ning. With its neighbors—Chad, Gabon, and the Central African Republic—it shares a customs union and has agreed upon procedures and organizations for joint administration and development of regional transportation, communications, fiscal matters, research, and other services. The Congo Republic has become one of the stanchest leaders of movements for African unity, and its capital city, Brazzaville, gave its name to the moderate Brazzaville group of 12 French-speaking states. Its relations with other countries on the African continent and with the world at large have been marked by cooperation and clear-sightedness.

It is true that nature could have been more generous toward the Republic of Congo. The chief livelihood of the people is agriculture, and the inland Niari Basin is a fertile agricultural region. But except for this area, the land is generally unfavorable. The swampy coastline fades into a sandy treeless plain cut off from the fertile interior by a range of forest-covered mountains. The northernmost part of the country is dense rain forest. The Congo has little mineral wealth to be exploited, but in spite of these obstacles the economy is expanding.

Industry is growing, and output now accounts for 11 percent of the country's gross national product. Food processing, lumber and woodworking, shipbuilding, iron and metal works, soap and cigarette manufacture, and the construction industries are presently the most important. The Congo does have one important natural resource—its forest wealth—which is still just being tapped. Timber and timber products accounted for over two-thirds of the Congo's export earnings in 1962.

Although the terrain makes transportation and communications difficult, the Congo has one of the best transportation systems in Africa. The 320-mile Congo-Ocean railroad links its two major cities, the ocean port of Pointe-Noire and the Capital and Congo River port of Brazzaville. This railroad runs through rugged terrain and dense rain forest, crosses 92 bridges, and passes through 21 tunnels.

The Congo Republic also surpasses many of the other African countries in the fields of education and public health. The Government is spending about one-fourth of its annual budget on education, and school enrollment, encompassing nearly 75 percent of the children of school age, is one of the highest among the French-speaking countries of Africa. The development of medical facilities and a public health program has also been emphasized. The Congo has 2 large hospitals, 13 medical centers, and over 100 dispensaries.

We salute you, President Youlou, and the people of the Congo Republic for your admirable accomplishments since independence. May your future endeavors be equally successful.

Independence of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, the Republic of India celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru; and His Excellency, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, B. K. Nehru.

Sixteen years ago Great Britain gave up the brightest jewel in the crown of its world empire. On August 15, 1947, India received its freedom and independence and took its place among the great countries of the world. The people of India today celebrate the anniversary of the historic and happy occasion.

Under the great leaders, Gandhi and Nehru, India has achieved a position of influence and leadership in Asia. It has a democratic representative form of government that makes it the most populous democracy in the world. The Indian Constitution provides for universal adult suffrage. A method of simplified and secret ballotting is used during elections. On three occasions India has successfully conducted the largest free elections ever held in the world.

India has made important beginnings in economic growth and social progress and has carefully considered its approach to the problem of development as a whole. The massive 5-year plans have brought an improved standard of living to the people of India. In these efforts to develop its economy, India has respected the will of the people and has not resorted to the totalitarian methods used in Communist countries. India and the Indian people can feel a sense of pride and accomplishment about many things they have done since independence. But there are many problems and difficulties that remain to challenge their ingenuity.

The standard of living in India is still one of the lowest in the world. How can it be raised significantly? Is it possible for India to greatly increase its agricultural yield and, at the same time, to effectively slow down the growth of its population? Can India, largely agricultural and unaccustomed to machines, be rapidly transformed into a modern industrialized country? How can the 80 percent of the Indian people who are illiterate be taught how to read and write, and also how can they be made to fill their roles as responsible members of a democratic country?

These are some of the questions and difficulties that confront India today. But no list is complete that does not include the problem of Communist China. India and China are the two great rivals in Asia. In their development both countries have started at about the same time at the same level. But in their approaches to development there has been a great contrast. Will India and the democratic path to development that it follows produce results as fast as the Chinese Communist totalitarian rule? The leaders in both countries know that the stakes in the contest are very high. The other countries of Asia and the rest of the developing world are watching closely to see whether India or China succeeds best in handling the problems of progress. The outcome will have a profound impact on the future.

The interest of the United States in India centers on the question of whether or not India can remain outside the Communist bloc and can achieve growth and prosperity as a democracy. As the leader of the democratic world, the United States must be sensitive to the needs of the people of India. In the past the United States has contributed generously to India's development. This country should continue to do what it can to help the world's most populous democracy along the path of progress.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1963

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

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

Thou great Companion of the sons of men, amid all the things our restless spirits seek, this quiet moment in the midst of the day's demands reminds us that Thou offerest Thyself to be found of us if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee. Give us to see and feel that prayer is yielding ourselves to be invaded, exalted, and commanded by the Infinite One and by standards higher and holier than our own unaided, fitful, faltering lives.

Come to us in the common affairs that entangle us; meet us in the thorny problems that confront us; make Thy highways through the avenues of sense. Clothe Thy glory in the earthen vessels of our feeble flesh; breathe through the things that are seen the peace of the unseen and eternal.

Without stumbling and without stain, may we follow the gleam of Thy will until the day is ended and our work is done. We bring our prayer in the ever-blessed name of the Master who did always the things that pleased Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 15, 1963, the following

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

reports of a committee were submitted on August 16, 1963:

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

S. 1828. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof (Rept. No. 400); and

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as "National Public Works Week" (Rept. No. 398).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 49. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 399); and

S. 1942. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America (Rept. No. 402).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1914. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America (Rept. No. 401).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 15, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 130. An act to change the name of Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case;

S. 131. An act to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe;

S. 219. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.;

S. 280. An act for the relief of Etsuko Matsuo McClellan;

S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos;

S. 850. An act to change the name of the Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir in the State of Idaho to the Dworshak Dam and Reservoir;

S. 1326. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; and

S. 1643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368).

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert A. Wallace, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT ON DELAY IN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED PROGRAM, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the delay in development and implementation of medical assistance for the aged program, District of Columbia government, dated July 1963, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 31. A bill for the relief of Sonja Dolata (Rept. No. 405);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jdaobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe (Rept. No. 406);

S. 198. A bill for the relief of Mother Azucena de San Jose (nee Carmen Hernandez Aguilar) (Rept. No. 407);

S. 202. A bill for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Briszk (Rept. No. 408);

S. 479. A bill for the relief of Chung K. Won (Rept. No. 409);

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Karolina Rado (Rept. No. 410);

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth (Rept. No. 411);

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo DeLucia and Angela DeLucia (Rept. No. 412);

S. 789. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa (Rept. No. 413);

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr. (Rept. No. 414);

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Tim L. Yen (Rept. No. 415);

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski (Rept. No. 417);

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterior Quitoriano (Rept. No. 418);

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora (Rept. No. 419);

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco (Rept. No. 420);

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian (Rept. No. 421);

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer (Rept. No. 422);

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker (Rept. No. 423);

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Veg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas (Rept. No. 424);

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker (Rept. No. 425);

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi (Rept. No. 426);

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo (Rept. No. 427);

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini (Rept. No. 428);

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang (Rept. No. 429);

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi (Rept. No. 430);

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy (Rept. No. 431);

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carta Gallitto (Rept. No. 432);

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic (Rept. No. 433);

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp (Rept. No. 434);

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin) (Rept. No. 435);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith (Rept. No. 436);

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski (Rept. No. 437);

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi (Rept. No. 438); and

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis (Rept. No. 439).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 212. A bill for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun (Rept. No. 440);

S. 838. A bill for the relief of George Crokos (Rept. No. 441);

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Despina J. Sanios (Rept. No. 442);

S. 1272. A bill for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets (Rept. No. 443); and

S. 1570. A bill for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock (Rept. No. 416);

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of Margaret Ann Cover (Rept. No. 444).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 7824. An act to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (Rept. No. 403).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 933. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 445).

FAVORING SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 404)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and submitted a report thereon; which concurrent resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254):

[redacted], Kong, Yee Lum.
[redacted], Lee, Bok Yee.
[redacted], Ng, Chew Wing.
[redacted], Yee, Sook Jane.
[redacted]Doo, Sid-Lin.
[redacted], Doo, Wai-Lin.
[redacted], Chan, Kwog Chiu.
[redacted], Jin, Ock-Tai.
[redacted], Leong, Poy Fong.
[redacted], Ng, Gum Foon.
[redacted], Ng, Kum Tai.
[redacted], Gee, Ming Dong.
[redacted], Kin, Cheong Chin.
[redacted], Wong, King Koon.
[redacted], Huey, Bon Hom.
[redacted], Lee, Quen Lim.
[redacted], Yee, Yick Tong.
[redacted] Lee, Do Pon.
[redacted], Wong, Chuck Ming.
[redacted], Hing, Lau Que.

SEC. 2. The Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254):

[redacted], Fun, Leong.
[redacted], Helenius, Einar Olavi.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Alvaro.
[redacted], Rodriguez de Torres, Josefa.
[redacted], Vargas-Gomez, Ascencion.
[redacted], Vargas-Gomez, Jose Eladio Jesus.
[redacted], Tak, Wa Kwok.
[redacted], Hung, Gay Chin.
[redacted], Alberti, Antoinette Marie.
[redacted], Kwai-ing, Wong.
[redacted], Wo, Chan Lok.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN LANDS EXCLUSIVELY BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 601) to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATIONAL TAX CREDITS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor to S. 1677, the Educational Tax Credits Act of 1963. I also ask that his name be included as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of August 6, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1988. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States: Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. THURMOND.

S. 2002. A bill to insure to military personnel certain basic constitutional rights by prohibiting influence in courts-martial cases and in certain nonjudicial proceedings, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 2003. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by insuring their right to be represented by qualified counsel in certain cases, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 2004. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by increasing the period within which such personnel may petition for a new trial by court-martial, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2005. A bill to afford military personnel due process in court-martial cases involving minor offenses, to insure the right of counsel in such cases, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2006. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection in certain cases to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. HUMPHREY.

S. 2007. A bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. HUMPHREY.

S. 2008. A bill to more effectively protect certain constitutional rights accorded military personnel: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2009. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, so as to provide additional constitutional protection in trials by courts-martial: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2010. A bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. HUMPHREY.

S. 2011. A bill to insure due process in the case of certain administrative actions involving military personnel: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. HUMPHREY.

S. 2012. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) so as to assure the constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process by providing for the mandatory appearance of witnesses and the production of evidence before certain boards and officers, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2013. A bill to further insure the fair and independent review of court-martial cases by prohibiting any member of a board of review from rating the effectiveness of another member of a board of review, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2014. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by court-martial, who have not been tried for such offenses, and who are no longer subject to trial by court-martial: Mr. BAYH, and Mr. FONG.

S. 2015. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who, while accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, commit certain offenses against the United States: Mr. BAYH, and Mr. FONG.

S. 2016. A bill to further insure due process in the administration of military justice in the Department of the Navy by establishing a Judge Advocate General's Corps in such department: Mr. BAYH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. HUMPHREY.

S. 2017. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing an independent forum to review and correct the military records of members and former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2018. A bill to further insure to military personnel certain due process protection by providing for military judges to be detailed to all general courts-martial, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2019. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection for members of the Armed Forces by establishing courts of military review, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate on Thursday last received the nomination of Gen. Herbert B. Powell, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to New Zealand.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the majority leader. Previously, I advised him that I would ask this question; so I am sure he is not caught by surprise.

Yesterday, an Associated Press article, under the byline of Jack Bell—whom we know, and for whom we have great affection, called attention to the fact that the majority leader "outlined in an interview a program calling for Senate action on measures to keep the debt limit at $309 billion, to authorize foreign

aid spending, and to permit ratification of the limited test ban treaty before any civil rights measure is brought up."

The headline of the entire article is: "MANSFIELD Sees Delay Until Late September in Taking Up 'Rights.'"

Mr. President, normally, we are rather sophisticated, and what is set forth in a headline or in a newspaper article—much as we may respect the author, and in *this* case all of us certainly do—does not disturb us particularly; we take it in stride, and go on to what is next.

But there will be what is called a "march" in Washington on August 28, and it involves enormous numbers of people who have deep feelings about civil rights legislation. In a national broadcast the President sounded for the country the note of morality on the highest level; and I think it fair to say that today civil rights is probably the No. 1 domestic issue, at least in terms of public temper and feeling.

So when something is said about delay, it has an influence upon all those who are deeply interested, and may cause them to an intensity of protest far greater than would be called for in the absence of the use of such a word—even if its use is justified by the approach intended.

So I think it would be of the greatest use and service—I make that statement knowing, as I told the majority leader, that he is on our side in terms of the desire to get civil rights legislation—to have his true idea and intentions spelled out. Not that he must do it, but I appeal to him on the ground that it would be of great service to the country, in this tense atmosphere, to know exactly what his plan is, and also to give, if it is possible, the feeling that we do intend to move forward, that we will not be intimidated by the threat of a civil rights filibuster or by the threat that every committee action and every action of the Congress will be held up, but that we will move forward with vigor in order to answer this national problem. I present my question to the majority leader on that basis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator from New York for calling me and telling me that he would raise questions this morning.

Second, the story is accurate in every detail.

Third, I was stating the truth as I saw it. I do not believe in twisting the legislative schedule. But I do believe in telling Senators, the people of the country—and reporters, incidentally—the truth as I see it.

The Senator has mentioned the word "threat." So far as the majority leader is concerned, he will not be threatened or intimidated by anyone. He will do his job to the best of his ability. That has always been his intention. That has always been his policy. That is still his intention. That will be his policy today and in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not recall mentioning the word "threat."

Mr. MANSFIELD. The word "threat" was used in connection with the word "filibuster." The word was also used, I believe, in connection with something else. I thought this was a good time and place to set the record straight so far as the attitude of the majority leader is concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator knows as well as I do that the Senate has a great deal of important proposed legislation to consider. Before I go into that subject, I think I should point out that so far as civil rights legislation is concerned, it is now out of the hands of the Executive and in the hands of three committees of the Congress—two committees in the Senate and one in the House.

