. I want

the Senator to know that. I also want the Senator to know that I believe it is regrettable that the Cooper amendments, which were in the bill, were dropped.

I tried my best to maintain those amendments. I was not very successful.

I did not want the Senator's statement today, in the light of the fact that I was present in the Chamber, to go uncorroborated in reference to the amendment. I owe the Senator that fairness, and I wanted the RECORD to so reveal.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I continue my discussion of the conference report.

The Act of Bogotá and the Act of Punta del Este both made it perfectly clear that private investment was to be the source of by far the largest part of development capital. Now we find that to one of the largest participants and beneficiaries from the Alliance, our private capital is only a hostage being held to coerce the United States into giving Argentina more of our taxpayer dollars.

I know that more recent word is that Argentina is having some second thoughts. Some accord on the oil contracts is reportedly possible. But irrespective of its outcome, the incident proves to me that some Latin American countries are not yet ready for the Alliance for Progress.

Argentina has yet to submit a plan called for by the Act of Punta del Este as a basis for eligibility to receive foreign aid under the Alliance for Progress program. But she is after the money, and she has been receiving it without a plan. She has been getting millions of dollars out of the President's contingency fund, as has Brazil, yet neither country has submitted a plan.

So long as we follow such an inefficient administrative course of action in handling foreign aid, what can we expect from Latin America but a flouting of the wishes of the United States?

As I have stated previously in this speech, in effect we sanction military overthrows by waiting a few weeks and then recognizing them, and then aiding them. We weaken every friendly democratic nation in all of Latin America by so doing. I am at a loss to understand such an American policy.

I ask Senators to go to the Pan American Union and talk with the representatives of Latin American countries. I am able to do so, because I have the confidence of many of them. They do not take us seriously when we use nice sounding words about seeking to strengthen the arms of democratic leaders in Latin America. They know our sorry record of the past—and it is a disgraceful one, to the everlasting discredit of this Nation. We have come to the assistance of military juntas within a few weeks after they have overthrown democratically elected governments. We go on supporting them as though nothing had happened.

Argentina is not alone in flouting the wishes of the United States. Brazil also does. The response to American offers of aid on the part of the Goulart government has been still more inflation and a still sharper turn to the left. I believe that before anything like \$600 million is

spent in Latin America, the whole program must be reviewed right from its roots, country by country.

I called this to the attention of Mr. Moscoso in a letter I sent to him this morning in regard to the Alliance for Progress program and the great difficulties which I believe will confront us in the months and years immediately ahead unless the administration of the Alliance for Progress program itself is drastically changed.

I see no likelihood that \$600 million, plus the \$180 million of the Social Progress Trust Fund, could be effectively and efficiently spent in Latin America in fiscal 1964.

INVESTMENT GUARANTEES

Adoption of the House language on investment guarantees was an improvement in the bill over the Senate version. But it is only a small beginning in the direction of reducing and processing the objectives of foreign aid. In this case, the amendment states that aid is prohibited to any less developed country which fails to enter into an agreement with the United States to institute an investment guarantee program providing protection to private investors against inconvertibility and expropriation or confiscation. The Senate language was only a "sense of Congress" statement to the same effect. I note that the effective date was changed, however, from December of 1964 to December of 1965. I think that is too generous. I see no reason why Congress should not make it clear that nations seeking capital from the United States cannot receive public money from our taxpayers while at the same time they reject, discourage, or even seize the investments of our private citizens. By moving the effective date to the end of 1965, we have suspended its applicability to the program for fiscal 1964. It is now only a promise, a statement of intention. I regret that the conferees did not write it into this year's program.

PURPOSES, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

The omission of the House amendment requiring a detailed statement of the purposes, objectives, and priorities of economic assistance programs in the request for authorization is another setback. Why should not such an outline be included in the request for authorization? The statement of the conferees suggests that this information is contained in the executive branch presentations to the committees. But we all know that these presentations often do more to cover up than to reveal the purposes, objectives, and priorities of aid. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] described in detail the changes in the use of various grant funds between the time of presentation to Congress and the final expenditure. The Senator from Louisiana showed very clearly that the contingency fund is the chief source of money for countries and purposes that are not contained in the executive branch presentations to Congress.

To put these purposes into the authorization would not preclude a degree of discretion in use of the contingency fund

for emergencies affecting the vital interests of the United States. But it would, I believe, reduce the extent to which aid programs in many countries are revised upward after Congress has been shown a different outline of what is planned for them.

SHORT-TERM EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

The House provision which is now section 101(c) (3) is an improvement insofar as it goes. But it urges only that development loan money not be diverted to such short-range purposes as budget support, balance-of-payment problems, and military purposes. It says nothing about uses of supporting assistance or contingency funds for these same purposes.

I am interested to note that the language approved spells out these undesirable uses of development loan funds, which I think should be extended to all kinds of U.S. aid in certain parts of the world. It says "such as budgetary purposes, balance-of-payments purposes, or military purposes." I offered an amendment in the Senate prohibiting expenditure of any kind of aid money for the first two of these purposes in Latin America. I intend to continue pressing the prohibition at every opportunity. Now that this language is part of the foreign aid statute, there is a precedent, and a very small beginning, to curb this unproductive use of American money.

AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM

The statement of the conferees notes that the Senate's "sense of Congress" language on South Vietnam is retained. It states that aid to that country should be extended or withheld "at the discretion of the President" to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return of Americans involved in the struggle. That is not much of an amendment. It certainly is no help to the President or to his administration. It is congressional buck-passing at its most obvious. Least of all, it will not absolve Members of Congress from the responsibility for getting and keeping the United States involved politically and militarily in one of the most useless foreign policy ventures of the postwar era.

Our forces in South Vietnam should be withdrawn right now, before we are dragged down to the position of France in 1954. That is where we are going to end up in Vietnam. I do not think it is a question of which faction we put in power in South Vietnam. It is a question of whether the United States can run any country in Asia by remote control. And that control is not so remote that it will not cost the American taxpayers upward of \$300 million in aid to that nation alone in the current fiscal year. That is in addition to the cost of keeping 15,000 American troops on the scene.

The infatuation of Far East policymakers with "the domino theory" in southeast Asia is not only expensive but it is ineffective. I shall develop that theme at some other time; but this provision is merely an evasion of one of the most important issues of the whole program.

INTEREST RATES

In my opinion, the House provision regarding interest rates on development loans should have been retained. Instead, it was modified to permit a grace period of up to 10 years, during which the rate may be as low as three-quarters of 1 percent, whereas the House language provided for no grace period. In view of the fact that the House said nothing about a grace period and the Senate allowed a grace period up to 5 years, one might logically expect the grace period to be not more than 5 years. But it magically rose in this conference to 10 years, and the 35-year limit of the loans called for by the Senate also disappeared.

The tightening of the interest rates on loans must be a foremost objective next year in considering a foreign aid authorization.

If anybody wants proof or justification for the statement of the senior Senator from Oregon that the American taxpayers are being fleeced, defrauded, and deceived by this bill, let him examine the conference report on interest rates. It will continue the rate at three-quarters of 1 percent for up to 10 years. It will continue the 10-year grace period, with no requirement for payment on the capital. It will continue the shocking present arrangement whereby Russia, Great Britain, France, West Germany can lend, on a short-term loan basis, at 5 and 6 percent interest and get paid off at the expense of the American taxpayers, who, under this program, put up loans at three-quarters of 1 percent for 10 years and thereafter not more than 2 percent. If that is not rooking and cheating and defrauding the American taxpayer, I do not know the definition of the terms.

I said during the debate, and I say tonight, that the American taxpayers must hold to political accountability those responsible for that kind of bill. Until the American taxpayers walk into that citadel of freedom, the voting booth, and hold politicians accountable for this kind of injustice, we shall not have the lesson learned here in the Congress that a program such as this cannot be foisted on the American taxpayers by the politicians and the politicians not be held to an accountability.

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

I move next to an item I mentioned at the outset—the Cooper amendment requiring a country-by-country reevaluation of economic assistance. As adopted by the Senate, the bill required the President to appoint committees dominated by public representatives to review economic aid in each country. The committees were to consider the performance of the recipient in working out a general development program and in carrying out self-help and reform; whether specific projects are contributing to development; and any other matters which the committees believed would aid Congress in considering the program authorization for fiscal 1965.

This highly meritorious provision was watered down to virtually nothing. We now find the President merely authorized to appoint a committee "to review and

evaluate the economic development program under this act, and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings."

It has been pointed out in the press that the Clay Committee has already done that, so it is very unlikely that the President will make any use of this provision.

I especially regret the omission of the intent and meaning of the Cooper amendment because the conferees have dropped without so much as a mention in their report the Morse amendment repealing the aid authorizations for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. The action of the Senate in approving that amendment was a fortification of the Foreign Relations Committee call for a revamped program next year. Adoption of the Morse amendment wiped the slate clean, and required the administration to come in with a new program. Adoption of the Cooper amendment was a requirement for a public review of foreign aid country by country.