It is my further understanding that, insofar as one of the bills in the Senate is concerned—the proposal relating to public accommodations—hearings have been concluded on that subject in the Committee on Commerce. Consideration of the disposition of the measure will begin shortly. When, I do not know. We still must consider the proposed railroad legislation which was sent to Congress by the President several weeks ago, and with respect to which a deadline of August 29 is established.

Hearings on civil rights proposals are being conducted by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. If my memory serves me correctly, the only witness so far has been the Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, who has appeared before that committee on 7 or 8 days. Other witnesses are still to be heard. Hearings have been held by the House Committee on the Judiciary under the chairmanship of the distinguished Representative from New York, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER. It is my understanding that those hearings have been concluded and that that committee is in the process, or soon will be, of marking up a bill covering civil rights legislation.

Tomorrow it is the intention that the Senate will take up proposed legislation on the debt ceiling or the debt limit. It is my understanding that the manpower retraining amendments have been ordered to be reported from the committee of which the Senator is a member; and then should be before us shortly.

Proposed legislation having to do with aid to medical and dental schools has passed the House, and I hope that it will come before the Senate in the next several weeks. Other measures relating to education may be reported from that committee to the Senate for consideration.

The question of proposed railroad legislation has not been settled. It is my most sincere hope—and I am sure that I speak for all Members of this body—that the carriers and brotherhoods, which seem to be getting along quite well at the present time, will arrive at a solution based on the outlines carried in the press and over the radio. If that is accomplished, there will be no need for legislation. Personally, I would be most happy if something were done to obviate the possibility of legislation. But if there must be legislation, it will be reported this week, and it will be before the Senate for consideration.

Then, of course, there is the question of the ratification of the test ban treaty, on which question hearings are now being held. It is my hope that shortly after Labor Day that treaty can be brought to the floor of the Senate for consideration.

The foreign aid bill markup was going along quite well until the test ban treaty was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. The markup of the foreign aid bill will continue after the committee concludes its deliberations relating to the test ban treaty.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can say what I desire to say in 1 minute.

The land conservation fund measure under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is still to be considered. I understand that the tax bill is on the verge of being reported from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and will be considered in that body shortly.

Then there are appropriate bills to be acted upon. To date the Senate has passed five appropriation bills; there are eight to go. So I assure the Senator from New York that what we are doing is operating on the same basis as always. We are not delaying any legislation. We do not intend to delay any legislation. But we intend to operate under the rules and procedures of the Senate. Collectively the leadership, in concert, will do the best it can on all these questions at the appropriate time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator two additional questions. First, have we any assurance that if the Committee on Commerce reports a public accommodations bill the majority leader will do his best to bring it promptly to the floor of the Senate for consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I would not give that assurance, because, frankly, that bill should be used as insurance.

I would not like to bring a bill to the floor of the Senate and see it amended to death. I would rather wait for a bill from the House which is a whole bill and, if necessary, meet it at the door, put it on the calendar, and then consider the whole spectrum rather than a part of it. I would assume that a bill passed by the House would have some kind of public accommodations proposal in it.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the Senator one additional question. Is there any desire to make civil rights the last item on the agenda at this session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not unless circumstances force us into that position. But certainly there is no intention to do so. In all frankness it is quite possible, in view of the fact that we will receive the tax bill late, that hearings will have to be

held by the Senate Finance Committee and those hearings will very likely take approximately 2 months. That is pretty speedy consideration. That bill might have to go over beyond the consideration of the civil rights bill. But I cannot make a definite commitment at this time. It will depend upon the circumstances and the speed with which committees in both Houses act.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his customary frankness. I would hope that if the Committee on Commerce reported a bill, it would be brought up for debate in the Senate, and that the majority leader would have done his utmost to do that. Of course, he has to run the gamut of his own policy committee. I understand that very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not only that, but I also have to work in accord with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senators whom he represents on the other side of the aisle. If we do not work together, the Senate will not function, and very little in the way of legislation will be passed. The Senator knows that.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that very well. I happen to be one of those whom the minority leader represents. Before concluding on this subject, I feel that the interests of the country dictate—and this is my own judgment—that when, as, and if the Committee on Commerce reports, we ought to begin the debate, because I think the urgency of the issue is that great.

As I say, this is my judgment. The Senator may disagree with me, as he obviously does.

I do not believe that the best interests of the Nation in this situation would be served by holding off beyond the time when the Commerce Committee reports the bill, because I do not think there is any likelihood of anything coming from the Judiciary Committee in time for consideration.

From what I can tell now, the development of the bill in the other body will require some time.

I also point out that this program was followed once before on civil rights, in 1957, and it worked very well. It is true that the debate continued and did not really get down to legislation until the House bill came over, but a good deal of the underbrush was cleared away by then. A good many Senators had had their say, which they will have anyway, whether it be called a filibuster or not; and a good bit of time had been consumed before the House bill came to the Senate.

I submit that point of view to the leadership.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's point of view. While I do not talk too much on the subject, I am also interested in a good civil rights bill. But I should like to see, insofar as possible, a whole civil rights bill, and not a fraction to which amendments could be offered, and about which there would be a good deal of discussion, delay, and other tactics, which might endanger the possibilities of obtaining a good bill.

Speaking of 1957, I point out, that on that occasion the Republican leader was the one who was in large part responsible for stopping the House bill at the door and bringing it to the floor of the Senate for consideration. I know my colleague does not forget that incident.

Furthermore, I agree with what the Senator says about the Judiciary Committee. I am not at all hopeful that proposed legislation will be reported by that committee. I hope I shall be surprised.

Therefore, on the basis of the two possibilities, the leadership must, in its judgment, do what it thinks best so that if at all possible a good and as whole a civil rights bill as possible, rather than a fragmentary portion, can be brought to the Senate for consideration, debate, and disposition.

Mr. JAVITS. It is my duty to submit my point of view to the Senate, to the country, and to the majority leader. This happens to be a subject about which I know something. I have lived with it a great part of my life.

One of the things which will take the heat out of the public situation most effectively is the fact that the battle will be transferred to the floor of the Senate. Then people will feel—and I think they will have a right to feel—that something is going to happen. Personally, I am confident that something is going to happen anyhow, but I am talking only about the large numbers of people who are, in a sense, confronting each other today in various sections of the country, not merely in the South, and creating very difficult situations not merely in southern cities, but also in New York and Chicago and other major cities of our Nation.

We are not dealing with a vacuum. We are dealing with the most incendiary material on the domestic front. That is why I consider it to be my duty at least to spell out exactly what people have a right to look to; that is my object. As I have given my point of view, others will give theirs. Then at least we shall know the timetable and the schedule.

I am grateful to my colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for his customary candor, which in this case I feel will contribute greatly to the public debate and public enlightenment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator has been most kind and generous. As always, he has been frank and candid in expressing his views.

The remarks which I made were made in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana and as a Senator of the United States. I happen to hold, by election of my colleagues, the position of majority leader. I intend, so long as I hold that position, to do the best I can, not only in behalf of my Democratic colleagues, but also in behalf of the Senate as a whole and Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I do not think it would be rendering a service if I were to give some double-talk in answers to the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from New York. All I can do is to "call them as I see them," to tell the truth as I know it, and to let things fall in place as they may.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the distinguished majority leader will discover—perhaps he has already discovered—that events and circumstances will continue to dictate the calendar now that the Congress is knee deep in August.

I have forgotten my astronomy sufficiently so as not to be able to remember whether the dog star Sirius is still on the ascendancy. This is the month of "dog days"; and for that reason, I suppose, it is a month which has a rather peculiar effect upon people.

When I speak of events and circumstances dictating the calendar from now on, I am thinking of our earlier action on the debt ceiling. We have a shuffling debt ceiling. It was at $305 billion. It went to $307 billion. Then it went to $309 billion. It is supposed to stay at that figure until August 30.

It was necessary for the committee to meet and report a new debt ceiling bill, to be effective from September through November 30. There will be another session with respect to the debt ceiling.

The fact is that those involved cannot very well compound a debt ceiling yet, not knowing what will happen to the tax bill and not knowing what will happen with respect to appropriation bills.

With respect to appropriations, there seems to be quite a hassel over the method of financing the Export-Import Bank, and many are concerned. The House takes the position that it would rather provide $2 billion under direct appropriations than $1 billion by back-door financing. The Export-Import Bank soon will be out of money, and will be out of authority. As a result, an effort is underway to lift that item out of an appropriation bill; but I doubt whether the Appropriations Committees will consider that kind of approach.

So that problem must be taken care of. Even though we are taking care of the debt ceiling now, we shall have to take care of it later.

The majority leader very properly considers the nuclear test ban treaty to be a matter of high urgency which must have attention. If it comes to the Senate after Labor Day, I assume it will be before the Senate for at least a week.

There will be intervening matters. The Government departments are now operating under interim resolutions with respect to appropriations. That is not a very happy situation, when in theory the appropriation bills should have had action completed on them by June 30. But that has not taken place.

That is another event. That is another circumstance to dictate that the Senate must maintain a rather fluid calendar.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe matters have jelled now sufficiently. I can see fairly clearly that we shall probably have our Thanksgiving Day turkey

dinners in the Nation's Capital, rather than back home, because if it is necessary to pass on the debt ceiling before November 30—and usually the request never reaches us until 2 weeks before the cutoff date—that will mean that the Senate Finance Committee will probably be considering the new Treasury Department estimate of the debt ceiling at that time, in order that no difficulties may ensue when the deadline of November 30 arrives.

I am anticipating that I shall be here and that the Senate will be in session, except for an occasional weekend or 3-day recess, if that can be contrived.

There is a tax bill to consider. So far as I can tell, the witnesses will be many, and probably there will be objection to the Finance Committee meeting when the Senate is in session. That will cause a stretchout of the procedure. Then time will be required for the markup in the committee.

So we might be quite fortunate, indeed, if we have a tax bill for consideration by December, if we get a tax bill at all. That is a matter being determined by the very genial and able Senators who sit around the table in the Senate Committee on Finance, who will determine in considerable measure what our tax destiny shall be.

But every day, every week, a new event, a new circumstance, something else by way of a tangent, strikes the Senate schedule, and then it must be revised.

With respect to civil rights particularly, I heard all the testimony by the distinguished Attorney General. He has honored us with seven appearances, and only one member of the committee has had an opportunity to interrogate him. I have not had my opportunity yet. It will not be extended. I do not expect to be repetitious or redundant about it. But other members of the committee desire to question the Attorney General. I am advised that there is a substantial list of witnesses who will want to be heard; and this list will include the attorneys general of various States, and leaders of various organizations.

The committee must so comport itself that it will devote as much time as possible, consonant with demands on the time of members of that committee with respect to other committees and other responsibilities.

So envisioning all these factors, I should say that the majority leader's estimate is rather realistic.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority leader may have 3 more minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the minority leader his own view as to whether or not he feels that civil rights legislation ought to be last on the calendar, on our own classic theory that those who are interested stay and those who are not interested go home. I appeal to him as he is the leader on my side, in view of the tense and difficult quality of the human relations which we find in the country today and my deep conviction—I think I have a right to a little expertise on this subject—that the beginning of the debate in the Senate will have a material effect upon transferring from the country to the Senate floor a good deal of the tenseness and heat and struggle which exist in the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the record will answer my distinguished friend. First, in 1957, I was a part of the interception whereby the House bill was finally brought before the Senate. And in 1960, it was my honor to be an author of the package bill under the prior administration, whereby we finally got some action on four of the six titles of that bill. So I am prepared, at any time within reason, to get out the civil rights package. I do not want to see it delayed.

There is a strong point in what my friend says about a certain indifference that is a part of the attrition of a long session. It is probably natural. It is like the end of the interest when the world's series is over. We get the main things out of the way, but other matters are added. Members of Congress would like to get home. They would like to see their people. They would like to make a few speeches. And we are not unmindful that a rather interesting contest will take place in the following calendar year. There are certain lures, and they are as human as they can be. But I share the Senator's hope that we can get at the civil rights bill and determine what we can do. My own record is clear as crystal, and I am prepared at any time to take up the cudgels for the program, even though there are points in it with which I do not agree. My friend knows how I feel about title II.

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to the other seven titles, I think my record and my utterances are quite clear.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the minority leader as well as to the majority leader for giving us their frank views. I deeply feel that the country will react on the basis of what they have said, which is healthy. It needed to be said. The question of a timetable is important so that the country, for reasons of public order and tranquillity, will know. While I may not agree with the timetable, in any case I commend both the majority and the minority leaders. They have set a model of candor which can only be helpful, whether we agree on details or not. The frankness of the judgments they have described will be helpful to the country. But I would be deceiving them if I did not tell them how I felt. The question of timetable will engender healthy debate. It has been started; and I say that it is helpful to have it started.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me add only in conclusion that the best testimony I can deliver in behalf of the sincerity and diligence of the majority leader is, first, that on the calendar this morning there are five bills. Two of them are marked "hold," because Members of the Senate have some particular interest that they want to ventilate. That is the most slender calendar I can think of in any session of the Senate, and it is a tribute to the majority leader.