Mr. President, I will not proceed in the Senate until the Chair gets the Sergeant at Arms to produce order both in the Press Gallery and on the floor of the Senate. It is about time that order is maintained in the Senate. I request that the Sergeant at Arms be produced immediately, and that he notify the Press Gallery that another sound out of the Press Gallery will result in the clearing of the Press Gallery, and that another sound out of an assistant of the Senate on the floor will result in his ejection from the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Sergeant at Arms will be notified accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know what more the Senate could have done in the bill to emphasize our determination to have foreign aid reexamined.

But the conferees have dumped all these provisions out the window. They have left the Senate with nothing but the language of the Foreign Relations Committee report, asking the administration for the umpteenth time to revamp foreign aid. The action of the conferees is notice to me that they intend to let the administration off scot free. They do not propose to require a revamping of foreign aid—they only want to ask for it.

I say to the President of the United States that you have ample authority to do for the Congress and the country what Congress has refused to do for itself. That is to set up publicly dominated committees to review not only economic aid, but aid of every kind, to each country in the world now receiving it, and to make recommendations to you and to Congress on how the program should be changed. To the Cooper amendment should be added the military aid programs as a subject for review, too, because we know that the extent and purpose of our military aid has a very great bearing on the extent and purpose of our economic aid.

Judging from the Senate amendments that have disappeared from this bill, and judging from the testimony currently

being given to the Appropriations Committees by Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Bell, I can only say that there is no intention, no plan, and no expectation of any kind within the administration or among the managers of this bill that foreign aid will really be reconsidered for fiscal 1965.

The Senate has been treated to another version of the old shell game, in which Congress always picks up the wrong shell no matter how sure we think we are where the pea is and no matter how many of the shells we pick up. The Senate did its best to nail down its demand for a new program. The conferees have taken the nails out; and the administration is busily declaring that it needs every cent of the \$3.6 billion in this bill for the current year. I have heard not a word of any review or revamping. I have heard only how badly it needs the money. I am satisfied that the Rusk-McNamara-Bell statements before the Appropriations Committees are also the preview of next year's program, and that we are going to be presented with nothing but the same old justifications for the same old expenditures in the same old countries for the same old purposes.

RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE

While I welcome retention of the Senate's purpose in limiting military aid to Latin America, again I regret that it does not go far enough. Moreover, although there is no word in the conference report nor in the statement of the House managers about it, the feeble Senate language regarding Latin American juntas has been dropped entirely. The \$55 million ceiling on Latin American military aid is retained, as is the \$25 million ceiling on such aid to Africa. The limitation on Latin American military aid to past commitments, and the security of the United States or the security of a country against overthrow of a duly constituted government remains.

But the warning flag to nations to the south that the United States means what it says about supporting constitutional government has been pulled down. The Foreign Relations Committee language was weak enough; it was so weak that I sought to strengthen it on the Senate floor. The only worse thing than the committee language on this point is no language at all, and now in the conference report we have no language at all.

I have already referred to the political climate and events in Latin America that I think call for a basic review of American financing of the Alliance for Progress. The sudden overthrow of elected governments in four countries of the Alliance is another major reason why such a review is urgently needed. As I have said, I am not at all sure that the major countries of Argentina and Brazil are ready for the Alliance for Progress. But there are military and oligarchic factions in virtually every Latin American country that are not ready, either.

To the extent that the Alliance has failed to achieve its purpose, the United States has to share a large part of the burden for the failure, because we have not applied the conditions and standards that are essential to its success. We

have not been tough enough in insisting on the standards which alone can bring success in the program.

We have made only one beginning in establishing firm and absolute standards, and that is in the area of protecting American private enterprise. I am a firm supporter of the Hickenlooper amendments. I see no purpose to be served in supplying taxpayer money to nations which have expropriated private money.

But it is to the everlasting shame and discredit of the United States that we have not shown the same concern for constitutionalism in Latin America. As I said during the Senate debate on this matter, the U.S. Government should have at least as much concern for constitutionalism in Latin America as it has for Esso and Texaco in Latin America.

I do not question for a moment that a major purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to increase stability in the Western Hemisphere, and to decrease the possibility of Communist takeovers. But there is no greater threat to stability and no more fertile ground for Communist takeovers than the countries ruled by military juntas. Until we have a firm and clearly established policy, known to all factions and elements within each country, that no American assistance of any kind shall be extended to a junta that comes to power by destroying a constitutional power, we are not going to achieve the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

ASSISTANCE TO INDONESIA

I note with some satisfaction that the Senate language restricting aid to Indonesia was retained. It prohibits aid to that country unless the President finds that it is "essential to the national interest of the United States." I think both Houses would have achieved their purpose only by banning aid to this country entirely.

Senators know that the presentation figures show Indonesia down for aid in fiscal 1964 amounting to more than \$50 million. Almost half of that is supposed to be grant aid of one kind or another. The reluctance of the administration to cut off aid to Indonesia in spite of the most flagrant affronts to the policies and principles of the United States has been well established. When the bill was under debate in the Senate, aid to Indonesia was still being continued at that time. We also learned from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that Indonesia is one of the countries that has received aid considerably above and beyond what was scheduled for her in the presentation to Congress for fiscal 1963.

I very seriously doubt that the provision voted by the Senate and retained by the conferees will really terminate aid to Indonesia. The terms "national interest" and "vital interests" and "national security" have been stretched so far by previous aid administrators that they are now almost devoid of real meaning. Putting the word "essential" in front of any of these terms will bring forth a little more explanation from downtown, but I doubt that the outcome will be any different.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] brought to me the other day a classified document. That classified document made perfectly clear the intention of the State Department and the AID officials to continue aid to Indonesia, both economic and military. Although the figures are classified, I say to the American people that they involve tens of millions of dollars. If this administration continues that program for Indonesia, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, it has bought a fight; and it has bought a fight not only with the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators who share this view, but also with the American people.

That causes me to say again that I wonder how long Congress will continue to be taken advantage of by the State Department and the Pentagon by being denied the right to extend to the American people the facts about their foreign policy by the use of the word "classified." Whenever the State Department and the Pentagon want to hide from the people facts that they are entitled to know, they put the word "classified" on them, and place those of us in Congress who are serving the people in a position where we cannot violate that label, because if we were to do so we would subject ourselves—and rightly so—to the discipline of Congress.

But this is a basic policy question. I say to the American people: "It is about time you rose up and made it perfectly clear to any administration, Democratic or Republican—for this policy has existed through both Democratic and Republican administrations—that you want the word "classified" limited to situations in which the great national interest is really and truly involved, and not misused, as it is being misused, time and time again, by the Pentagon and the State Department. This is such an example."

Why should not the American people be told now of every dollar that the State Department and the Pentagon propose to spend by way of military and economic aid in Indonesia? I should like to have any Member of the Senate or any member of the administration give me an answer to that question. Why should not the American people be told that plans are underway to spend many millions of their dollars in Indonesia, a country headed by a corruptionist, an aggressor, a man who is a threat to peace in Asia and may very well be a threat to the peace of the world. Yet it is now being proposed that we spend many more millions of dollars on him in the coming year. This must be stopped; and the American people are going to demand that it be stopped.

I shall point out before I finish what a series of conferences downtown have produced by way of a new strategy to get around the Congress. The recent historic debate on foreign aid, really the first comprehensive one the Senate has had for years, and the first one that has resulted in having some amendments adopted to the foreign aid program, really dehorned the sacred bull of the State Department and the Pentagon. It has the bureaucrats upset. But they have not met with any desire to conform

to the will of Congress. They are scheming to flout Congress. They are scheming to get around Congress. They are scheming to put Congress in a position where they will be able to nullify the check of the Constitution that is granted to Congress, the provision of Constitution that provides that no funds may be spent except as appropriated by law. That is what they are up to.

There are some Senators who dare to oppose them. We shall oppose them. We shall go exactly as far as we can under the restrictions that are placed upon us in respect to classified material to warn the American people of what the Pentagon and the State Department are up to.

That is why, staying within my rights, I am warning the American people tonight that there is no intention on the part of either Secretary McNamara or Secretary Rusk or Administrator Bell to bring an effective end to economic or military aid to Sukarno. We must hold the administration to an accounting. It is not easy to oppose one's administration; but I shall oppose this administration, as I have opposed all administrations in the past during my 19 years in the Senate, whenever I believe the administration is following a course of action that is not in the public interest. Aid to Sukarno is not in the public interest. I dare the administration to announce the exact sums that it proposes to make available to Sukarno. Then let the American people pass judgment on the program.

LIMITATION ON GRANT ASSISTANCE

The statement of the House conferees on section 301(e) (3) makes it clear that the Morse amendment defining "economically developed nation" has been removed from the bill. There is no reason I can fathom for its removal. The statement says that such a determination is one of "reasonable judgment." It does not say that the judgment of the Senate is in any way faulty. It was the judgment of the Senate that we should apply the finding of the General Assembly of the United Nations in determining what nations are economically developed, and not give them any more money. What is wrong with that? The conference report does not say.