The second point I wish to make is that only a week ago the majority leader stood in the well of the Senate and fairly entreated the various chairmen of the standing committees of the Senate to get busy on the bills that are pending and to report them for Senate consideration. I think that is an earnest of his good faith, his diligence, and his devotion to get these measures to the Senate for further consideration, the better, probably, to bring the ultimate end of the session of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To clear the decks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Now I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator mentioned the fact that he would be eating his Thanksgiving dinner in Washington. That is a reasonable prediction, but I am afraid he is optimistic. If I can see into the future at all, I would suggest that he prepare to have his Christmas dinner here as well, and to spend New Year's Eve within the confines of the metropolitan area.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am ahead of the majority leader, for we had a full attendance at the Senate Finance Committee last Thursday, and as we approved the House debt ceiling bill I told the Members that I would be happy to take their orders for Christmas trees.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hoped the leadership would be inspired by the spirit of Labor Day, even though we may have to stay here until Christmas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be a brief layover on Labor Day. I think as good a time to announce it as any is at the moment. I have discussed this question with the minority leader. It is anticipated that we will have Friday, Saturday, and Sunday off preceding Labor Day, and Labor Day itself. Members of the Senate had better get a little rest while they have the opportunity, because when they come back they will have to man the trenches at least until Christmas.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator misunderstood me. I did not mean to be in session Labor Day. I have an AFL–CIO Labor Day celebration to attend, and I think other Senators do, too. I meant that I hoped the animation of Labor Day would be conveyed, and I hoped we would labor diligently even though we were to be here until Christmas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I misunderstood the Senator. I am in accord.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader one question: Does he remember when Henry Ford, Sr., dispatched the so-called Peace Ship in the hope of getting the boys out of the trenches before Christmas in World War I?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was a little young then, but I remember it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure he remembers it. I am wondering whether the majority leader sees an iridescent sail on the horizon which might give some hope that we Senators can be gotten out of the trenches by Christmas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some hope; but I do not usually believe in mirages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to address the Senate after this faint expression of hope, or expression of faint hope, and to carry on with the business of the Senate.

I am one of those who feel that they will hand-deliver Christmas greeting cards this year.

I am fully convinced that once August is behind us everyone will feel much better. August, in the conduct of either public or private business, presents an ordeal. The French are the only ones who have solved the problem. They take off in August. In effect, they cancel August from the calendar. They do this for all public and personal purposes. On the other hand, we grind on and do the best we can.

I join the majority leader and the minority leader in the conviction that Congress will undoubtedly be here for the remainder of the year. This is as it should be.

It is about time that Congress be scheduled on a year-round basis. We should stop deceiving ourselves. We are the victims of traditions in Congress. However, the traditions that we adhere to, relating to the length of sessions of Congress, are anything but realistic. We operate under a law which provides that Congress shall complete its work by July 31. Congress disobeys that law as no citizen in the United States disobeys any law. The Reorganization Act provides that we must complete our work by July 31. As soon as we passed that law we immediately proceeded to ignore it. We should repeal that section of the law. We should predicate our work in Congress on a year-round basis, and plan our work so that we will attend to our duties over a 12-month period, phasing in whatever time we need, just as ordinary, wholesome, decent American citizens do. There is such a thing as planning one's life and planning one's work—everywhere except in Congress.

I am not at all unhappy about the development that has been discussed today, because once we set our minds to the task of scheduling a full year's activities of the Senate, we shall be a much happier and more productive body.

The American people do not realize that most of the work of Congress is done in committees, and not on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the other body. The committee work of Congress carries on frequently long after Congress has adjourned.

Therefore, the sooner we come with clean hands to the American people and let them know that this is not only a full-time job, but also a double time job, the better it will be for all concerned. Frankly, most Members of Congress work long hours every day and on weekends. Very seldom do we get what we call a moment of privacy. If there is such a moment for any Senator, I wish he would tell me how he gets it.

When I worked in private employment, I found that there was at least a schedule of hours of work, and perhaps a 5-day week, or at most, a 6-day week. Any Member of Congress who does not have to see a few constituents and receive telephone calls, and spend a full day of work on Saturday, is a lucky person, indeed. Therefore, I prefer a 365-day plan of operation for Congress on that basis.

I hope that we shall be able to give some thoughtful attention to setting up an appropriate organizational structure and time scheduling within Congress, for the year 1963 and thereafter. With all the international problems that we face, with all the responsibilities of world leadership, and with all the crises that come upon us, we cannot look upon our job as a part-time job. To the contrary, it is an overtime job.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR INOUYE TO RETAIL CLERKS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently the 24th quadrennial convention of the Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, meeting in Chicago, was privileged to be addressed by a distinguished array of speakers, several of them Members of this body.

One of the outstanding speakers was my friend and distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], whose remarks on that occasion are worthy of consideration by every Member of this body.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

A JOB LEFT FOR LABOR

(Address by Senator INOUYE at Diamond Jubilee Year Convention of Retail Clerks International Association, June 24, 1963)

The editorial from the June 1963 issue of your magazine, the Advocate, proclaims that the eyes of the entire Retail Clerks International Association will turn to Chicago on June 24, as this 24th constitutional convention opens. I would like to say that not only are the eyes of RCIA cast in the direction of Chicago in this, your diamond jubilee year, but the collective attention of most of the United States is riveted here in the Windy City.

I say this because a strongly objective study of your union sponsored by the Ford Foundation claims that "by the end of the 1960's, it may well be that the RCIA will be one of the two or three largest, and perhaps the most powerful labor institution in the United States."

I think that both the rank and file members, as well as the top leaders of the RCIA must certainly realize that today is marked not only on their calendars but in the minds of many in the top echelons of business and industry, as well as Government. There is no denying that the RCIA is destined to become one of the most outspoken, most influential, and most responsible unions in this country of free unions.

The record of the RCIA is one of outstanding accomplishment and substantiates the claim made for your organization by the Ford Foundation study. For example, I have no doubt of the claim made by your organization that today retail clerks enrolled under the banner of RCIA are the highest paid group of store employees in the world.

Because of what I have said for the past minute or so, I think that it is especially commendable that you have the kind of leadership which all unions ought to have. This convention as well as others in the past have shown your leaders to be very much concerned about the structure and procedure of union democracy. They have taken pains to permit the free flow of criticism and expression of opinion from the lowest levels of union organization to the highest. Of course, such a commitment to democratic practices ultimately makes for more effective labor unions. In this regard, I might add that you also have one of the smartest set of leaders. Nevertheless, I think it is especially commendable that the union which has been characterized as potentially one of the most powerful in this decade also realizes very clearly its responsibilities.

After these opening remarks, I should realize that I am a little ahead in this game. But politicians are much like union negotiators—we hate to give up an opening. I hope you will bear with me.

I think you will have to agree with me that there is a large number of people whose reaction to increasing labor union activities is, to say the least, unfavorable. Such individuals are not to be found in any particular economic stratum of society. Nor do they predominate among those who have a certain social background. I think it is rather widespread and covers the entire spectrum of American society. What are some of these reactions? Let us try to list them.

1. Labor unions are too powerful: It has often been said that certain of our labor unions have become much too demanding as a result of previous victories won. Labor unions are no longer satisfied with 2 or 3 percent increases but incline toward greater and greater annual increases with the sky as the limit. Unions are too obsessed with lining their own purses and not given to any concern for the health or welfare of the national economy.

2. Labor unions are dominated by rackets and racketeers: As a result of certain evidences uncovered by Senate investigators with regard to a few isolated unions, there is a feeling that unscrupulous practices have been long tolerated throughout the labor movement, a feeling that labor union racketeering is widespread throughout the movement.

3. Labor unions are too strike happy: They strike without provocation. They strike without cause. They strike without regard for the economic consequences to their neighbors. They strike because they want merely to flex their muscles.

Strikes have wreaked havoc on the national economy leading to decreased production and internal debilitation. Strikes have resulted in indefensible loss of man-hours and salaries leading to a generally weakened national economy. If all the lost man-hours and salaries resulting from such strikes were to be added, it would far outweigh any minor gains made by labor unions. Strikes are the bane of the hard-working man as they are the haven of the inveterate loafer.

I do not think it is necessary for any of us here today to feign surprise at what I have just said. If we are honest with ourselves, we must surely realize that such images as I have presented have gained general acceptancy among our fellow citizens more and more in the last decade. It seems to me reasonable to assume that the manipulators of image distortions have not been napping on their jobs. Journalists given to sensationalism have had more than one field day in which they have let their imaginations

stray. As a result, many of our citizens have been influenced by such stories as I have cited.

In order to set the record straight, let us analyze these image distortions one by one.

I do not think that I need to spend much time on the argument that labor unions are too powerful or that they are merely self-interested in their own good. Labor unions are restricted as to monopolistic practices in much the same way as are industrial concerns. If labor is not satisfied with 2 to 3 percent annual increases and feels that it deserves more and can substantiate these demands, then it appears to me that it is the responsibility of industry to refute them. Free enterprise was never an exclusive prerogative of industry.

As far as a regard for the national interest is concerned, I need only remind you of the policy resolutions on community service adopted in December 1961 by the AFL–CIO, for example. We find that particular labor organization committed to various community programs for the aging and the aged, rehabilitation for the physically disabled, consumer counseling, elimination of polio, blood banking, and service to children and youth.

That same resolution recorded the position of the AFL–CIO as follows: The AFL–CIO recognizes that unions have a responsibility to the unemployed non-dues-paying member as they have to the employed dues-paying member.

President George Meany expressed labor's interest best by saying: "We look upon the handicapped workers just as we look upon any other group that suffers from prejudice, discrimination, and inadequate opportunity. We want to help them win their full status as citizens." Not only the AFL–CIO but other labor organizations as well have made impressive contributions of both time and money toward the establishment of local rehabilitation centers. Labor has effectively been represented on the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, as well as on various State advisory committees.

Another of the more interesting stereotypes of labor unions is that they are dominated by racketeers and convicted felons. This is a very prevalent image of unions not only in this country but throughout the world. But again, we ought to look at facts and figures.

A specific comparison between losses suffered by companies that furnish bonds to union officials, as well as officers of banks, savings and loan firms, and similar financial institutions has been compiled to provide some very startling information which all of you should know, especially since you may not get them in any other way.

These figures are not of my own concoction but have been obtained from leading bonding companies throughout the country. It shows that millions of dollars are handed out each year to cover thefts by those who are bonded in the various financial institutions of our country. As compared to this, losses are significantly smaller among the thousands of union officials who are now required to be bonded under the Landrum-Griffin Act.

These are the figures: In 1961, premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $23,944,000 with losses amounting to $17,095,000 for a loss ratio of 71.4 percent. In the same year, premiums paid by unions totaled $1,462,000 with losses at $257,000 for a loss ratio of 17.6 percent. In 1960, the difference was even greater. Premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $21 million with losses at $17 million for a loss ratio of 81 percent. Unions paid a total of $1,402,000 in premiums with losses amounting to $104,000 for a loss ratio of 7.4 percent.

William Botkin, the international secretary-treasurer of the International Woodworkers of America, indicated that labor unions are now compiling figures over a 5-year period including premiums, losses, and the amounts recovered from guilty individuals to support labor's attempts to receive lower rates on bonds for union officials. I am sure that the figures will prove that labor deserves much lower rates on the basis of past, as well as present, performance.

When the Landrum-Griffin Act became effective, bonding companies attached a 50-percent surcharge on the bond premiums of labor officials primarily because of the existing climate of opinion. "Labor corruption" as a tag hung indiscriminately on all union officials apparently led to such an exorbitant surcharge. But that surcharge was later cut in half and now it appears on the basis of facts and figures today that the surcharge is not warranted.

It should not be concluded upon the basis of what I have said that all labor unions are pristine pure and lily white. Continuing effort must be made by labor organizations and labor officials to discharge the public trust fully and honestly. In this sense, we must be our brother's keeper. We must be very much concerned with organizations and officials who have betrayed not only public confidence but the confidence of its members as well.

As to the charge that labor unions are strike-happy and given to irresponsible waste of man-hours and manpower, there are certain pertinent statistics readily available from the U.S. Department of Labor.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has said that: "Lost time—and production—from strikes has, during the past 3 years, represented a smaller percentage, about one-seventh of 1 percent, of total man-hours worked than during any other years since the end of the last war."

He went on to say that, "More potential man-hours of production were lost in 1962 as the result of involuntary unemployment than have been lost from all strikes in the past 3 years. The public reacts more vehemently to a kick in the shins than to an attack of economic arthritis."

Secretary Wirtz' own department provides us with interesting data. Let's look at the record.

A seemingly awesome total of 19 million man-days were lost as a result of strikes in 1962. But when one considers that this amounts to only .16 percent of the total estimated working time in that year, somebody has managed to make a winter day look like one in summer. This amounts to less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total.

The purveyors of strike fright have neglected to point out other equally pertinent facts. For example, they conveniently forget than many more man-hours of labor are lost through chronic unemployment as comparted to strikes. The following are the percentages of unemployed in the civilian labor force by years: 5.6 percent in 1960; 6.7 percent in 1961; 5.6 percent in 1962; and 5.6 percent as of May 1963.

In other words, 28 to 33 times more man-days have been lost through chronic unemployment than through strikes in any given year.

Nor do these peddlers of strike-fright inform us of the increase of the gross national product from $482 billion in 1959 to $553 billion in 1962. They do not tell us that output per man-hour of labor in nonagricultural work has increased from 104.8 units in 1960 to 112.1 units in 1962, using the 1957–59 period as parity of 100 units.

Furthermore, they fan the fever of fright by withholding the fact that we have an unused plant capacity of 15 percent. That is the amount of available industrial power which is simply not used.

In view of such incontrovertible facts, I submit that the problem is not one of an excess of strikes. It is one of balancing the supply and demand of our economic resources, especially human resources. This is our most important problem. We simply cannot afford such a high level of unused manpower as represented in unemployment statistics, and we cannot tolerate less than complete utilization of our industrial potential as seen in our 15 percent unused plant capacity.

Lest my statements be misinterpreted, let me assure you that I am not in the least condoning frequent and impulsive resort to strikes as the ultimate weapon of labor dissatisfaction. A fair assessment must be made of the possible detrimental effects to nonparticipants in a strike situation.

Frequently, for example, both labor and industry participants in a strike situation have financial resources built up through the fat years for such eventualities. Strike benefit programs of one kind or another for labor and strike insurance programs of varied types for industry have tided over many a direct combatant manning either side of the barricade.

But the consuming public is often the victim. They have nothing in reserve to cushion the shock of a head-on labor-industry clash. Such victims can fall easy prey to malicious propaganda.

There is a current case which pointedly illustrates how stereotypes are formed and what can be done about them.