It does allude to U.S. base rights in Portugal and Spain. But the General Assembly resolution does not mention Portugal or Spain as being economically developed.

I think it is perfectly evident that this is not a matter of what is reasonable judgment, but a question of who is to exercise it. The administration does not want Congress to exercise a "reasonable judgment" in foreign aid matters. It wants that privilege reserved entirely to itself. This is one of the chief obstacles Congress will have to overcome if the United States is ever to have a truly revamped foreign aid program.

Do not be surprised by the action taken by the conference committee. It is only necessary to consider the personnel of the conference. When no voices representing the opposition are a part of the conference, we ought to expect this kind of result. As I said earlier in my speech,

one of the major mistakes was in the selection of the conferees, to begin with.

EXEMPTIONS OF CERTAIN ACTS FROM THE PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE

The conferees agreed to language in section 302(h) that excludes from the various prohibitions in the act, the Peace Corps, the student and cultural exchange program, Export-Import Bank operations, and title II of the Food for Peace Act. This title relates to famine or disaster relief, including such relief through voluntary agencies.

This means that all the provisions seeking to ban aid to Communist countries, to Indonesia, to nations that seize U.S. property without compensation, and to aggressor nations will not affect a very large part of American aid. I think the Export-Import Bank operations should most certainly be included in any ban on aid, and I regret that the conferees added it to the loophole.

Of course, the conference report is not clear on how this section jibes with the so-called aggressor amendment. As approved by both Houses, this amendment states that no assistance shall be provided under this or any other act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and so forth.

I recognize that title II of the 1954 act would probably not be covered, since it deals with relief rather than with sales. But to continue the Peace Corps, cultural exchange, Export-Import Bank operations, and famine relief to nations that are in clear violation of the principles and objectives of the American Government, seems to me to vitiate much of the meaning of a ban on aid to them under the Foreign Assistance Act.

USE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Under this heading the House conferees discussed section 302(a). They noted that they had accepted the Senate language to encourage use of private enterprise, rather than Federal agencies, where the former is able to provide the goods and services on a contract basis.

I very much regret that in approving the Senate amendment, the conferees did not improve upon it to make use of some Federal services which enhance these private services. It has repeatedly been brought to my attention that the planning and supervision of construction constitute one of the major weaknesses of U.S. aid programs abroad. The aid agency itself has never organized the kind of engineering supervision of this kind of work that is already available in other Federal agencies.

The Corps of Engineers of the Army, for example, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy not only have long experience in this field themselves, but have enabled such complex new agencies as NASA to get their programs going much more effectively and efficiently than they could have done alone.

I believe that in calling for utilization of professional and other services from private enterprise, the law should also utilize in the planning, administration, and supervision of contracts the services of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

CONCLUSION

Finally, I would also point out to the Senate that the conference report has dropped entirely the Senate amendment relating to fishing rights. It will be remembered that we terminated aid to nations that unilaterally extend their fishing limits beyond those recognized by the United States. I think this was an entirely salutary provision. It did no more than establish an American determination to settle international rights and claims by negotiation. Far from being an arbitrary provision, as has been charged, the Kuchel amendment was an upholding of negotiation as the means of settling disputes. Why in the world should not the Congress say that we will not extend aid to nations that unilaterally and arbitrarily violate an international understanding on territorial or fishing limits?

Mr. President, you will look in vain for any explanation of why this amendment was eliminated. So will you look in vain for any explanation of why the Morse amendments repealing the aid authorizations for the next fiscal years and defining economically developed countries were eliminated.

Most important, however, is the elimination or watering down of the provisions that were to guarantee Congress a new program next year. In my opinion, this is the real issue in this year's foreign aid bill. It is an issue of whether Congress means what it says when we call for a revamping of foreign aid. We can always cut the funds if we do not like the program; but how do those of us who believe foreign aid can have useful and fruitful application go about getting the kind of standards and requirements that produce such a program? That is our problem; but we have had the ground cut out from under us by the conference report.

Our only recourse is a country-by-country review of foreign aid by ourselves. When the aid authorization comes before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next year, it will be up to us to examine every program, in every country, in all its ramifications. I serve notice on the State Department and the Pentagon that that will be the approach I will make. I also serve notice on the Foreign Relations Committee that never again, so long as I am a member of that committee, with a bill as important as this one, will I go along in a cooperative attitude and arrangement of 10 minutes at a time for cross-examination, the objective being to permit the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense or Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, to conclude their presentations at one session of the committee hearings.

Of course, I shall abide by the will of my colleagues in regard to the rotation system; but next time when we take up foreign aid, country by country, I shall insist, as a Senator from a sovereign State, representing its people, that we keep Mr. Rusk, Mr. Bell, and Mr. McNamara before the committee for as many days as will be required in order to have adequate cross-examination, on a country-by-country basis, in

regard to the AID program set forth in the administration's proposal.

We on the Foreign Relations Committee must go into the question of the purposes and objectives of both economic and military aid and their relationship to each other; the degree of self-help; the existence or lack of existence of a country program; and all the other factors that determine whether aid is worthwhile. Interested Senators will have to undertake, themselves, the kind of country-by-country review contemplated by the Cooper amendment. I shall be doing my best to do that in the months ahead; and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I shall exercise my rights, as a member of that committee and as a Member of the Senate, to do what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] sought to have done by way of the appointment of the kind of commission or committee which he contemplated to have appointed to investigate the foreign aid program and to consider it on a country-by-country basis.

Mr. President, an article, published this morning in the New York Times, has a close and direct bearing on the pending conference report. The article has the headline:

Johnson Calls in Passman on Aid.

The article was written by Felix Belair, Jr. 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:

JOHNSON CALLS IN PASSMAN ON AID—WHITE HOUSE MEETING DRAWS LINES FOR A SHOW-DOWN

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—President Johnson intervened today to prevent a further slash in this year's foreign aid funds.

He sought to maintain the \$3.6 billion compromise authorization recently approved by Senate and House negotiators.

He summoned Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK and Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, to a White House conference with David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development and Lawrence F. O'Brien, congressional liaison chief for the President.

From the meeting emerged a clear definition of the battlelines in what has already become the toughest behind-the-scenes fight over foreign aid in many years. President Johnson gave the component parts of the \$3.6 billion he wants for this year's commitments. Mr. PASSMAN outlined his own set of figures. They were far apart both on figures and categories.

No agreement or compromise was sought or offered by either side. But it was implicit in the President's position that he was prepared to force a showdown on the House floor if Mr. PASSMAN carried out his announced intention to bring in an appropriation bill of less than \$3 billion for what the administration calls its substantive aid program.

Another major consequence of the meeting was to make it impossible for the Louisiana Democrat to outsmart the administration by making a deal on a certain appropriation figure to avoid a floor fight and then including in his agreement figure many extraneous items that the administration does not regard as part of the aid program.

Mr. PASSMAN has employed this technique with success several times in recent years. After reaching an understanding with the Speaker and the White House he has then included in the foreign aid appropriations bill such items as the Peace Corps, the civil administration expenses for the Ryukyu Islands and new funds for various Federal and multilateral financing agencies.

At today's meeting, for instance, the wily foe of the aid program included in his figures an estimated total of \$700 million of so-called carryover funds from prior appropriations. He proposed to include these in the appropriation bill he intends to bring out next week.

He was informed at the conference that his \$700 million figure was irrelevant since much of the amount was in the form of unobligated balances of various loan programs that were not subject to reappropriation and did not lapse at the close of the fiscal year.

President Johnson made it clear that the only carryover funds in which he was interested were \$209 million of unexpended balances of military and economic aid appropriations that lapsed last June 30 and had to be reappropriated for that reason.

The President included in his \$209 million an item of \$127 million that was unexpended from his cold war contingency fund and that the administration said it was turning back to the Treasury Department. That was before Senate-House negotiators compromised differences and brought back agreement on a contingency fund of \$160 million, compared with the administration's \$300 million asking figure.

Now, President Johnson made clear, he wants the \$127 million put back in the appropriation bill.

Representative PASSMAN was keeping his own counsel about his intentions. But some members of his subcommittee indicated that the President's intervention has put him in the most difficult position in many years in trying to win over a majority of the subcommittee to his formula.

This was reflected in his recent attempts to make a no-floor-fight deal with the Speaker. But Mr. McCORMACK's unwillingness to be maneuvered into the position of middleman culminated in today's White House meeting.

Resentment of some members of the subcommittee at what they considered Mr. PASSMAN's attempt to railroad his formula through that group broke into the open earlier in the day. On the House floor, Mr. PASSMAN sought unanimous consent to file by midnight Friday a report from the full appropriations panel on his bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article indicates that President Johnson is insisting upon a foreign aid appropriation of at least \$3 billion in new money for the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act, plus reappropriation of some unspent funds from last year. I particularly call attention to these words in Mr. Belair's article:

President Johnson made it clear that the only carryover funds in which he was interested were \$209 million of unexpended balances of military and economic aid appropriations that lapsed last June 30 and had to be reappropriated for that reason.

The President included in his \$209 million an item of \$127 million that was unexpended from his cold war contingency fund and that the Administration said it was turning back to the Treasury. That was before Senate-House negotiators compromised differences and brought back agreement on a contingency fund of \$160 million, compared with the Administration's \$300 million asking figure.

Now, President Johnson made it clear, he wants the \$127 million put back in the appropriation bill.

In my opinion, it is time for the American people to rise up and put a stop to the freehanded, freewheeling use of what is euphemistically called a contingency fund.

Why does this, or any other President, require an advance appropriation for allegedly unanticipated emergencies, amounting to almost \$300 million? That is the sum the administration is clearly determined to have, if it can get it. On what basis is the figure \$300 million fixed? How can the administration know that it must have \$300 million?

What is it up to, that it is so sure it must have \$300 million?

This demand, and it is becoming nothing less than a demand, for \$300 million in money unrestricted and unlimited as to use, should be resisted not only by the Congress but by all the American people.

My suspicions are rising that contingency money is not for unforeseen contingencies at all. I think most administrations have a pretty good idea what they are going to do with contingency funds before they are ever appropriated. In short, the emergencies are not unforeseen or unanticipated. They are known in advance.

I refer Senators again to the figures placed in the RECORD during the debate on this authorization bill. As our magnificent friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proved beyond any question, not more than \$35 million was spent out of the contingency fund last year for real unforeseen emergencies. That is out of appropriated funds of \$250 million—\$35 million spent for real emergencies.

The real emergencies were natural disasters, and upheavals in various countries in Latin America resulting from the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. At that time, we made available small amounts to several countries in South and Central America to forestall Castro-inspired disorders.

But out of the contingency fund we also extended \$7 million to Ecuador to cover a budget deficit, and "to avoid serious political disturbances which would result from the Government's inability to meet its immediate expenses."

Did Senators ever hear of a budget deficit in the United States? I am at a complete loss to understand why it is thought proper to take \$7 million out of the contingency fund, unknown at the time by Congress or the American people, to shore up a deficit in the budget of Ecuador. I said during the debate on the bill, and I repeat now in the debate on the conference report, that it is an improper use of contingency funds. The purpose for which contingency funds should be spent, on the basis of which it has always been implied they are being asked, is for an emergency to the United States that threatens the security of the Republic. We had better get back to our objective—and fast.

Three hundred million dollars for a contingency fund is \$300 million of unchecked funds. Forget about the individual involved. Think only of the of-

face. With \$300 million, if a President wished to misuse it, we would soon be at war. The constitutional power of Congress to declare war would become meaningless. In principle this is not a safe practice. Any practice that is not safe in principle is a practice that should be checked by the Congress and prohibited by law.

We should stop granting to a President of the United States unchecked contingency fund money, except in a small reasonable amount which he might need to take care of a national emergency or an emergency that might involve serious national interests overnight, so to speak.

Name one. Just name one, Mr. President, that \$100 million would not be perfectly adequate to take care of. It takes a President only 20 minutes to get from the White House to a joint session of Congress. If Congress is not in session—and it looks like Congress will always be in session from now on almost all the time—we can return to Washington in 24 hours.

No, Mr. President, no President can possibly justify on the basis of the element of time \$300 million for a contingency fund.

What we are really doing in effect as a Congress is waiving a constitutional responsibility. There is a tendency to downgrade Congress and to seek to undermine the powers of Congress and to build up the powers of the Executive. It is dangerous. It is dangerous because, I point out, it changes our form of government. It changes our form of government from a government of 3 coordinate, coequal branches of government to a form of government in which the Executive is supreme. It is not safe for the American people to live under a government which has become a government in which the Executive has become supreme.

Do not make the mistake of thinking, I say to the American people, that our system of representative government cannot be changed into a system of executive-controlled government. Whenever the ugly head of executive supremacy rears itself, the Congress should strike it down. It is rearing its ugly head in connection with the issue of contingency funds. In principle, \$300 million requested for contingency funds is a movement in the direction of making the executive supreme. It must be stopped. If it is true that the administration is proposing that \$127 million of unexpended funds in the contingency fund which would otherwise revert to the Treasury of the United States should be reappropriated to the executive and added to the \$160 million set forth in the conference report for contingency funds, it should be stopped by the Congress.

Oh, I know the comments that will be made on the argument I have made. It will probably be said that this is a serious attack on the President. Nonsense. But it is a serious attack on a proposal to enhance the power of the Executive which is inconsistent with our system of government based upon three coordi-

nate and coequal branches of government.

Those principles of government had better be preserved. I do not intend to be a party to voting to this President or to any other President any such request for additional Executive power as is suggested in the Belair story.

Mr. President, when I say that I have become suspicious that a practice has grown up and contingency funds are asked for because it is pretty well known in advance what their probable use will be, I am not merely yielding to suspicion.

I refer Senators again to what I have pointed out, that \$7 million went to cover a budget deficit in Ecuador. I submit that the budget deficit in Ecuador was an emergency in Ecuador, but it was not an emergency in the United States. We merely found it convenient to dip into the contingency fund and bail out Ecuador.

Mr. President, are we to chase around the world shoring up every budget that has a deficit? We do not have that much money. In my judgment, we cannot justify it in a single specific instance.

In fiscal 1963, we also used \$23.9 million out of the contingency fund to support the economy of the Dominican Republic. One million of it went to assist agriculture and industrial diversification, for some reason that completely eludes my wildest imagination, in respect to a U.S. national emergency. The use of \$22,750,000 of this remains "confidential."

Do Senators believe it is safe, in a democracy, to give any President of the United States that many millions of dollars to spend in accordance with his own judgment or whims, unchecked by the taxpayers of the United States?

Oh, I know. It will be said that these are abstract principles of government I am talking about, and that therefore the objections are impractical and theoretical. I repeat, the only rights of freedom the American people have are in relationship to the abstract principles of government under which they live.

Never argue with me that we can justify expediency in the name of practicality. Never argue with me that we can compromise these basic principles and guarantees of our system of government and still preserve for the American people their rights to freedom, for their rights to freedom are dependent upon maintaining good faith and respect in the carrying out of these abstract principles of government.

I am greatly concerned about the ease with which administrations have been able to get through the Congress these violations of abstract principles of government, as they have been succeeding to do in connection with the contingency fund. We must hold the Presidency to an accountability.

The contingency fund use in the Dominican Republic was all grant money. So was \$2 million in contingency funds given to Trinidad-Tobago.

Twenty-five and a half million of contingency fund dollars went to Brazil in the form of a loan.

Why in the world should we loan money to Brazil out of a contingency fund? How does that meet a definition of "U.S. emergency"? What is wrong with insisting that an administration come to the Congress and get legislative approval for a \$25 million loan to Brazil? I do not know what is wrong with that, in view of the fact that it is exactly what the Constitution of the United States provides.

I happen to believe that any dollar spent out of a Presidential contingency fund for any so-called emergency which is not a U.S. emergency, which endangers the security of the United States, is an unconstitutional act on the part of the President of the United States. Oh, I know it will be said, "You cannot very well test it in the courts, Senator." But that does not make it any less unconstitutional.

Let us take a little longer look at the \$25.5 million of the contingency funds that went to Brazil in the form of a loan.

It was extended last March, when the Brazilian Finance Minister negotiated a \$84 million package from several American aid sources to balance its international payments.

Twenty million dollars more went to Argentina to correct its serious balance-of-payments and budget deficit. Hence a total of \$45 million was used from the contingency fund for Brazil and Argentina alone in fiscal 1963, not for any unforeseen situations at all, but to bail them out of embarrassing situations that were foreseen by many in both countries.

There is another shocking phase of this. That was American taxpayers' money, and in some amounts it was used to pay American business creditors of the Brazilian and Argentine Governments. I am at a loss to understand how anyone could possibly believe that could be justified. I am at a loss to understand how any one could believe one could justify using American taxpayers' dollars from a Presidential contingency fund to bail out foreign governments and to help foreign governments pay American business interests to whom they owe money.

Then there are those in this country who get a little concerned about subsidies to American farmers. No economic group in the United States has received anywhere near the amount in subsidy from the American taxpayers that American business interests have. But here is an unjustifiable subsidy.

I have just related the facts to show how the contingency funds were spent in Latin America up to March of fiscal year 1963.

Of course, this is not anything like the only aid these countries received from us. It is only in addition to the aid they received from the other categories of foreign aid.