As a result of the disturbances in Philadelphia concerning certain employment practices, labor unions are being typed in some quarters as having no concern for civil rights. I think that any objective person will have to admit that certain of our unions, like certain of our commercial enterprises, have not always disregarded the color line. However, the same brush should not be used to tar all labor unions.

Most of the union movements have come of age in the matter of respect for civil rights. But that maturity is in danger of being impaired by the actions of a few and by the ramifications of that action among the people at large.

In the America of today, unions cannot afford the circulation of an image pockmarked by the pits of racial exclusion and inclusion. But please be assured that every effort will be made to cultivate that stereotype unless you speak out with the collective voice of conscience decrying such practices and demanding that the house of labor be cleansed.

The problem, of course, is not only peculiar with labor but cuts across all groups and all regions. But you in labor have a distinctive interest because you are committed to the cause of social and economic justice which you have so widely, and justly, publicized.

Forget this commitment, and you will automatically give license to all those who are only too eager and willing to tarnish the image of labor.

From what I have said, there appears to be no better antidote for the spread of the malady of "antilaboritis" than a healthy dose of facts and figures. This is the most effective prescription which can be administered by anyone interested in the health and well-being of our country.

Those of you in the Retail Clerks International Association are in an especially favorable position to counter the effects of such misinformation. In your almost daily contacts with the public, you can seek to dispell the image which has been wrongfully created. You can do this simply by studying facts and figures which are readily available through organizations such as the Department of Labor and your own research departments.

I need not tell you of the consequences that may derive from a neglect of this essential responsibility. When public tolerance of any institution decreases either through

valid appraisal of facts or through clever distortion of them, then a situation is created which eventually leads to restrictive legislation. I am certain that you can rise to the occasion, as you have done in the past, to man the ramparts of labor.

IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS AND POLITICIANS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, of Utah, recently delivered a very important address before the School of Business Administration, Brigham Young University. His address was entitled "The Importance of Politics and Politicians." I think all Senators will be interested in reading the remarks of this distinguished citizen of my State; and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS AND POLITICIANS

(By Robert H. Hinckley, before the School of Business Administration, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah)

My theme today is the importance of politics and politicians. This may seem to you an inappropriate subject in a series of executive lectures on business management. If it seems inappropriate it would probably startle you even more if I said politics and politicians could very well be the most important factors in your business lives. I am hopeful that you, students in and of this modern age, have a higher regard for politics and politicians than the general public attitude. I know great progress has been made on this campus in this regard.

When I was here, as a student, President Heber J. Grant would visit us in election years to admonish students and faculty alike to stay out of politics, because he said, "Politics is the stinkingest kind of 'tics' there is." While I did not agree with President Grant, he was in pretty good company, for Thomas Jefferson once said: "Politics is such a torment that I would advise every one I love not to mess with it." So you see, these great men were saying, in effect, the same thing.

One dictionary definition of a politician is: "One who, in seeking or conducting public office, is more concerned to win favor or to retain power than to maintain principles." But the Oxford English Dictionary says that the definition of a politician as a "crude schemer, a crafty plotter, an intriguer," is obsolete; obsolete in Britain, that is.

Oscar Ameringer, an American writer and editor, said: "Politics is the gentle art of getting votes from the poor and campaign funds from the rich, by promising to protect each from the other."

Simon Cameron, Republican boss of Pennsylvania in the last century, said: "An honest politician is one who, when he is bought, will stay bought."

Another dictionary definition of a politician is: "One skilled in political government or administration; a statesman." The definition of a politician being a statesman is interesting, because it's just as difficult for a politician to be a statesman as it is for a businessman or a labor leader to be a statesman. Of course, a politician has to be a very good politician to be a statesman. President Truman used to say: "A statesman is a dead politician." In other words, you only say kind things about the departed. I have discussed with President Truman what might be done to improve the standing and public esteem of politics and politicians. His answer: "There is only one way to do it and that is to improve the breed of politicians." At one time I suggested to him that since politics is the science of government, we might change the name of "politician" to "governmentician"—he thought "governmentician" sounded too much like "mortician" and said: "I will continue to be a politician from Missouri." President Truman thereby put the onus on the politicians for their present low estate and not on the citizens who ignored politics.

I agree with President Truman. To improve politics and politicians, we must select better people to represent us. To do this all citizens should participate in government—then all citizens become, to some degree, politicians, which is as it should be.

You have heard people say, "I wouldn't touch politics with a ten-foot pole." Those same people are willing to spend untold hours in Red Cross work and similar community projects. I was shocked recently to read an attack on politicians by the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, "Taking them by and large as a breed," he said, "they leave me cold. You wonder how the country survives with these men. I used to think a Governor or Senator was a great man but I long since got over it. He's just cleverer than the next guy, that's all."

In answer to the Reverend Peale, I quote another New Yorker from an earlier day, Elihu Root, who said: "Politics is the practical exercise of self-government and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government."

Of course, Reverend Peale would sneer at Mr. Root because he was a politician. He was a Senator from New York. He was Secretary of War under President McKinley. He was Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt. Altogether a most respected citizen, but a politician. So, in the reverend's sweeping denunciation, he must be included.

And speaking of politics and business, it was Pericles who said: "We do not say a man who takes no interest in politics minds his own business. We say he has no business here at all."

In this century, Lincoln Steffans said: "Politics is business, that's what's the matter with it. The corruption that shocks us in public affairs, we practice ourselves in our private concerns."

It is not my desire to change your choice of occupation, but whatever that choice is, politics and politicians will be a part of it. For your own good and the good of your community, State and country, you should enter some field of politics.

Since my first experience in Federal Government, I have advocated that all businessmen do a tour in government; the result will only be beneficial. You will make a contribution even though you may not think so. In the Federal Government the playing field is so large it is sometimes difficult to know whether or not you have advanced the ball. But you will have learned something about democratic processes that you could not learn in any other manner, and you will be able to impart this knowledge to your business associates. This is very important because many businesses are operated as dictatorships.

To mention but a few of the national and international problems confronting us, we have:

A lagging economy—our economy is far under its potential.

Unemployment—the technologically displaced by automation and related problems.

Diminishing natural resources—particularly water.

Farm problems—surpluses, prices, etc.

Education—improving our educational systems to where they meet our needs.

Poverty—should be eradicated in a land of plenty.

Civil rights—a 100-year-old problem.

World trade relations—without improvement here there can be no peace.

World population explosion.

Underdeveloped countries, and world-peace—most important of all.

All of these problems and more become the responsibility of politicians because they are political in nature. Only politicians equipped with intelligence, with high integrity and complete dedication can contribute the best answers to these problems.

One of the national discussions of the moment is the tax reduction program offered as a means of improving our lagging economy. Most national leaders, political, industrial, and labor, favor such a program. Many however, favor it only if like reductions can be made in national expenditures.

If there is any lesson to be drawn from this discussion and from the review of other problems confronting us, it seems to me that American businessmen must stretch their minds, lift their sights beyond the horizons of their immediate business concerns, and devote some of their brainpower to the solution of the big national problems of the day through political participation.

They must think more and more in terms of the national welfare. This is a responsibility in a democracy.

We need politicians who understand our economy as a whole, our social structure as a whole, our international relationships as a whole.

We need to have business leaders make the same effort.

We need to have labor leaders make the same effort.

As graduates of business administration, you students are going to be challenged with some gargantuan problems and it will be your responsibility to renounce the shibboleths of the past and make this businessman-politician relationship work for the long-term good of America.

This relationship must have as its overriding consideration the promotion of the general welfare.

Selfish, narrow pressure for any one segment of our society without regard to the general welfare can result only in delay and perhaps defeat.

In our national economy and in our national life as a whole, no business can afford to be "an island entire of itself."

American businessmen cannot afford to be political illiterates any more than they can afford to be economic illiterates. In other words, we must have statesmanship in business, statesmanship in labor, as well as statesmanhip in government. This three-way combination of statesmanship would hasten the day of the general-welfare-first concept.

Now, a political career is not unlike a teaching career in many ways. In my opinion, politicians and teachers are not compensated as they should be and certainly neither group is accorded the public respect to which it is entitled. To be good either as teacher or politician you must be dedicated. "Dedication" is an overworked word today and frequently a misunderstood word. When I talk about dedicated people, I mean people who are doing what they love to do and do it with the zeal of a missionary.

Compensation of politicians is in no way comparable to the income of businessmen. For instance, the President of the United States is paid $100,000 and is given another $50,000 for expenses. Both amounts are taxable. Last year the chairman of General Motors received $791,475. The president of General Motors received $726,100. Two vice presidents received over $600,000 each, and four vice presidents received over $500,000 each.

Our Cabinet officers are paid $25,000, and our Senators and Congressmen receive $22,500. These salaries, of course, are in no way comparable with what can be earned in industry. Moreover, industrialists are not subject to the kind of abuse that is heaped

upon public officials. Never have I heard anyone snarl about those characters running General Motors. But I dare say you all have heard disparaging comments about "that man in the White House."

In going through some old files recently I found my last contract as a teacher with North Sanpete High School at Mount Pleasant. It was for $1,200 for the year. Of course, that was a long time ago.

A little over 20 years later, President Roosevelt appointed me a member of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The legislation creating this agency specified a salary of $12,000 annually. The next Congress discovered this was more than they were being paid—at that time the salary of a Congressman was $10,000—so that became the salary of Civil Aeronautics Authority members. Next year I was promoted to Assistant Secretary of Commerce at $9,000.

My last tour in Government was as Director of Contract Settlement. I was with the Sperry Corp. in New York, when pressured back into Government as Director of Contract Settlement—the office created to settle terminated war contracts. It was near the end of the war, but the war was still on—my children were in it. The President wanted someone with experience in Government and business to organize the Office of Contract Settlement and get it going immediately for as many as 10 million unemployed was forecast for the interim from war work to peace work. I succumbed to the pressure and was again in Government at a salary less than one-fifth of the salary I was then receiving.

An amusing sidelight was the dismay of our friends who could not understand my action on returning to Government service. I had done my share in Government, they contended. When Mrs. Hinckley was asked what was wrong with her husband, she replied: "Well, he's like LaGuardia. LaGuardia runs to fires, while Hinckley runs to Government." At the time Fiorello LaGuardia was mayor of New York City and thought it his duty to attend all fires.

While many thought my return to Government was a great personal sacrifice, it was not. It was one of the most satisfying experiences of my life. The Office was organized with less than 100 people. All terminated contracts were settled by the contracting agencies—a great majority of them in less than 2 years. And most importantly, there was no unemployment in the transition from war to peace.

On the basis of my experience, in and out of Government, my best advice is that all of you at some stage of your career enter the field of politics.

Earlier this month President Dwight D. Eisenhower, speaking on the 95th anniversary of the University of California, on its Los Angeles campus, said: "Our American system, while nearly 200 years old, is still an experiment, and is even today being tested."

President Eisenhower said that to help the system pass this test: "Each of us must comprehend his proper relationship to Government, his duty to it, and his authority over it. Unless he does so, he has forfeited his right to, and his opportunity for self-government. He allows others to govern him."

President Eisenhower further stated, "Educators rightly place high value on, and fiercely defend, academic freedom. But this freedom is only one of a group that includes also political, economic, religious, and personal freedoms. They are mutually interdependent. If any falls, the others will eventually be destroyed."

We are a democracy. Politics is the lifeblood of democracy. We can, as George Bernard Shaw indicated, have politics without democracy, but we can't have democracy without politics or politicians. That's what democracy is all about.

Politics is democracy in action.

Political parties were not even provided for in our Constitution. Indeed many of our Founding Fathers, including the Father of His Country himself, hoped that somehow we might be able to proceed without political parties. But it was quickly seen that this could not be, that all sorts of problems gave rise to all sorts of opinions, and men must take sides to hammer these out in debate, to appeal to the electorate. The electorate must decide and the ultimate solution is usually a compromise. For that is what democracy is—a continuous compromise. Politics has been called "the art of compromise," "the art of the possible," "the middle way."

Those who think or who preach today that we can have a perfectly splendid democracy without politicians are living in a dream world. They remind me of Disraeli's delightful paradox: "Every woman should be married and no man."

Of course, all that I am saying in defense of politics as being the essence of democracy is predicated upon the acceptance of democracy itself. If one doesn't believe in that, then it follows that politics is irrelevant. Strangely enough, at this late date in our national history, we still have citizens popping up to denounce democracy itself.

Extremists and fanatics of the far right and the far left have no use for the democratic process.

Politics is the art of the possible. But this sort of compromise doesn't appeal to the extremists.

The official manual of one extremist group has this to say about democracy: "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery and a perennial fraud." This manual also calls for the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren because of "the unceasing help he has given the Communists."

In a communique called "The Politician," the founder of this semisecret society called Dwight D. Eisenhower a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."

Appropos of this sort of thing, let me quote Charles A. Beard, a great American historian who died in 1948. He said: "One of the best ways to get yourself a reputation as a dangerous citizen these days it to go about repeating the very phrases which our Founding Fathers used in the great struggle for independence. All despotisms, under whatever name they masquerade, are efforts to freeze history, to stop change, to solidify the human spirit."

Claude Bowers, in his memoirs recently published, writes, "Nothing stands out more impressively in my memory of the Indianapolis of the nineties, than the general appreciation of fine speaking and the respect for political leaders. This was before totalitarians, Fascists, and Communists taught the people to sneer at politicians, without whom democracy cannot work."

And the great Dictator Franco of Spain said: "We abhor political parties. We are against political parties, and we have none."

This organization in publishing and circulating the tract called "The Politician" is only another effort to derogate politicians and thereby undermine our entire governmental system.

My concern today, though, is not with extremists or the lunatic fringe—some of whom we perhaps will always have with us—but with the overwhelming preponderance of Americans, people who believe in democracy and only hope to see it function more efficiently and more responsively to the needs of the day.

This, after all, was also the hope of our Founding Fathers, and according to their best knowledge, considering that this was a bold experiment, started us off in the right direction.

They could not foresee all of the problems that would arise, all of the further steps that might have to be taken to keep our democracy flexible and serviceable, but they did give us the framework that enabled succeeding generations to do just that.