I think it is apparent that the contingency fund is the loophole of the Alliance for Progress. Unless it is closed, the Alliance cannot demand effective self-help from the biggest countries of the hemisphere—Brazil and Argentina. So long as these two largest nations of South America are able to flout the requirements of the Alliance and obtain money from the United

States, anyway, through the contingency fund, the other nations of Latin America are not going to see much need for them to meet the requirements of the Alliance, either.

CONTINGENCY FUND IN FAR EAST

How were contingency funds used in the Far East? Why, primarily for Indonesia. Out of the President's fund for uses he determines "to be important to the national interest" the United States furnished almost \$20 million last year to Sukarno and Indonesia. As was pointed out in the Senate on November 6, \$17 million was in the form of a loan to mitigate serious internal financial and balance-of-payments problems. A grant of \$2.7 million was made to Indonesia to assist in equipping and training the mobile brigade, a special unit of the Indonesian National Police which has been trained to deal with civil disturbances.

Of course, the mobile brigade was not interested in "dealing" with the civil disturbance which wrecked the British Embassy not long ago and threatened the lives of its employees. As we all know, there are only certain civil disturbances that many nations desire to deal with, and they are glad to have American training. But what folly our policymakers commit when they think that by financing the training and equipping of such forces we assure that American interests will be promoted.

Sukarno—and put it down, Mr. President, because it is undeniably true—will promote Sukarno's interests, and that is all. The money we have wasted from the contingency fund for these purposes is only a small fraction of what has been wasted from other sources for the same purposes.

Finally, out of the contingency fund we extended \$80,000 to Indonesia to aid flood victims in Java. I call that a genuine unforeseen emergency.

The other nation of the Far East which received money from the contingency fund in fiscal 1963 was Thailand. It was a grant of \$9.5 million, the purposes of which still remain "confidential." Too bad, Mr. President. I do not know why the American taxpayers should not know for what the money was spent.

CONTINGENCY FUND IN NEAR EAST

Three countries of the Near East received money from the contingency fund. Iran received \$465,000 to take care of earthquake victims; Syria received \$7,000 to acquire Salk vaccine after an outbreak of polio in rural areas; and the United Arab Republic received a \$10 million loan.

What emergency was involved that brought about the use of \$10 million from the contingency fund? Why, the UAR had a "stabilization" problem. She had already obtained a loan from us of \$20 million from other aid sources, and the contingency fund was only used to boost it to \$30 million.

I can understand, of course, that a nation that finances a war in Yemen, that contributes troops to Algeria for use against Morocco, and that spends vast sums every year to propagandize the Arab world against Israel would have

some budgetary stabilization problems. It was very generous of the United States to help the UAR finance these activities. I am against our financing them from any source; but to call this a contingency that it is in the national interest of the United States to finance is simply absurd.

CONTINGENCY FUNDS IN AFRICA

In Africa, contingency funds were all used for medical purposes or natural disaster relief. To Algeria went \$753,000 to finance a Care-Medico team of doctors and nurses. To Mauritania went \$54,000 to provide inland transportation for food furnished under title II of Public Law 480. To Tunisia went \$113,000 to provide blankets for flood victims in the Gabes region. I find this an incredible figure, but that is the explanation for the expenditure. Morocco received \$500,000 for urgent flood relief; and Libya received \$27,000 to aid victims of an earthquake at Barce.

Finally, \$150,000 has been spent as a result of a flood in India, an earthquake in Turkey, a cholera epidemic in Taiwan, a typhoon in Hong Kong, a typhoon in Thailand, and the collapse of a dike in Korea.

This analysis has covered the uses of the contingency fund during the first 9 months of fiscal 1963. It describes how \$120,028,000 was used, of the \$250 million appropriated. I think the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is probably generous in concluding that \$35 million of this was spent for true contingencies that could not be financed out of the regular categories or programed for the forthcoming fiscal year.

REVERSION OF CONTINGENCY FUNDS TO TREASURY

One of the highlights of the debate on the contingency authorization was, it will be remembered, the stress put upon the return of unspent contingency funds to the Treasury. The figure of \$117 million was given. But now we are told that what was returned to the Treasury must be taken out again. To do so makes a mockery of the effort to fix authorization ceilings.

This is typical of the Treasury Department. It is also typical of the State Department, the Pentagon Building, and the administration of AID. I regret to say it, but I have learned it is true—they are masters of deception.

They come before us and try to pacify us into going along with the program on the basis that they will return \$117 million to the Treasury. We take it for granted that the taxpayers will get the \$117 million returned. I say to the Senate, do not be so naive. Do not be so trusting. That is their argument of expediency for the moment. Just wait a few weeks or months. They think we shall have forgotten it. They will have completely reversed their field. They will be back, as they are now, before the Appropriations Committee, seeking to keep the \$117 million.

Mr. President, it is serious. We cannot even deal with them at arm's length. What we must do is exercise the checking power that our constitutional forefathers gave the Congress of the United States. We must make clear to them that they

cannot spend a dime except as authorized by law, as provided for by the Constitution, and that they cannot continue to weaken, or attempt to weaken, or evade, or avoid the checking powers of the Congress of the United States by the type of expediency they are resorting to in their various presentations of requests for foreign aid, including contingency fund aid.

The \$160 million we have provided in the conference report for the contingency fund is right now being undermined by the demand for that plus \$127 million more in funds unspent from last year.

The American people must not be deluded about foreign aid appropriations. The deception that is too often practiced on them is to reappropriate unspent money which does not show up in the figure for new obligational authority. By that device it will be possible for some to make the claim that foreign aid funds were being kept to \$3 billion or a little less. But the public will not be told that over \$200 million more is also being appropriated under another provision of the bill which gives money not for new purposes but for old ones.

The price tag on foreign aid funds, according to the account in the New York Times, is not \$3 billion; it is \$3.2 billion. I intend to make this fact perfectly clear to the American people, so there will be no misrepresentation of how much of their money is going into foreign aid in fiscal 1964.

Today a leader of the House of Representatives, who is fully informed in regard to unspent balances, said to me, "You have not heard anything yet." To use his language, he said, "The deal is to reach a settlement on \$3 billion. The purpose is to let it go out to the country that a great saving has been made and there has been a great cut made in the foreign aid program, and that only \$3 billion was allowed."

But, he said, the gimmick is a sleeper provision which will permit the administration to spend another \$400 million—not \$200 million as referred to by the New York Times—of unexpended funds.

If it happens, who is responsible for it? The Congress.

The people have given us the power to check. The Constitution gives us the power to check. In fact, I am shocked and alarmed that there is any thought over on the House side of an appropriation of \$1 dollar more than \$2,700 million. If the appropriation figure ended up with \$2,500 million, it would be ample.

I also intend to make clear to the American people that there is no need for a contingency fund of anything like the \$287 million, which the President is apparently seeking. A fund of such size is unnecessary for true emergency purposes which cannot await specific Congressional action. It can, in fact, be a positive threat to the principle that the foreign policy of the United States belongs to the people of the United States and not to any one officeholder or group of officeholders.

Let it not be forgotten by either the Congress or the people that when a true emergency, threatening the interests of

the United States, arose in Berlin in 1961, the Congress of the United States appropriated \$3.2 billion almost immediately, almost overnight. That is how contingencies and emergencies which truly threaten the vital interests of the United States should be handled.

I have one final topic to discuss before I close. I said earlier in my speech that I would disclose, before this speech was over, the tactics and strategy—yes, the schemes—of the bureaucrats downtown to evade and avoid and run around the checking powers of Congress. I made mention of it last night in a speech on the floor of the Senate. We have pending before the Foreign Relations Committee a couple of bills, which came to us from the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury came before the committee and testified for them. That is a part of the scheme. What they are up to is to change the administration of American foreign aid involving billions of American taxpayer dollars into a system of multilateral administrative set-ups, whereby other countries, which put up very little money, will really come to have a controlling voice in the administration of the expenditure of American taxpayer money.

They will try to rush some of that legislation through before we quit on December 20. If I can only get some pledges of help, they will not do it.

The time is at hand for the American people to come to realize what these officials are up to. The administration of the expenditure of American taxpayer dollars in the foreign aid program must be kept by the Congress under its complete control. If any foreign country does not like it, it does not have to take the money. It is that simple. This is taxpayer money, and not the money of the Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, or the Secretary of State Rusk, or Bell of AID, or McNamara of the Pentagon, or the President of the United States himself.

Under this constitutional checking system of ours, Congress must say, "You can spend it for this purpose, and for this purpose alone. No one else will have a voice in determining the policy of expenditure."

That does not stop any country in Latin America—and I say this as one of the delegates at Bogotá and Punta del Este, which brought the Alliance for Progress program into possibility of implementation—that they cannot make their recommendations, that they cannot make their proposals, that they cannot submit their plans. However, Congress must be on guard. The American people must warn Congress to keep on guard. We must be on guard against turning the administration of the funds for foreign aid over to any multilateral commission or organization. To do that would put these Secretaries or the President in the position of being able to say, as they are now able to say to a too great degree in connection with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, "After all, these are not merely American funds. After all, the charter of these organizations—and the United States is a charter member, and

Congress approved our becoming a charter member—authorizes this multilateral administration."