One of these great developments was the two-party system. Nobody planned it, or devised it—it just grew to meet the necessity. The necessity was to nationalize the issues, to present a choice of two national policies or lines, not 50 conflicting or competing parties and issues, as you find in some other countries.

Your first step will be to decide, probably you already have, whether you will be Democrats or Republicans. There is not much use in being anything else—at least at this period in history.

Note well, that before these parties can go before the country with a platform on the many issues of the day, they have gone through tremendous hurly-burly of conflicting interests. All these, in the end, and somehow to be compromised since they had to represent the national platform of a national party. Herein lies the great nationalizing influence of the two-party system.

The only way a party can survive and attract voters is by presenting an appealing national position—a position which by the very nature of the process of being formulated has to be moderate. There is no place for fanaticism.

Each party has widely disparate elements. But in the end, they know that if they take a walk, or go it alone, they will get nowhere. So the democratic spirit of compromise must prevail. All must put on the best possible face, unite for battle for the electoral votes against the other party—which has had to go through the same, useful, moderating process.

Healthy, vigorous, representative major parties are indespensable to our democracy, to our national progress, to our freedom. The truth of the matter is that these two parties do, in fact—more or less roughly in turn—run the Government.

Now, all this nationalizing of issues, this selection of a candidate to battle for these issues, all this involves politics and politicians.

When the smoke of the battle has cleared, when the electorate has spoken, when one of the parties has won, then the stage is set for further contesting as the issues finally reach the floor of Congress. And again, we have politics and politicians.

This system, whatever its defects, is a system we cannot quarrel with.

The remedy for any malfunctioning is always in our hands. It would be interesting to know how many of those who complain the loudest about politics and politicians are doing their part to make the party of their choice more representative. How many of them are card-carrying, dues-paying members of the party they profess allegiance to?

How many of them are willing to jump in and pull their share of the load? How many of them are willing to start at the bottom and work their way to party influence; start by ringing doorbells as a precinct worker? How many will throw their homes open to neighborhood political meetings?

If more Americans would take their politics more seriously and come to know the cold, practical facts of political organizing, the hard work, sacrifice, the endless electioneering involved, they would have a greater understanding of our political process. And I know they would have a greater admiration for those workers, from the lowest working ranks, to the precinct captains and all the way to the national level.

Voting is not enough.

And it is all very well to study political science in college, to join discussion groups on the issues of the day, to raise your blood pressure by reading newspaper or magazine articles or to battle vicariously with panel discussants on television shows. But that is not what pays off. What pays off is for

you yourself, personally, to jump into the political fray at no matter what humble level.

I say advisedly that it pays off. Even if your party loses you have rendered necessary service. Strong opposition parties are indispensable to the best functioning of our two-party system. The party in control needs to be challenged—it needs to be put on its mettle, and kept on its mettle. So well recognized is this principle in Great Britain that the minority party is called Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

Political wallflowers don't make our democracy work. What will make our democracy, our politics, work even better is for all of us to become politicians, to fight for the political leaders we think can best do the job, and further, to fight to select the candidates that best represent our own political thinking.

The successful political leader is one of the hardest working members of our society. And perhaps the most valuable, versatile of all. It is high time that we Americans discarded the stereotype, the caricature concept and started judging our politicians as they really are, not minimizing the faults, but certainly giving full credit where credit is due. This would be a mark of maturity and sophistication.

In these days of world tension and grave national problems, when we need to rely so heavily on our practicing politicians, we owe it to ourselves and to our country to come of age politically.

Adlai Stevenson said: "That 'politics and politicians' have become words of disrepute and abuse—epithets, if you please instead of words of honor and respect—reflects no less on those who apply the epithets than on those to whom the epithets are applied."

Claude Bowers said: "Nothing in the old nobility of England sets it so much apart from that of other nations as its recognition of an obligation to participate in politics as a patriotic duty. The son is not thought vicious and smearing the family name or lowering its prestige by rendering public service in the halls of Westminster."

Senator HUGH L. SCOTT, Republican, from Pennsylvania, said: "For too long businessmen have been too timid and have been wont to expect others to do the necessary political work for them. Perhaps they feel that politics is a dirty business. If so, the dirtiest thing about it is the failure of decent, responsible people to do their civic duty."

Former Congressman T. V. Smith said: "Disdain of politicians should be left to dictators. Democrats cannot afford the luxury of such malevolence. If most politicians deserve disdain, then our democratic way of life perishes for lack of leadership. If they suffer undeservingly, then our Western way of life perishes for lack of loyalty to its key institution, the legislature."

Politics is not alien to business. Politics is not alien to anything in our national life. Politics is basic. How good everything else is depends on how sound and good our politics and politicians are.

To mention only world peace—the greatest of our problems—when, as and if it is obtained, it will not be the scientists who achieve it—it will not be the theologians who bring it—it will not be the businessmen, unless they be practicing politicians. It will be the politicians. That's why I believe politics and politicians are important—very important—most important.

James MacGregor Burns, in his recent book, "The Deadlock of Democracy," writes: "The cure for democracy, people used to say, is more democracy. A half century of hard experience has shown this cliché to be a dangerous half-truth. The cure for democracy is leadership—responsible, committed, effective, and exuberant leadership."

So, what politics needs is you. What the country needs is you in politics. A transfusion of you and your counterparts from every campus in the land into political participation.

APRIL 30, 1963.

SIERRA CLUB LETTERS ON GLEN CANYON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently I received from the Sierra Club a superb portfolio of colored photographs entitled "The Place No One Knew: Glen Canyon, of the Colorado." The foreword is written by David Brower, executive director of the club; and it is a worthy and appropriate introduction to a magnificent series of pictures of a canyon endowed with startling beauty. I have visited the Glen Canyon stretch of the Colorado several times, and I shall treasure the portfolio as a reminder of my days on the river.

Mr. Brower included with the portfolio two copies of letters to Secretary of the Interior Udall. The first mourns the immersion of Glen Canyon under the murky waters now backing up behind the Glen Canyon Dam, and then requests that the President proclaim an enlarged Grand Canyon National Monument to withdraw all portions of the Colorado River between Lees Ferry and the Grand Wash Cliffs from development, in order to prevent the Federal Power Commission from giving Arizona and the Bureau of Reclamation authority to construct a dam in Marble Canyon. The second letter again asks that a barrier dam be constructed to protect Rainbow Bridge from the waters of Lake Powell.

Mr. President, both Glen Canyon and the Lees Ferry-Grand Wash Cliffs stretch of the Colorado River are unquestionably scenic. For hundreds of miles, as it proceeds through the States of Utah and Arizona, the river carves one colorful canyon after another out of the multihued sandstones through which its rushing waters flow. Some of the most spectacular of these canyons will be preserved upstream from Lees Ferry and above Lake Powell, in Cataract Canyon and in the proposed Canyonlands National Park, to which the Senate recently gave unanimous approval. The most impressive of the Colorado's great downstream canyons has been preserved as the Grand Canyon National Park.

Perhaps it would seem desirable to some to lock up the rest of the Colorado's canyons—every winding mile of them—in their pristine state. I am sure there are many other stretches, aside from the Glen Canyon stretch, which would yield equally as spectacular pictures if taken from the right angle, and by as gifted a cameraman. But every practical person knows that in this country the time has passed when we can demand that we lock up most of the West for wilderness and scenery only. We must select carefully several of the best examples of each type of scenery, see that these are preserved, and then open the rest for other types of development. Only in this way can the West progress, and only in this way can we continue to create the kind of abundant life to which our mid-20th century standards of living have accustomed us.

Anyone who loves the out-of-doors as I do, and who has hunted and fished and camped as often as I have, can understand the deep reverence the nature lovers have for areas in which the elements have done some special handiwork. I commend the Sierra Club and other similar organizations for their continual fight to conserve our natural beauties and to save from exploitation or waste our heritage of forests and streams and canyons. We all know that many of the national parks and monuments which we now enjoy would not be there were it not for the dedication of men such as Dave Brower and his colleagues in the Sierra Club. We all appreciate the sturdy assistance which its members gave in the 87th Congress, and again in this 88th Congress, when the wilderness bill was under consideration by the Senate and when other conservation legislation has been at bay.

But the measure of true effectiveness of either a person or a movement is the knowledge of when to fight and when to withdraw. Bitter inflexibility is never as productive, in the long pull, as tolerance, as the knowledge of when to give and when to stand firm. Effective intervention also requires a sense of reasonableness and a sense of reality.

The attack of the Sierra Club on the Glen Canyon Dam as unnecessary and its proposal to place all of the Lee's Ferry to Grand Wash Cliffs stretch of the Colorado River in an enlarged Grand Canyon National Monument are, in my estimation, examples of bitter inflexibility. To the Sierra Club, everything seems to be either black or white. What it wants is white, while everything else is automatically black.

We in Utah learned this through sad experience during the long struggle for authorization of the Colorado River storage project. Long before Dinosaur National Monument was established, there was a reclamation withdrawal for development of Echo Park Dam site at the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers. This withdrawal was recognized in the Presidential order extending Dinosaur National Monument. I was far upstream from the Dinosaur Quarry. Yet the Sierra Club ignored this reclamation withdrawal, in marshalling its opposition, and forced the Colorado River Basin States to surrender Echo Park for a less desirable and less efficient damsite. The water and power users of the Rocky Mountain States will pay for that defeat over the years, just as the same taxpayers would have paid for the high-cost barrier dam to keep Lake Powell out of Bridge Creek had the Congress not supported its appropriations committee in rejecting the Sierra Club's demands. As it now stands, Rainbow Bridge will be completely untouched by any water, and at the same time Lake Powell will open up, for easier and greater public access, the greatest and most beautiful sandstone arch in all America. Many will see and marvel where only a very few came before.

In its testimony on Canyonlands, the Sierra Club has demanded that the park

be enlarged many times its proposed size, and that there be an absolute prohibition against any development in the area. There is no doubt that on the fringes of Canyonlands there are many areas and structures which could well be included, and that a pure park would be appropriate; but if I stuck blindly to demands of this type, there would be no bill to create Canyonlands National Park, and we all know it.

As for Glen Canyon, the club is challenging the veracity of some of the greatest engineers and hydrologists in the world today, by its assertions that this dam and reservoir are not needed. It is only by the construction of Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir that there could be provided the vast storage capacity which would permit the Upper Basin States to fulfill their Colorado River compact commitments to the downstream States, and still have a sufficient supply of water, year in and year out, for upper basin use.

I say we owe a great debt of gratitude to Secretary of the Interior Udall for standing firm against the demands of some of our naturalist groups. I know of no one who is a truer disciple of conservation than Stewart Udall. He is in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot in his interest in protection of the public domain and public resources.

But Roosevelt and Pinchot did not advocate locking up all the resources of the West. Gifford Pinchot is primarily responsible for our system of national forests. Should we lock them up for the fortunate few? The national forests are managed under the concept of multiple use—timber, mining, grazing, recreation, and so forth. Theodore Roosevelt visited the Grand Canyon in 1903, and advocated that it be left as he saw it. The Congress responded to his plea by establishing the Grand Canyon National Park. The park embraces a vast area of 645,000 acres of some of the most spectacular area in the world. I would be the last to propose any invasion of it. But we have this great, breathtaking, beautiful area covering many, many square miles. Should we add to it more of the same, for the single purpose of scenery?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 3-minute limitation, the time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the nature lovers would add more, more, and more, at the expense of other users which bolster the national and local economy. Speaking from sad experience in Utah, I warn our good friends from our sister State Arizona not to be taken in by this proposal to create a national monument of all of the Grand Canyon, and then to expect Congress to undo the proclamation and provide for disposal of the area.

Congress has already decided on the use of the Glen Canyon area of the Colorado, and it was a wise decision. Now that the Supreme Court has made a determination on the allocation of water from the lower basin of the Colorado, the States of the lower basin are considering, with the Federal Government, the most suitable plan for the comprehensive development of the remaining water resources on which the economic development of the area depends.

The Colorado River is the key to that economic development. I can only express the hope that no one will be so taken in as to follow the Sierra Club's tortured thinking about the river's future.

Our national parks and monuments are a wonderful institution. No one loves them more than I, and I am proud of those in my own State. But the self-elected guardians of these and similar areas must use judgment. They must live and let live.

What we are really faced with is 1960 thinking in a 1960 world. Fifty years ago—or even 25 years ago—who would have dreamed that by 1960 we would be facing a water shortage in several areas of our country, and that by 1980 some of them could actually run out of water? Who would have believed that we would have been seeking more and more hydroelectric powersites on our rivers, so we could use power revenues to pay the costs of putting more water on our land in order to raise enough food for the 200 million people America soon will have? Who would have thought that our economic progress and the continuation of our abundant living standards would rest very greatly on the wise and comprehensive development of our water resources?

But now we know the dimensions of our problems, and we know that, in prudence, we cannot carve out and set aside virtually all of our river gorges to be kept forever inviolate and untouched. We must balance our needs, and must meet first those which are paramount. This will be possible only if conflicting interests will be moderate, tolerant, and broadminded.

CONTINUED PROGRESS IN CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish today to comment on some good news of events that are taking place in America with respect to the issue of civil rights. I mention this because, as I said a few weeks ago, all too often we read or hear about demonstrations and disasters and difficulties, rather than achievements and accomplishments in favor of human rights in the United States. I wish that we could convey this good news to the rest of the world. I wish we could tell the rest of the world about what is happening in this country in terms of the fulfillment of the promise of full citizenship for every American citizen.

For the past several weeks I have been noting a variety of instances relating to encouraging progress in the cause of civil rights, where the struggle for human freedom is going resolutely forward.

Ours is the one country in the world that can truly say it is making progress in the cause of human freedom. We are setting new standards for ourselves and for the world. We ought to be proud of it. We ought to tell the world that the accomplishment of new standards of performance often brings with it some difficulties. We are breaking with customs and traditions, and breaking down barriers. This, in itself, is sometimes a rather difficult and troublesome process. Nevertheless, we are making progress.