This is a great threat to the taxpayers. It explains why the senior Senator from Oregon in the debate on foreign aid sought to have adopted an amendment that would end all foreign aid at the end of fiscal year 1965 and establish a new foreign aid program with the necessary terms, conditions, and restrictions that would have to be complied with by the applicant countries, limited in number to not more than 50, instead of the 107 into which we are now pouring the taxpayers' largess, many of which are not entitled to a single dollar.

If Congress falls for this propaganda of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of AID, it will have lost a considerable portion of its checking power under the Constitution in regard to the regulating of the expenditure of taxpayers' money. It will be extremely hard to make the dangers clear. It will be most difficult to persuade Members of Congress, to say nothing of the American public, to think in terms of abstract principles of government. Nevertheless, that is what is involved. The whole system of representative government is involved.

But in the debate this year we served notice on the bureaucrats that we were aware of the dangers of bureaucratic control, and the bureaucrats do not intend to give up without a struggle to protect their selfish interests.

I understand that tomorrow a couple of these bills will again be before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We shall discuss them later. If the committee takes final action on them tomorrow—and I think a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be as willing to sacrifice the rights of the taxpayers in regard to these bills as the conference report shows they were willing to sacrifice the rights of the taxpayers in connection with foreign aid generally—we shall have to fight the battle again on the floor of the Senate. Then we shall have to fight it on the political platforms of America. We shall have to urge the American people to exercise their precious right and duty to hold to political accountability the present Members of Congress who are willing to support such a frightening and dangerous weakening of our whole system of representative government by voting to enhance the power of the executive branch of the Government and making it supreme, rather than coequal and coordinated with the other two branches of Government.

That is my case against the conference report. I sincerely hope that tomorrow the Senate will reject the conference report. If the Senate rejects it, then under the parliamentary situation we will be in a position to call for another conference. There is no hurry. The rush act on the foreign aid bill has been pulled on us for months. There are so many millions of dollars in the pipeline that it is not necessary to appropriate another dollar for many months. Time is not of

the essence, contrary to the false representations of the spokesmen for the administration.

What is of the essence is that Congress keep the faith with the taxpayers in regard to its clear obligation to fulfill that provision of the Constitution which gives Congress a checking power on foreign policy, and to see to it that the conference report is rewritten so that the necessary checks will be put into it to protect the rights of the people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in keeping with the agreement previously entered into, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, December 13, 1963, a 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Rebecca H. Baker, Crossville, Ala., in place of Amby Campbell, retired.
Evelyn Y. Lambert, Darlington, Ala., in place of J. E. Lambert, deceased.
Marion L. Glass, Jemison, Ala., in place of D. A. Littlejohn, retired.
David E. Dunn, Sr., Montgomery, Ala., in place of C. D. Moore, resigned.
Margaret P. Gray, Sipsey, Ala., in place of L. H. Barton, retired.
Lillian E. Tyson, Toxey, Ala., in place of N. C. Davidson, retired.

ARKANSAS

Fleasant I. Richardson, Ash Flat, Ark., in place of F. B. Richardson, deceased.
Lexie P. Woods, Crossett, Ark., in place of P. G. Gates, retired.
Hal E. Bodenhamer, Mountain Home, Ark., in place of J. L. Bodenhamer, retired.
Henry R. Robinson, Wilson, Ark., in place of A. T. Harnden, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

James T. Smith, Banning, Calif., in place of J. A. Adrian, Jr., deceased.
Herbert V. Irey, Bridgeport, Calif., in place of W. B. Evans, resigned.
Marguerite M. Fanning, Burbank, Calif., in place of A. S. Richetts, retired.
Roberta M. Shriner, Burnt Ranch, Calif., in place of V. R. McKnight, retired.
George N. Laird, Colusa, Calif., in place of L. A. Mannee, deceased.
Frank P. Siatt, Fremont, Calif., in place of M. W. Lewis, resigned.
Alvin C. Blackford, Fullerton, Calif., in place of J. R. Layton, deceased.
Herman W. Biggers, Sr., Graton, Calif., in place of H. P. Heintz, retired.
Marie W. Forrest, Highland, Calif., in place of D. M. Alexander, retired.
Anna M. Brosh, Piru, Calif., in place of M. E. Bailey, retired.
Joan E. Gold, South Pasadena, Calif., in place of M. R. Rix, retired.
John W. James, Upland, Calif., in place of R. A. Ray, retired.

COLORADO

Laurell E. Julius, Evergreen, Colo., in place of A. J. Elmgreen, retired.

Carrol E. Byerrum, Grand Valley, Colo., in place of Otis Murray, retired.
Jacob N. Schmidt, Montrose, Colo., in place of F. H. Buskirk, deceased.
Reyburn I. Morgan, Platteville, Colo., in place of G. E. O'Neill, retired.

DELAWARE

Melvin R. Hearn, Georgetown, Del., in place of H. T. Swain, retired.

FLORIDA

Raymond E. Chandler, Altamonte Springs, Fla., in place of E. N. Mitchell, retired.
Alfred J. Tracy, Palm Beach, Fla., in place of E. R. McKenna, retired.
Lucille H. Pearce, Saint James City, Fla., in place of Nellie Hord, deceased.

GEORGIA

Wilfred E. Parrish, Chickamauga, Ga., in place of M. L. Deck, retired.
Guy C. Wallis, Conyers, Ga., in place of H. D. Austin, retired.
Roselyn S. Tyson, Harrison, Ga., in place of J. G. Jackson, retired.
John M. Johnston, Jr., Huber, Ga., in place of M. R. Denson, retired.

HAWAII

Thomas T. Oyasato, Wahiawa, Hawaii, in place of M. C. White, retired.

IDAHO

Ella M. Dixon, Stites, Idaho, in place of H. E. Detwiler, retired.

ILLINOIS

Orlin H. Nuernberger, Barrington, Ill., in place of H. C. Berghorn, retired.
R. Kent Billingsley, Buncombe, Ill., in place of B. H. Davis, deceased.
Harold H. Westendorf, Dieterich, Ill., in place of G. C. Hardiek, transferred.
Joseph B. Reichard, Jr., Prophetstown, Ill., in place of M. D. Pritchard, deceased.
Edward S. Howe, Robinson, Ill., in place of H. L. Thompson, deceased.
Wallace B. Rice, Williamsfield, Ill., in place of A. G. Daub, retired.

INDIANA

James L. Slough, Bourbon, Ind., in place of L. M. Slough, deceased.
Kenneth W. Cochran, Flat Rock, Ind., in place of O. C. Mohr, resigned.
Eleanor N. Harness, Grovertown, Ind., in place of W. B. Pelkey, deceased.
Michael H. Faikel, Portage, Ind. Office established on June 17, 1961.
Mildred L. Burchett, Romney, Ind., in place of G. G. Barker, retired.

IOWA

Charles H. Hamilton, Barnes City, Iowa, in place of R. T. Allen, retired.
Byron L. Evans, Centerville, Iowa, in place of W. W. Koestner, deceased.
Lester C. Schulte, Elkader, Iowa, in place of Lyle Barthel, retired.
Lucille J. Erickson, Hartford, Iowa, in place of R. W. Schooler, retired.
John H. Tutje, Matlock, Iowa, in place of J. C. Koele, deceased.
Clarence W. Sorensen, Melvin, Iowa, in place of M. J. Wackerbarth, resigned.
Thomas L. McDermott, Oto, Iowa, in place of C. P. McKenna, deceased.
Carl A. Thompson, Promise City, Iowa, in place of J. W. Smith, retired.

KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden, Kans., in place of P. T. Weiter, transferred.
M. Kenneth Morgan, Dwight, Kans., in place of L. A. Holshouser, retired.
Everett W. Hull, Fredonia, Kans., in place of W. W. Koch, retired.
Hubert P. Johnson, Harper, Kans., in place of W. W. Nye, transferred.
James R. Hogue, Pomona, Kans., in place of E. J. Neely, transferred.
Walter C. Preble, Jr., Rossville, Kans., in place of Everett Pelfrey, retired.

KENTUCKY

Jerry W. Davis, Radcliff, Ky. Office established on September 15, 1962.
James H. Sutton, Woodbine, Ky., in place of A. O. Perkins, retired.

LOUISIANA

Earline F. Lowrey, Lisbon, La., in place of W. B. Killgore, retired.

MAINE

Evelyn W. Stinson, Dryden, Maine, in place of A. M. McLaughlin, retired.
Philip A. Whitehouse, Winter Harbor, Maine, in place of A. B. Gerrish, resigned.