This is the kind of news that should be broadcast throughout the world, instead of having the press of America constantly carry ugly stories of disaster and violence. Where are the good stories, and why do they not receive the attention they deserve? Today I have before me some of these good stories that I have been able to glean from the news media, and I intend to put them in the RECORD.

I am not doing this to indicate that President Kennedy's civil rights legislation is not urgently needed, or to suggest that racial prejudice and discrimination do not continue to bring grave social and economic and political injustices. Legislation is needed, and we have serious problems. Rather, I have done this to demonstrate, in a small way, that America is making progress in race relation, and that many millions of Americans are determined to bring the reality of freedom to their fellow citizens, regardless of race or color of skin. I have attempted to provide some perspective to a subject with respect to which reports of violence, discord, and disunity are too often given the headlines by the press, radio, and TV. Too little notice is given to the constructive, unspectacular, and quiet achievements that take place every day in the field of civil rights.

I am convinced that America will eventually solve its racial dilemma. I believe that only in America do we possess the fundamental commitment to human freedom, the tradition of liberty, finally overcome prejudice, discrimination, brutality, and hate. When this day arrives, it should be noted well by future historians. For America will have become the first country of any size and containing any variety of races and nationalities to resolve the hard facts of discrimination and prejudice. Let us never lose sight of this fact: America is the great melting pot of the world; we are the gatherer of races and peoples; we have opened our doors to inhabitants from every continent.

I can say with humble pride that no country at any time has made the progress that the United States of America has made in providing equality of treatment and equality of opportunity for the vast number of people of different races, creeds, and national origins that we have in the United States. While we have our problems, we are facing those problems courageously. We are not running away from them. We must take criticism for it in the foreign press, and even criticism from behind the Iron Curtain; yes, even from Red China, where the most vicious form of brutality is being practiced against the Chinese people by the Communists rulers of that country.

Let the American people be proud of the fact that we are making progress, that we have a record that is not ex-

ceeded by any people in the history of the world.

Therefore, when this challenge of racial equality is finally met, it will—in many ways—represent a victory for all mankind. For America will be the first Nation in the history of the world to fashion a society where many races, religions and peoples will live together in freedom, harmony, and peace. This will be an achievement in which every American should take great pride.

Mr. President, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., deserves high commendation for their decision to implement a policy of open occupancy in their many residential housing developments throughout the Nation. This decision represents a major breakthrough for equal housing opportunity in northern Virginia since Parkfairfax will be available to all qualified tenants, regardless of race. Other Metropolitan projects affected by this action includes Stuyvesant Town, Peter Cooper Village, and Parkchester in New York City, and developments in Los Angeles and San Francisco. It is most heartening to see such affirmative action by Metropolitan Life.

I also note the hopeful progress that is underway in Nashville, Tenn., where peaceful, voluntary, and constructive citizen action is being taken to create a city truly open to persons of all races. Last Sunday's New York Times magazine contained a most encouraging report of the progress in Nashville. Similar progress is underway in Charleston, S.C.

The South is rising up to meet this kind of racial discrimination. I think we of the Northern States ought to praise these accomplishments. We ought to sing forth the praise of these achievements, because they are difficult assignments; yet they are being undertaken and fully and successfully completed.

There are numerous reports of the deep involvement of the Nation's churches and synagogues in the current civil rights crisis. In the past, the religious institutions have too frequently avoided their full responsibilities in this regard, but their response in the present crisis is most heartening. Denomination after denomination has involved itself directly in this historic struggle. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish governing councils have issued official pronouncements supporting action on all levels in the life of the church. The three principal faiths are taking an active role in the march for jobs and freedom scheduled for August 28 in Washington.

Finally, there have occurred a number of specific actions by labor unions and employers to improve the economic and occupational status of Negro employees. The New York Times of last Sunday published an excellent editorial detailing the progress that has recently been achieved in the construction industry and the building trades.

Yes, there is good news on the freedom front in the great struggle for human equality. Much remains to be done, but let us not ignore the progress that is being made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a variety of articles and editorials attesting to the progress in civil rights that is being achieved be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times magazine, Aug. 11, 1963]

HOPEFUL DIALOG OF THE RACES

(Whites and Negroes set a bright example in Knoxville, Tenn., by establishing a biracial committee to create a truly open city.)

(By Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—Negroes have served notice on white America that they intend to be part of a community dialogue. The massive resistance to change on the part of whites in the past has led to the massive resistence on the part of Negroes today. If they are not allowed to communicate their deep-seated anger and compelling needs by negotiation, they will communicate them by demonstration. Local leaders everywhere are becoming aware of this fact. To many it is not welcome, but commonsense compels them to act in the face of a challenge that threatens the entire fabric of the American community.

One important answer to this challenge is the formation of biracial committees, examples of which are being created almost daily throughout the South. These committees have a very real function. They offer an alternative to those who shout, "We'll do nothing and we'll do it tomorrow," and those who demand, "We want everything and we want it yesterday." Between these two defiant positions stands the majority group of each race. The biracial committee helps them to create a full, meaningful exchange.

Recent and continuing developments here in Knoxville provide an example of how local leadership and biracial responsibility may mobilize to achieve progress with a minimum of open conflict and its aftermath. Because Knoxville has neither the intransigence of the Deep South nor the complacency of the North, its experience has significance for cities both North and South.

Two facts are fundamental to understanding the situation that existed in Knoxville at the beginning of last May. First, white residents of the city had been served notice that the Negro citizens of the city were not satisfied with the status quo. Lunch counter sit-ins 3 years ago and, more recently, student picketing of segregated restaurants near the desegregated University of Tennessee and demonstrations at a downtown movie theater had pinpointed some of the Negro grievances. They had also shown that Negroes were ready to take direct action if that was necessary to abolish segregation. (Although the lunch counter sit-ins had been resolved when department and variety stores desegregated their counters, the other sources of resentment remained and led to almost nightly demonstrations during the past spring.)

Second, and even more important, Negroes were making their demands known at another level, through conferences among community leaders. The Knoxville Area Council on Human Relations, the interracial Fellowship House and the ministerial association had provided channels for discussing integration and the achievement of certain limited goals of desegregation. The weakness of these groups was that they were not part of the community's economic and political decision-making power structure.

Then the violence in Birmingham, Ala., occurred. Faced with a reappraisal of the critical situation throughout the South and in their own city, some 35 white business, political, educational and social leaders of Knoxville came together on May 16 to discuss immediate desegregation.

"We were running scared because of Birmingham," one member of the group admitted, but another added: "Knoxville at least had the sense to profit from Birmingham's experience. We know we couldn't let it happen here."

An editorial which had appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel the previous afternoon gave these men confidence. Editor Loye W. Miller had issued this challenge: "Let's Make Knoxville an 'Open City'." Citing its recent award as an All America City, Mr. Miller urged open facilities for all Americans. "This means admit everybody to every place that caters to the general public—to the movies, the stores, the hotels, motels and to the 'private' hospitals. And let's do it by common consent and not by force. This calls for leadership from Knoxvillians of all races and faiths."

The editorial appealed to civic pride and helped create an atmosphere of what one resident called pragmatic idealism. It paved the way for the statement the 35 civil leaders publicly endorsed the following afternoon: "Believing in the equal rights of all people and what is morally right is economically sound—and in observing the law of the land—we pledge ourselves to work peacefully for the prompt and disorderly desegregation of all public facilities."

Hugh W. Sanford, Jr., an industrialist in the group, concluded: "Getting everyone's name out in the open was important. We wanted to make public opinion public, get leadership focalized out in front.

An executive committee of eight men was named. Besides Mr. Sanford, it included Mayor John Duncan; former Mayor and industrialist George R. Dempster; Dr. Charles A. Trentham, minister of the First Baptist Church; chamber of commerce President E. B. Copeland, Jr., and three other prominent businessmen, Robert G. Chapman, John Hart and W. B. Neill. It met with a committee of the city's Negro leaders—Dr. James A. Colston, president of Knoxville College; Dr. William T. Crutcher and the Reverend Robert E. James.

The first of a series of biracial meetings were held in one of the public assembly rooms of a leading downtown hotel. Most of the participants were already acquainted with one another, but within a few weeks they would realize just how superficial this previous acquaintance had been. "I know I have developed the greatest respect for this Negro leadership," one of the white businessmen says, "since I've seen these men under pressure and witnessed their maturity and judgment and their commitment to the community." And one of these Negro leaders says, "I know working with this executive committee has helped bring problems of white leaders into sharper focus for me. We've all learned a lot."

Although the two groups sat down together in an atmosphere of goodwill, there was tacit understanding that the Negroes were staking their reputations on the good faith and the ability of the white participants to deliver results. If the Negro leaders could not return to their people and say, "Negotiation won us these specific gains," they were in real danger of being shunted aside for leaders who might prefer belligerent protests to less dramatic progress.

They were asked to spell out what the Negro community wanted. As immediate steps toward the ultimate goal of total participation in the life of the city, they listed: desegregation of hospitals, hotels and motels, theaters and restaurants, and improved job opportunities.

"We'll get to work on it," the white leaders promised. But they soon discovered that

what was needed as much as better communication between the races was improved communication within the white group. At this point Knoxville began to adapt the workings of the biracial committee to its own local needs. The white executive group became completely flexible in handling each phase of desegregation, working on a biracial basis in its meetings with Negro leaders to learn what Negro citizens wanted in specific instances, operating unilaterally in its approach to certain businesses and white groups which had to be won over to the "open city" idea.

This procedure had the approval of the Negro leaders. "We feel," says one, "that this is the best approach they could have used. These were not crusaders or people of another race asking for something; these were fellow businessmen talking good business and the progress of our city."

The task of talking good business was not easy. Not all of the establishments faced with the demand for immediate desegregation were controlled locally; the owners or regional managers of at least two of the key enterprises were in other States. Attitudes varied sharply from businesslike adaptation to the inevitable to outright hostility toward any discussion of change.

"One fellow was hardnosed as the Devil," a committee member says. "He grew pretty hot on the phone and so did I. 'Look here, I'm not trying to tell you how to run your business,' I finally said to him, 'I'm just trying to help you save it.' He saw our point after a while and agreed to have a talk with us, and now Negroes are welcome in his establishment."

One important result of the first meeting of the biracial committee had been that eroding Negro trust in the good faith of the white community was considerably shored up. This had important consequences for the work of the white executive group. As one member confided recently: "First we found that some businesses wouldn't even discuss desegregation if they were under any pressure. By having the good faith of the Negro leadership, we were able to halt some of the pressure, at least momentarily, until we could talk. One of the businessmen felt that he had been singled out for demonstrations. We could see his point. So, although we had planned at first to start in only one or two fields at a time, we decided we had to attack segregation across the board."

Within a week, three Knoxville hospitals (St. Mary's, Baptist, and Presbyterian) had agreed to desegregate this summer. (The other, University Hospital, already accepted Negro patients.) "We must follow the example of the Great Physician, who ministered to all people, if we are to be consistent in our practice of Christianity," Dr. Trentham insisted.

A few days later, downtown hotels and several major motels announced their desegregation. As public endorsement of the open city declaration began to grow—the chamber of commerce received more than 4,500 signatures within a few weeks—confidence among both Negroes and whites increased.

On June 22 an International Visitors Center for entertaining foreign observers of the TVA was opened in one of Knoxville's leading hotels. (Financed by a grant from the Edgar Stern Family Fund in New Orleans, this center is the first of its kind in the country and has been acclaimed as a symbol of Knoxville's awareness of its role in building or damaging America's image abroad.)

Desegregation of downtown theaters began a little later. As the committee worked on this, one Negro was heard to remark: "I fought in Korea to preserve the ideals of this community. And yet when I go to buy a ticket to 'Ben Hur' or 'The King of Kings,' they turn me down. I don't want to marry the cashier; I just want to learn about the life of Christ." Ex-Mayor Dempster summed it up in committee meetings: "I know a lot of good Christian people who are looking forward to spending 2 billion years in heaven with Negroes but won't spend 2 hours at the show with them."

Opening restaurants to Negroes required considerable negotiation. Without the efforts of the biracial group, no one can even hazard a guess as to when, or at what cost in violence, the city's restaurants might have been desegregated. During the weeks the committee was at work, there were no restaurant demonstrations.

"Even the most radical Negroes knew we were putting our best effort into this," one man says, "and they helped us and themselves by keeping faith with their leaders and providing an atmosphere in which we could negotiate." On July 5 the overwhelming majority of Knoxville's restaurants—about 65—including all major downtown ones, desegregated.

With the municipal auditorium and libraries, city golf courses, parks, the swimming pools, and public schools all integrated without incident, desegregation of Knoxville's restaurants is the latest, but not the last, step in the march toward an open city.

Plans for the opening of the restaurants were no sooner completed than the committee set up a meeting to consider equal employment opportunities. White and Negro members alike agree that this is the longest, hardest step of all. Some progress is being made: Negro sales clerks in certain downtown stores, Negro bus drivers for the city transit system, upgrading of Negroes in industries where they are employed. But as Frank Gordon, a Presbyterian minister and State president of the NAACP, observes: "This committee is opening better opportunities for us to spend our money. Now we need better opportunities to earn money. Before long we want a real breakthrough on jobs."

"I went down to eat in one of the big hotels last week," a Negro student confides, "but I won't be going again soon. I can't afford it, and neither can most Negroes in Knoxville and east Tennessee. What we need is jobs."

But in Knoxville and the surrounding area, many white people are also waiting for a breakthrough. Most of these unemployed are unskilled. It is possible that as the committee searches for a solution to racial difficulties, it will also gain new insights into other problems in the region. To some observers this would involve the healthiest sort of integration: the cooperation of Negro and white citizens in an attack on the common enemies of poverty, inadequate education and cultural deprivation.

A key figure in Knoxville's program has been the chamber of commerce's President Copeland. A native of Birmingham, he is committed to avoiding repetition of that city's upheaval. "What we try to do," he says, "is dig out the reason why a man won't go along on this and then we try to show him where his course is unrealistic or more likely to bring him trouble than orderly desegregation would."