MARYLAND

Virginia M. Lochstamphor, Burtonsville, Md., in place of V. E. Beasley, retired.
John B. Sewell, Henryton, Md., in place of O. E. Corsa, deceased.
Mary L. Greiner, Queen Anne, Md., in place of M. L. Clark, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard C. Bockus, East Templeton, Mass., in place of B. T. Connors, deceased.
Theodore I. Piwowarczyk, Indian Orchard, Mass., in place of A. L. Bengle, retired.
Charles F. Germano, Millis, Mass., in place of F. J. Sheehan, retired.

MICHIGAN

Vere W. Arend, Baroda, Mich., in place of Samuel Somora, Sr., retired.
Donald C. Brill, Brutus, Mich., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.
Arnold S. Keskimaki, Chatham, Mich., in place of S. I. Seppli, deceased.
Bernard P. Beauchamp, Hubbell, Mich., in place of A. J. Pini, resigned.

MINNESOTA

James F. Kuelbs, Gaylord, Minn., in place of R. G. Mueller, retired.
Earl W. Rueckert, Grove City, Minn., in place of O. W. Anderberg, transferred.
Edward W. Appel, Millville, Minn., in place of T. E. McGowan, retired.
Alvin H. Groen, Murdock, Minn., in place of L. H. Egerstrom, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Robert D. Heslep, Boyle, Miss., in place of D. M. Collins, retired.
Lawrence C. Skipper, Jr., Gholson, Miss., in place of J. R. VanDevender, transferred.
Lula L. Chatham, Rose Hill, Miss., in place of R. E. Chatham, retired.

MISSOURI

John R. Evans, Monroe City, Mo., in place of R. L. Hawkins, retired.
Jack Crafton, Saint James, Mo., in place of M. C. Mikkelsen, retired.

MONTANA

Lawrence J. Driscoll, Charlo, Mont., in place of Lee Biggerstaff, retired.
Florn K. Martin, Poplar, Mont., in place of O. M. Mitchell, retired.

NEBRASKA

Nadine F. Summers, Creston, Nebr., in place of G. H. Summers, retired.
Orvale J. Widick, Farnam, Nebr., in place of W. E. Parker, retired.
Robert L. Jelden, Hildreth, Nebr., in place of Carl Kruse, transferred.

NEVADA

Susan I. Brizendine, Black Springs, Nev., in place of B. L. Linder, removed.
Charles L. Connor, Henderson, Nev., in place of H. S. Baldwin, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Arthur J. King, Conway, N.H., in place of E. L. Richardson, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Jane M. Seelman, Dorothy, N.J., in place of C. R. Andersen, deceased.
Edward R. Haag, Levittown, N.J., office established, October 2, 1961.

F. Robert Siebert, Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., in place of C. A. Snyder, Sr., deceased.
Allan E. Hamilton, Waretown, N.J., in place of P. O. Bonnell, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Frances G. Shaw, Capitán, N. Mex., in place of O. V. Cloud, deceased.

NEW YORK

Joseph A. Smith, Jr., Barneveld, N.Y., in place of W. C. Wells, retired.
James D. Folts, Cochocton, N.Y., in place of P. A. Kinkald, retired.
Carol A. Young, Hughsonville, N.Y., in place of J. F. Clark, resigned.
June J. Sinius, Huntington Station, N.Y., in place of L. P. Cass, deceased.
Vincent J. Boccia, Valley Cottage, N.Y., in place of Frank Pillere, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

H. Burch Idol, Colfax, N.C., in place of G. G. Gibbons, retired.
Opal W. Packard, Mooresboro, N.C., in place of E. A. Pipkin, Jr., deceased.
Archibald L. Taylor, Jr., Oxford, N.C., in place of V. W. Taylor, retired.
William A. Lovelace, Jr., Thomasville, N.C., in place of Paul Green, retired.
Robert S. Smith, Jr., Walnut Cove, N.C., in place of M. W. Davis, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur B. Haakenson, Toga, N. Dak., in place of G. E. Mark, retired.
Eldora M. LaBar, White Earth, N. Dak., in place of H. C. LaBar, deceased.

OHIO

Ralph G. Moore, Logan, Ohio, in place of C. C. Achauer, retired.
Merrel D. Geiger, Pandora, Ohio, in place of H. L. Basinger, retired.
Donald S. Fankhauser, Perry, Ohio, in place of H. B. Acker, deceased.
Henri L. Mondor, Piedmont, Ohio, in place of E. J. Calfee, retired.
Buel F. Collins, South Point, Ohio, in place of F. L. Brown, retired.

OKLAHOMA

William L. Bond, Madill, Okla., in place of R. T. Strickland, retired.
Charles B. Harjo, Sasakwa, Okla., in place of J. D. Bullington, retired.
Betty J. Lozano, Wann, Okla., in place of F. B. Taylor, retired.
Charles M. Horner, Welch, Okla., in place of J. E. Ewers, transferred.

OREGON

Robert B. Roe, Gaston, Oreg., in place of T. R. Roe, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard, Pa., in place of G. W. Golden, retired.
Walter G. Woolbaugh, Hallstead, Pa., in place of F. E. Chamberlin, retired.
Robert M. Kellerman, Irvine, Pa., in place of H. K. Kellerman, resigned.
Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg, Pa., in place of G. L. Johnson, retired.
George Mermon, Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of V. J. Koomar, deceased.
Donald J. Bogert, North East, Pa., in place of L. A. Clavin, retired.
Lester L. Miller, Slatedale, Pa., in place of F. O. Shenton, retired.
William D. Hartman, Stouchsburg, Pa., in place of M. W. Loeb, retired.
Jane W. Hinkle, West Hickory, Pa., in place of H. B. Wheeler, retired.
John D. Kershner, Witmer, Pa., in place of W. W. Kershner, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Carlos Oramas, Bayamon, P.R., in place of Vicente Felgu, retired.
Julio C. Rivera, Moca, P.R., in place of A. B. Rivera, retired.
Pedro J. Sandin, San Juan, P.R., in place of M. F. Varela, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Raymond N. Lombardi, Warren, R.I., in place of J. E. Conley, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Ellison Deer, Ulmers, S.C., in place of L. V. McMillan, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo P. Harens, Marion, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Weiland, retired.
Clifford R. Mitchell, Watertown, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Farl, deceased.
Marion C. Nash, Yankton, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Beaver, deceased.

TEXAS

Jimmie L. McFarland, Claude, Tex., in place of C. W. Appling, retired.
Ted Reeder, Crowell, Tex., in place of Alva Spencer, retired.
Henry F. Sheppard, Cuero, Tex., in place of S. G. Tarkington, Jr., retired.
James W. Dowe, Jr., Falfurrias, Tex., in place of T. R. Bennett, retired.
Dan J. Morse, Lewisville, Tex., in place of J. C. Cobb, retired.
W. Phillips Wolford, McKinney, Tex., in place of D. O. Davis, retired.
Ted F. Robinson, Marietta, Tex., in place of R. L. Harris, transferred.
Charlie Scaff, Matador, Tex., in place of E. F. Springer, retired.
Donald C. Reece, Prosper, Tex., in place of A. E. Robinson, deceased.
Eddith P. Mattox, Rio Vista, Tex., in place of I. C. McClellan, retired.
Virgie M. Holmes, Tolar, Tex., in place of N. O. Jackson, transferred.
Florence E. Warren, Wilmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Stadden, retired.

VERMONT

Nail P. McGinn, East Fairfield, Vt., in place of L. B. Maginn, retired.
Carroll P. Eastman, East Hardwick, Vt., in place of S. M. Eastman, retired.
Barbara M. Champney, North Pownal, Vt., in place of A. G. Church, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mary E. Farrar, Afton, Va., in place of G. G. Farrar, deceased.
William E. Brubeck, Middlebrook, Va., in place of C. E. Almarode, retired.
Martha E. Deane, Nottoway, Va., in place of W. G. Carter, retired.

WASHINGTON

D. Ben Meservey, Aberdeen, Wash., in place of G. D. Magee, retired.
W. Duane Duke, Vantage, Wash., in place of W. C. Duke, deceased.