"We haven't got a completely open city yet," another Knoxvillian said last week, "but the door's swinging wider all the time. No matter what anybody says or thinks, there's no magic wand we can wave and solve this problem. What we've all got to do is settle into the harness in our own towns and communities for a long, hard pull. I believe that's what we're doing here and I believe we're getting somewhere."

"Some people say that Negroes must earn the right to participate in democracy," another commented. "Well, we all have to earn that right, and those of us who are white must earn it now by participating in a search for a solution to our racial crisis."

Other cities have noted the Knoxville program. Even Mississippi's Gov. Ross Barnett is aware of its influence. Mayor Duncan tells of a late evening telephone conversation with the Governor. "He asked me what we were trying to do up here," the mayor recalls. "He wanted to know if I was from the South. He said the South had to stick together now. Finally I told him that Mississippi would have to work out its problems and we would work ours out."

Because of their vulnerability and accessibility, both Mayor Duncan and Editor Loye Miller have received most of the anonymous threats and obscene messages from rabid segregationists. There has been little real opposition to this drive for desegregation, however. A White Citizens Council which flourished briefly has sunk into oblivion.

Reports from all parts of the South reveal that biracial committees are achieving solid results in many communities. The most effective committees have certain characteristics in common—small size, informal procedures, unassailable civic figures as members. One factor for success remains constant: Negro members of the committee must be truly representative of the Negro community and not mere reflections of white opinion. An interracial committee exists to listen to ultimate demands and extreme defiance; then it has to work out a course by which both may be kept from tearing the community apart.

"The art of the whole thing," says a philosophic Southern editor in summation, "is recognizing and including the spectrum on this committee and in its thinking. Negroes are fragmented as well as whites. In fact, isn't that the story of our whole civilization today—man's fragmentation, his loneliness?"

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

CHURCH TO ENLIST CATHOLICS HERE FOR CAPITAL CIVIL RIGHTS RALLY—VICAR GENERAL'S LETTER TO BE READ IN ALL 402 PARISHES URGING PARTICIPATION

Roman Catholics in the archdiocese of New York will be asked next Sunday to take part in the August 28 civil rights march on Washington.

A letter from the Most Reverend John J. Maguire, auxiliary bishop and vicar general of the archdiocese, will be read in all 402 parishes in its jurisdiction. Bishop Maguire's letter points out that Cardinal Spellman recently observed that "much—ever so much—remains to be done" in the field of racial justice.

In another development yesterday, the National Council of Churches—comprising 33 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox communions—estimated that more than 40,000 churchmen would take part in the Washington demonstration.

The council's newly formed commission on region and race, it was said, had received reports that State and local councils of churches, national and regional denominational agencies, and individual church congregations in many parts of the country have chartered planes and buses for the trip, exhausting in some instances available facilities.

The council said it would work closely as a cosponsor of the march with the American Jewish Congress and the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.

There were other developments yesterday concerning the civil rights movement here. In one of them Malcolm X addressed a unity meeting of Black Muslims in Harlem that drew 3,000 persons.

A young man and a young woman continued the sit-in at Governor Rockefeller's office, 22 West 55th Street.

QUIET AT MEDICAL CENTER

But everything was quiet at the site of the Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn, the scene of recent demonstrations over the issue

of more jobs for nonwhites in the construction industry.

At the Rochdale Village housing project in Jamaica, Queens, 50 pickets marched for about an hour and a half. But no construction workers were on the job for the weekend, and the pickets left before 10 a.m.

Bishop Maguire's letter to be read next Sunday said:

"You will recall the recent statement of Cardinal Spellman concerning racial justice in which he reminds us, 'But much—ever so much—remains to be done. The great Christian and American principle of equality must be reduced to action in local circumstances and in specific ways. We need civil rights measures enacted into law; but we also need the attitudes of justice and charity to be applied by every person in our society to the concrete problems of housing, employment, and education. This is the challenge which 1963 has set squarely before us and it must at all costs be faced and solved.'

"In line with this we wish to make the following announcements:

"There are many civil rights organizations which are carrying out the objectives which His Eminence describes and are therefore deserving of our support as we follow the principles of Christ and our obligations of good citizenship."

GOOD OUTWEIGHS ILL EFFECTS

"Demonstrations and other activities of these organizations, in which the good that is reasonably expected through these demonstrations outweighs the accidental unfortunate effects, when they are carried out in a responsible and peaceful manner within the bonds of Christian charity and justice, and finally when they are undertaken as a last resort in the struggle to overcome the second-class citizenship of American Negroes, are deserving of the support and participation of Catholic American citizens.

"Notable among these is the 'March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom' scheduled for August 28. You will find an opportunity to support and participate in this major commitment to justice through charity in many organizations, committees, unions, etc. The Catholic Interracial Council of New York will be sponsoring a group in this event. Information can be had at the office of the Catholic Interracial Council, 20 Vesey Street, Re 2-5417."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 2, 1963]

CHURCHES TAKE MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN NEGRO'S FIGHT FOR EQUAL RIGHTS—SOME BAR ECONOMIC DEALINGS WITH SEGREGATIONISTS; NUNS WALK CHICAGO PICKET LINE—A CRACK IN BAPTISTS' DIKE?

(By William R. Clabby)

The Nation's churches, once content with a back pew in the ever-intensifying civil rights struggle, are becoming increasingly active in trying to break down stubborn segregation barriers.

The arrests early last month of leading Protestant, Catholic and Jewish clergymen who attempted to integrate a Baltimore amusement park, and the startling spectacle of seven nuns manning a racial picket line in Chicago point up the expanding role of U.S. churchmen in the racial crisis. But direct participation in civil rights demonstrations is only one of the more dramatic manifestations of the pressures which U.S. church organizations are unleashing in behalf of integration.

Only a few weeks ago, the United Church of Christ (a million members) voted to impose stringent economic sanctions on member churches which continue to support segregation policies. Meeting at its biennial convention, the church's general synod voted to withdraw financial support from its segregated educational institutions and ordered a halt in loans to new congregations that refuse to open their doors to Negroes.

MAKING UP LOSS OF PLEDGES

Not long before, the 3.3-million-member United Presbyterian Church moved to set up a special commission on racial matters and armed it with $500,000 in church funds to help smooth the way for integration. Among other things, the commission is empowered to reimburse churches that have lost pledges from members as a result of desegregation.

At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church, whose 42 million members make it the Nation's largest religious denomination, is beginning to bring its considerable economic weight into play. Since the first of this year, four major Catholic dioceses have banned the issuance of construction contracts to builders who violate fair employment practices. Catholic leaders predict the ban will spread rapidly. The Catholic church spends about $2 billion annually on construction, more than any other U.S. institution except the Federal Government.

These and similar moves represent a major change in the policies of most churches toward integration. Though individual clergymen have been among integration leaders for many years, most church organizations either have remained silent on civil rights or have limited their support to approving resolutions condemning discrimination.

"But the day of passing pronouncements is ending," declares the Reverend Jay Moore, a member of the newly formed Emergency Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches. "More and more the churches are deciding the time is long overdue for them to take their place at the receiving end of the firehose."

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION

Much of the organized Protestant effort to eliminate segregation is centered in the National Council of Churches. In a resolution passed in June at the time it set up its emergency commission, the big church association declared: "Now is the time for action—even costly action that may jeopardize the organizational goals and institutional structures of the church."

Already, the council has assigned 8 full-time staff members to the race commission and the Reverend John Regier, the acting director, estimates that 300 paid and volunteer workers will devote themselves to race problems before fall. Besides supplying manpower for racial demonstrations, the commission currently is sending emissaries to racially tense communities across the country in an effort to get local church leaders to play more active roles in the civil rights drive.

In the New York City suburban towns of Chatham, Madison and Summit, N.J., for instance, the Council of Churches is leading drives to overcome discrimination in housing, education and hiring, as well as in the churches.

Local churchmen and lay leaders are asking residents of these communities to sign petitions supporting equal housing opportunities for Negroes; residents also are being asked to declare they won't move away if Negroes integrate their neighborhoods. "We know that the real key to the school segregation problem is the housing problem," says Rev. Colin Williams, a leader of the council's emergency commission. "If we can solve this, then school integration will be advanced."

NEGROES AS ASSISTANT MINISTERS

Working with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights groups, the council also plans to ask large white churches not only to integrate their congregations but to take on Negroes as assistant ministers. "The Negroes say, and we agree, that it's no good to integrate the pews and not the pulpits," comments the Reverend Mr. Williams.

The council is forging legal weapons to aid Negroes, too. In Tulsa its local chapter joined with the NAACP recently to help collect 10,000 signatures on a petition asking city officials to wipe out segregation in all public places with a city ordinance backed by stiff fines. Speedy approval is predicted for the measure, which also is supported strongly by Catholic and Jewish leaders.

On a broader scale, the Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America and top Catholic officials last month drafted and presented to Congress a joint statement backing strong civil rights legislation. The statement marked one of the first important tri-faith stands on civil rights.

Along with such joint efforts, many denominations are charting their own civil rights moves. Last month the Protestant Episcopal Church, with 3.5 million members, summoned all its American bishops to a meeting in Canada August 12 to discuss the U.S. racial crisis. In issuing the call, the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the church in the United States, declared: "There is an urgent need to demonstrate by specific actions what God has laid on us. Such actions must move beyond expression of corporate penitence for our failures to an unmistakable identification of the church at all levels of its life with those who are victims of oppression."

ORGANIZATIONAL OVERHAUL

The Methodist Church will vote next year on a plan to overhaul its organization to eliminate separate jurisdictions for its 10 million white and Negro members. Approval of the plan is expected, though not without determined opposition from Methodists in the South.

The strong feelings many Southern Methodists have against integration is pointed up in the experience of 28 Methodist ministers in Mississippi, who spoke out early this year against segregation. Three of the ministers had their salaries cut off immediately by irate congregations and another minister who was attending college with church aid found his financial support withdrawn. In addition, 15 other ministers were put under such pressure from their congregations that they resigned and left the State.

The church's ruling body, however, stepped in and quickly found new posts for the 15 resigned ministers. And a group of Methodist laymen gathered funds to pay the salaries of the three ministers whose pay was cut off.

But there's been an even more important Methodist reaction in Mississippi to the integration issue. A few weeks ago the ruling board of the First Methodist Church in Tupelo, Miss., voted 40 to 4 to seat Negroes. "This is a big step forward," declares Rev. A. Dudley Ward, general secretary of the Methodist Board of Christian Social Concern in Washington. "The Tupelo move means more than if a dozen churches in New York had voted to admit Negroes."

DESEGREGATING DIOCESES

Church barriers against Negroes are breaking down in other denominations as well. Roman Catholic bishops in Savannah, Ga., Charleston, S.C., Mobile, Ala., and Baton Rouge, La., plan to desegregate part or all of the schools in their dioceses either this year or next and at least one other bishop is expected to take a similar step this fall. "This would leave only 2 of the 148 Catholic dioceses in the country still with completely segregated school systems," reports an official of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice. One of the two remaining dioceses is in Mississippi, where the church is about to begin an educational program aimed at paving the way for integration; the other diocese is in southern Louisiana.

Even in the strongly segregationist Southern Baptist Church the attitude toward integration is beginning to change. In the last

few months, four Baptist churches in Texas and one in Arkansas have opened the doors to Negroes—the first white Baptist congregations in those States to do so. "It's a crack in the dike," comments Rev. Donald T. MacGregor, associate editor of the Baptist Standard, official publication of Texas Baptists. "It seems Texas Baptists aren't as segregation minded as we at first thought."

The Baptist newspaper itself asked recently in an editorial: "How much longer will we leave it to other religious groups and to the power of government to do what we Baptists could have led the South to do peacefully many years ago if we had only tried? Now the hour of crisis is upon the Nation and we are in a large measure responsible for it."

MORMONS CONSIDER MOVE

In the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon), where Negroes are barred from the priesthood and positions in church government, desegregation is also being considered by officials. Only a few hundred U.S. Negroes are members of this church out of about 2 million adherents, but the Mormons are preparing to send a mission to Nigeria, where 5,000 Negroes have petitioned the church to become members, and some church leaders believe extension of the priesthood to Negroes is only a matter of time.

But the move is not likely to come quickly. For one thing, the status of the Negro within the church goes to the heart of church doctrine: Mormons consider Negroes to be descendants of Cain and, as such, to bear a curse God put on Cain because he slew Abel. Secondly, such a step might be viewed publicly as a political expedient, designed principally to boost the presidential stock of a prominent Mormon, Gov. George Romney, of Michigan.

Negro leaders view the more active role of churches in the civil rights struggle as an important development. "One of the tragedies of the Negroe's drive for equal rights has been the silence of the churches" declares Clarence Laws, Southwest regional director of the NAACP. "Unfortunately there has been more segregation in this country from 11 to 12 o'clock on Sunday than at any other time of the week.

"But now the churches are moving and it's significant and encouraging" Mr. Laws adds. "While we need laws we also need to do something about changing men's hearts and attitudes, and in this area the church cannot be excelled."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1963]

CHURCHES MOVE TO ERASE SUNDAY MORNING SHAME

(Despite official pronouncements in favor of desegregation, racial bars persist widely at the church door in America—"the shame of Sunday morning," as one saying goes. But a new militancy on the issue is apparent this turbulent summer as individual churches face the problem.)

(By George W. Cornell)

The picture in the Sunday school lesson showed a group of babies in a clinic, two of them Negroes. Another picture showed three children at play, one a Negro. The story discussion said:

"God loves white children, yellow children, brown children. Dorothy's hands are very pale. Her hair is golden. Ben's hands are brown. His eyes are black. Do you think God loves Dorothy better because her hands are white?

"No, indeed not; it would be sad indeed if we all looked alike."

Most American religious bodies, in their official pronouncements and educational materials, have long stressed the equal worth of all human beings, whatever their color, that all were created by God and precious to him.