WISCONSIN

James C. Anderson, Dallas, Wis., in place of H. C. Lee, transferred.
Philip A. Panetti, Juneau, Wis., in place of E. J. Peters, retired.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of December 11, 1963):

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Allen E. Rolland	Larry D. Brooks
James L. Walker	Francis W. Mooney
William L. Avery	Ronald M. Potter
David W. Proudfoot	Richard C. Blaschke
James A. McIntosh	Stephen H. Hines
James L. Mueller	George A. Casimir
Richard J. Klessel	Robert K. Blaschke
Joseph H. Discenza	Thomas P. Keane
David H. Withers	Thomas H. Lloyd, Jr.
Leonard J. Pichini	Thomas W. Boerger
William S. Haight	John G. Denninger, Jr.
Frederick D. Smith	Theodore A. Somes
Charles W. Morgan	Arthur R. Gandt
Robert A. Bastek	John W. Brittain
Alexander C. McKean,	Lawrence M. Schilling
Jr.	David W. Robinette

David H. Whitten	William A. Borchers
Harvey L. Wahnquist, Jr.	Edward K. Roe, Jr.
Jon P. Ryan	Michael O. Murtagh
Harry A. Allen	Joseph L. Crowe, Jr.
Joseph L. Valenti	Anthony J. Soltys
Lance A. Eagan	William H. Roth
Richard B. O'Keefe	William C. Heming
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.	James A. Umberger
William J. Wallace, Jr.	Kwang-Ping Hsu
Eugene Hornstein	Albert F. Baker
John A. Wuestneck	William S. Murray
Michael J. Schiro	George E. Mason
Harold L. Bonnet	Norman H. Huff
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.	Clifford E. Banner
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.	Don M. Keehn
Daniel T. Koenig	Thomas D. Smith
Frederick A. Kelley	Daniel M. White
James H. Lightner	Thomas F. McGrath
Raymond D. Bland	III
James F. Greene, Jr.	Thomas S. Whipple
Arthur E. Henn	Robert D. Markoff
John T. Mason	Stewart B. Morgan
Joseph H. Sanford	Raymond J. Houtte-
Joseph J. Smith	kier
Laurence J. Dallaire,	David K. Carey
Jr.	Louis M. Casale
Peter C. Hennings	John M. McCann
Ronald C. Zinzer	Peter M. Bernstein
Walter M. Coburn	Robert E. McDonough,
Henry B. Traver	Jr.
William H. Spence	Joseph R. Finelli
John K. Andrews	Wayne P. Stevens
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.	Jack W. Whiting, Jr.
David S. Gemmill	Phillip J. Bull
Richard V. Consigli	Harry N. Hutchins III
Carl H. Burkhardt	Thomas W. Watkins
Joseph P. Bibella	III
Neal Mahan	David W. Hastings
George E. Archer, Jr.	Herbert M. Hurst
Glenn E. Haines	Richmond D. Green-
Timothy G. McKinna	ough, Jr.
Peter T. Muth	Thomas J. Kenney
Richard E. Shrum	John C. Schmidtman
David T. Boyle	Robert F. Boysen, Jr.
	James C. McElroy

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of December 11), 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Oscar W. Schahn, Morenci.
Jane T. Williams, Patagonia.
Charles H. Archibald, San Luis.
Emert W. Hawkins, Thatcher.

COLORADO

Ralph M. Apple, Crowley.
Louis Bruder, Jr., Oak Creek.

CONNECTICUT

Dignor G. Piner, Mansfield Center.

IDAHO

Harold K. Beaudreau, Nampa.
Frederic M. Sanger, Twin Falls.

MARYLAND

William F. McNutt, Fallston.
William Telemeco, Maugansville.
George R. Parsons, Sr., Rock Hall.
Albert N. Golliday, Severn.
George L. Hart, Sudlersville.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles H. Hughes, Cleveland.

NEBRASKA

Raymond O. Johnson, Butte.

NEW JERSEY

Michael Arillo, Jr., Allenwood.
William F. Martin, Elmer.
Vincent T. Fagan, Jackson.
Frank W. Howell III, Newton.
Francis A. Newman, Spring Lake.
John R. Latourette, White House Station.

NEW YORK

A. Joseph Boulet, Gouverneur.
Edward A. Lesson, Greenwich.
John M. Hickey, Round Lake
Edna E. Grossman, Woodmere.
Paul G. Kenna, Wyoming.

OREGON

Stephen N. Blackmore, Cave Junction.
James P. Sandoz, The Dalles.

PENNSYLVANIA

John W. Richard, Elysburg.
Kathleen W. Cairns, Morgan.

Roy S. King, Pitcairn.
Francis A. Keyack, Shamokin.
Rudolph M. Gallup, Ulster.
Agnes K. Timko, Windber.

TEXAS

James R. Smart, Farwell.
Wright H. Williams, Friona.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park.
Luther G. Pool, Garland.
Eugene J. Dworaczyk, Hobson.
Talmage E. Gilbreath, Iowa Park.
Cecll W. James, Palestine.
Hiram C. Dubose, Port Arthur.

Ernest C. Minyard, Sudan.
Memory G. Wright, Jr., Troup.

WISCONSIN

Eldon R. Rode, Cambria.
Loren G. Nelson, Cushing.
Adolph L. Somers, Custer.
Michael J. Finnane, Evansville.
Ronald L. Marcks, Pepin.

WYOMING

Ellen R. Smith, Medicine Bow.
Charles G. Taylor, Pavillion.
Margaret H. Hennek, Wamsutter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence of Kenya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1963, the final transfer of power will take place between Britain and the Kenyan Government, making Kenya an independent nation. We wish to take this great occasion to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister, Jomo Kenyatta, and the people of Kenya on their approaching independence, and express to them all good wishes for a peaceful and progressive future as an independent nation-state.

Kenya's future indeed looks promising. This prosperous country on the east coast of Africa, roughly equivalent in size to the combined area of our States of Colorado and New Mexico, includes some of the best agricultural land in Africa. Kenya is a land of contrasts. The north and northeastern part of the country is arid—almost desertland—but the south contains the fertile well-watered highlands which produce the coffee, tea, sisal, and livestock that are the basis of the Kenyan economy. Agricultural production accounts for more than 80 percent, by value, of all exports.

Kenya is a multiracial society par excellence. Included in Kenya's population of about 6,500,000 people are approximately 6,215,000 Africans; 175,000 Indians, Pakistani, and Goans; 65,000 Europeans; 40,000 Arabs; and 5,000 others. Although a majority of the Africans still practice subsistence agriculture on small farms, under the impetus of government efforts to intensify African agriculture, African farmers have begun to make a substantial contribution to the production of cash crops, which were formerly produced almost entirely by Europeans. The Asian population is engaged chiefly in marketing, distribution, and transport. In recent years industrial activity has been increasing fairly rapidly; over 2,400 new public and private companies were registered between 1952 and 1962, among them subsidiaries of several large British firms.

Thus, Kenya is reaching the threshold of independence with a more diversi-

fied and complex economy than many of its African sister countries. It is not a single-crop economy; an important measure of agricultural diversification has already been achieved. Industrialization has already begun, and recent assurances by Kenyan leaders that an independent Kenya Government will not nationalize industries should encourage further private foreign investment. The marketing, distributing, and transportation industries are thriving concerns.

The inheritance of this progressive economy is a mixed blessing, however, for it is based on a multiracial society in which tensions can easily be aroused if a balance is not struck. The memory of Mau Mau is not yet dead, but the election manifesto of Prime Minister Kenyatta's party, the Kenya African National Union—KANU—should assuage the apprehension of any who fear that a repetition of Mau Mau might accompany independence. The manifesto stated:

The KANU government will welcome those non-Africans who choose to join with us in the noble task of building a Kenya nation. Their training, skills, and knowledge will be of the greatest value to us. We are confident that those who show confidence in us will appreciate the need to pass on to the nation what they can teach the people. They will be fully accepted by us, not only through legal forms, but in our hearts.

We, too, are confident that the new government and the people of Kenya will achieve lasting harmony in the task of successfully building a progressive and united nation.

The 1963 Achievement Awards to 870 Outstanding Students of English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a letter received from Mr. James R. Squire, executive secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill., announcing the selection of 870 outstanding students of English throughout the Nation as winners of

the 1963 Achievement Awards for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness. The letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1963.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE 88TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: In the enclosed brochure you will find the names of 870 of the Nation's outstanding students in English who have been cited for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness by the National Council of Teachers of English. The winners and runners-up from your State are listed therein.

These young people were chosen from approximately 6,800 students who were nominated by their schools for the 1963 Achievement Awards competition. Their entries were carefully judged by teams of prominent high school and college teachers across the Nation. We are confident that these finalists, who are recommended by the NCTE for college scholarships in 1964, represent the most able students of English in our Nation today. We also highly commend the respective English departments of these students for contributing to their achievements by providing a superior quality of instruction.

Today statesmen are calling for excellence of performance in all activities crucial to our effectiveness and creativity as a society. We, therefore, present these young people to you in response to this expressed need.

We trust that, should the opportunity present itself, you will assist these young people to develop their talents for the benefit of their country by congratulating them and recommending them to schools and scholarship donors.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. SQUIRE,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives of the NCTE Achievement Awards is the identification of highly qualified students to colleges and universities where they may apply for admission, as well as to scholarship donors. The NCTE is a non-profit organization without funds to support college scholarships, but those students who receive the recognition of the distinguished chairmen and judges, representing the 50 States, who selected the award winners, do find their prospects of receiving a scholarship greatly enhanced.

It is gratifying indeed in this age when great emphasis is given to other areas of academic activity that the NCTE has balanced the scales of intellectual achievement by recognizing outstanding young students of English. There is great value to the Nation in preserving and developing a high degree of competence in the English language, our most important heritage from our mother country. I commend the National Council of Teachers of English