MOST SEGREGATED HOUR

At the same time, however, the churches have often been described as the most racially segregated major institutions in the Nation's life.

"The shame of Sunday morning," goes an oft-used phrase of self-reproach in church circles. And another: "The most segregated hour of the week is at 11 a.m. on Sunday."

Since church congregations harbor intimate personal relationships among whole families, it has been maintained that once Negro and white mingle fully there, racial barriers will collapse elsewhere.

In that sense, the local church becomes a testing ground, a point of decision, for the whole community pattern.

Churches have long been rallying points for desegregation activity in many instances, and some southern ministers have been roughed up for their parts in it.

On the other hand, the churches themselves in their local compositions have remained predominantly one-color units, even though the number of desegregated parishes has been increasing rapidly of late.

This is the lump in the throat of the churches, the acknowledged gap between their official pleas, and their on-the-spot conditions.

With the racial crisis flaming and with Negroes demanding equity with new vehemence and immediacy, church strategy generally has undergone an extraordinary change in the last few months.

It has switched from talk to action.

As expressed by the National Council of Churches, which includes 33 Protestant and Orthodox denominations with 40 million members, the new method calls for personal "involvement in every phase of the struggle for justice, including negotiations and demonstration."

The new punch in the church stand has showed up in many ways. The United Church of Christ (a merger including Congregationalists) at its general synod in Denver this summer shaped a potent financial weapon.

DIRECT-ACTION PROGRAMS

It moved to make loans for new church construction contingent on nondiscrimination in building work, and on a commitment to an interracial policy by Congregational leaders.

United Presbyterians have adopted a similar policy. The denomination last spring appropriated a half-million dollars to support direct-action programs for desegregation. The Disciples of Christ also made a special allocation for this purpose.

Roman Catholicism was a forerunner in desegregation action. In 1947, Joseph Cardinal Ritter, of St. Louis, desegregated parochial schools there, despite lay resistance, Catholic Bishop Vincent S. Waters did the same in the diocese of Raleigh, N.C., in 1953, ahead of the court decision.

Much of the reinforced church activity was geared for an interfaith approach.

That aspect got its big push last January at the historic and unprecedented "National Conference on Religion and Race" in Chicago, the first time leading Protestant, Jewish and Roman Catholic bodies had joined in tackling the problem.

MOST SERIOUS EVIL

"Racism is our most serious domestic evil," the conference declared. "We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed."

Permanent machinery was set up for continuing interfaith operations.

Among the Nation's Negroes, about 10 million belong to separate all-Negro Protestant denominations—Baptist and Methodist. About 500,000 are Roman Catholics and another 500,000 belong to predominantly white Protestant bodies, although they are chiefly in one-color congregations.

At the national level, in most denominations, and in interdenominational bodies, Negroes have considerable representation.

But the pattern rarely is reflected on the local scene, in the overwhelming white suburban congregations, and in de facto segregated city neighborhoods, North and South.

"Some of the white pastors have been heroic, but the church as a community, allegedly a community of grace, has been woefully lacking in relevance and vitality," says Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr.

BROTHERHOOD PREACHED

In its formal and official preachments, however, the church traditionally has pleaded for interracial brotherhood.

In 1946, nearly a decade before the Supreme Court decision, the Federal Council of Churches, an interdenominational procursor of the National Council, declared that "segregation is a denial of our Christian faith."

After the Supreme Court decision, every major denomination, including the strongest church body in the South, the Southern Baptist Convention, endorsed the desegregation order.

Among those southern preachers who support segregation, some maintain that the idea of interracial mixing is Communist-inspired. Some also argue that the Bible teaches segregation.

"God created the races distinct from one another," declared a southern fundamentalist group. "He scattered the races over the face of the earth at a time when they attempted to integrate" (Genesis 11).

The passage cited tells the story of the Tower of Babel, generally understood as a portrayal of man's arrogant tendency to try to make himself equal to God.

Segregationists often cite the so-called curse of Ham in Genesis 9 as God's decree for separation of black men. It tells of Noah awakening from a drunken sleep and cursing his younger son, Ham, and his Canaanite descendants, who were a Semitic tribe.

On the other hand, desegregationist ministers cite many Biblical passages in support of all men's equality before God, such as Acts 17: 26, saying God made of one blood all nations, and Galatians 3:28, saying men are "all one in Christ Jesus," without divisions of race or status.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1963]

SAVANNAH TRUCE SHAPED BY PRIEST—A LEADING ROLE IN PARLEYS TAKEN BY MONSIGNOR TOOMEY

(By M. S. Handler)

SAVANNAH, GA., August 3.—Msgr. John D. Toomey, the Roman Catholic pastor of St. James Church, is the unsung hero of the interracial truce signed Thursday night by white and Negro negotiators.

Unless the truce is upset by the youth council of the Chatham Crusade for Voters, the most militant of civil rights groups in Savannah, it may open a period of constructive race relations in this handsome Southern coastal city, one of the oldest in the United States.

The youth council leaders have rejected the truce that was arranged as a basis for an agreement principally on the ground that their jailed leaders have not been released. These young people, who organized and led demonstrations here in June and July also reject the agreement on the ground that restaurants have been excluded from the desegregation process that is to begin October 1.

COOLING-OFF PERIOD

The nine Negro negotiators agreed to halt all demonstrations for a 60-day cooling-off period, but the question is whether they can control the people who descend into the streets to demonstrate.

Monsignor Toomey is a tall, thin, gentle priest, with a convincing manner. He vol-

unteered last June with the permission of his Bishop, Thomas J. McDonough, to enter the civil rights struggle with a view to restoring peace and harmony through negotiations. Although the Catholic parochial schools of the Savannah diocese—10 elementary and 1 high school—are totally desegregated, the public school system is to begin desegregation with one class, the 12th, and work downward.

Monsignor Toomey's St. James Parish lies on the edge of the far southeastern suburb of Savannah, an area that was developed with small, well-designed homes that blend into a beautiful landscape with many old trees and shrubbery.

Monsignor Toomey first rallied the city's white Protestant and Catholic clergy and then approached the business leaders. A committee of businessmen organized by the chamber of commerce had made little headway earlier.

With a persistent and convincing optimism Monsignor Toomey won over the leading businessmen, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, to the cause of negotiations that he considered inevitable.

RETAIL SALES HURT

His approach to the business community coincided with a substantial loss of retail sales along Broughton Street and other shopping centers. Levy's, a big department store, had quietly desegregated 2 years ago and experienced no disturbance, but the lesson was not followed by other businesses.

A hundred business leaders agreed with the arguments of Monsignor Toomey that justice, tranquility, and good economics, required a serious negotiating effort to end civil rights turmoil.

The businessmen appointed two special negotiating committees. Monsignor Toomey was called in by the businessmen's group as the only clergyman in the preparatory and negotiating periods.

Last Thursday night an agreement was finally signed. All the businessmen agreed to withhold their names from public attention until the details of desegregating hotels, motor inns and bowling alleys were worked out, but Monsignor Toomey's pioneer role is acknowledged by those who have been involved in the civil rights struggle here.

The decision of the business community to end the blight of racial conflict through negotiations was the act of a community conscious of its place in American history, living amid impressive architectural achievements of the 18th and 19th century.

CLIMATE FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Members of old Savannah families who have moved into leading roles in business, banking and industry here have been joined by an aggressive new type of businessmen from other parts of the country, men who see their problems primarily in economic terms and have little time for uneconomic solutions.

The climate for negotiations with the Negroes was present. Monsignor Toomey's faith and energy brought action.

Savannah is a city of the old and new blending into a harmonious whole against the background of old trees, lawns and shrubbery. Even dilapidated sections generaly inhabited by Negroes form part of the picture.

Beyond the old sections of the city houses are set back at a comfortable distance from the sidewalks and surrounded by shade trees and lawns.

The intervening Negro sections of Savannah suffer in comparison with white housing, but they contain some decent streets and some good housing. On balance the Negro sections of Savannah do not produce the impression of utter gloom and hopelessness found in other southern cities and in northern urban centers.

Though fairly prosperous, Savannah has lagged behind Atlanta and other cities in the rate of growth. Many of the heavy industries are owned by out-of-State capital. Road communications have not kept pace with the demands of traffic. The higher educational facilities have not been expanded. One white college offers a 2-year course and one Negro college offers a 4-year course, primarily for teacher training.

Like many southern communities, Savannah is dotted with many churches and chapels of all denominations.

One of the curious anomalies of Savannah is the great number of money-lending companies clustered around Broughton Street, the main shopping thoroughfare. There are more than 70 listed in the telephone directory, and the fierceness of their competition is evidenced in their advertising.

Broughton Street is a lively shopping center, but it is believed that the city has not developed its potential. The unemployment rate is high, particularly among the Negroes. Public works are lagging behind other cities. Opportunities are said to be limited, and a high number of college graduates migrate to other cities to start their careers.

[From the Catholic Herald Citizen, Milwaukee, Wis., Aug. 3, 1963]

SUPPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION CALLED CHRISTIAN DUTY IN PASTORAL LETTER

CINCINNATI, OHIO.—The archbishop of Cincinnati has called it a Christian duty to support the proposed civil rights legislation before Congress.

Archbishop Karl J. Alter said, "we should urge favorable action on the part of our representatives in enacting this legislative program."

A prominent member of the U.S. hierarchy who has held several national posts in the church, the prelate expressed his views in a pastoral letter in all churches of the archdiocese, Sunday, July 21.

He deplored the grievous injustices which Negroes suffer and said "The fact is that unless there is a redress of grievances now and not merely in the future, the cleavage between our citizens and the resulting bitterness will continue to grow."

The archbishop, whose fellow bishops elected him to six 1-year terms as chairman of the board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, gave his support to civil rights legislation during a recitation of remedies he proposed to curb racial injustice.

"The first remedy, one of prime importance," he said, "is the passage by Congress of a civil rights bill which will grant all citizens irrespective of race and color, equal rights in voting, in admission to schools on all levels, in employment, in housing, public facilities, and in recreation.

"It is fully recognized that equal social status necessarily rests upon the full use of equal opportunities, and ultimately upon equal qualifications. Our Christian duty at present is to support in an articulate fashion the proposed legislation which is now before Congress."

Other areas in which action is needed, the archbishop said, include:

Fair employment and fair housing legislation at the State and local levels.

New employment opportunities for all citizens, but particularly for Negro workers.

Support of merchants who will remove race restrictions in sales and office jobs and in public facilities.

Removal of white and Negro labels from available homes and integration of neighborhoods in the same ratio as the racial proportions in the cities.

Avoiding panic in changing neighborhoods.

"The duty of the church," he continued "is to safeguard, promote, and sanction the great social virtues, and not only the level of individual action but also on the level of social and community action. Less than this would be to prove false and disloyal to the mandate of Christ."

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

LIGHT IN THE BUILDING TRADES

The walls of racial exclusion that have traditionally stood between Negroes and skilled jobs in the building trades are coming down. The formula jointly submitted to Secretary of Labor Wirtz by construction unions and employers provides the most tangible guarantees the industry has ever given on a national basis for equality of access to apprenticeship programs. Included in the plan is a provision for impartial representation on local appeals boards to guard against the danger of continued discrimination by those who believe job opportunities ought to be determined by inheritance rather than qualification.

This indication of readiness to move toward eradication of the injustices Negroes have suffered so long is doubly welcome because the building trades have been the most troublesome battlefield in the struggle for civil rights in recent weeks. In dozens of Northern cities demonstrators have conducted sit-ins, sleep-ins, and lie-ins, often in defiance of law and good sense, to dramatize their demands for equal treatment. The new procedures deserve a fair test in an atmosphere free of illegal pressure.

The desirability of such a harmonious approach is reinforced by evidence that many local unions are as prepared as their national leaders to accept the inevitability of change. In Cleveland the Plumbers Union has agreed to have representatives of both the Negro community and the Federal Labor Department on its membership review committee. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has hailed this arrangement as a national model.

In New York City, where picketing has been carried to the point of disruption, the unions last month set up a biracial screening committee to pass on applicants for apprentice or journeyman status. Appeals may be carried to another committee of Federal, State, and city officials. If there are defects in this system, they should be explored at the conference table. The great problem here and everywhere will be to assure a sufficient expansion of jobs so that Negroes will have places to go to. Equally urgent will be the necessity for equipping them with skills they never before had a real incentive to acquire. These are tasks that can better be carried through by cooperation than by further exchanges of bitterness.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1963]

DAN RIVER MILLS EASES COLOR BAR

(By William Chapman)

DANVILLE, VA., July 31.—Dan River Mills, the industrial giant of this Southside Virginia city, has moved quietly to erase its color lines while the general racial stalemate continues, 2 months after Danville Negroes took to the streets.

The big textile firm that employs 10,000 workers has desegregated a cafeteria, removed partitions in restrooms and painted out "colored" and "white" signs at drinking fountains and restrooms.

The moves were made without public comment, but the company's cautious attempts to ease racial tension in broader fields of employment became entangled in the bitter impasse between the city government and demonstrating Negroes.

Two company officials met recently with a demonstration leader, Rev. Lawrence Campbell, and a retired school teacher to discuss the hiring and training of more Negroes and the elevation of others from menial to skilled jobs.

CITY OFFICIALS OBJECT

City officials, who have refused to meet with arrested demonstrators, objected to the discussions. The Danville Register, which reflects the city government's positions in most instances, said editorially that only "serious mischief" could result from the meetings.

"The only way to treat an alleged criminal is to give him his day in court," the Register said.

The city's objections to negotiating with arrested or indicted Negro leaders while demonstrations continue make up half of the racial impasse here. The other half is the Negroes' conviction that no gain will be made unless they stay in the streets.

Moderate businessmen generally line up behind the City's position of not negotiating "while looking down the barrel of a gun" as a leading retailer put it today.

City officials have said privately for several weeks that some of the Negroes demands—specifically the hiring of Negro policemen—would be met if the demonstrations cease. But the city maintains it cannot take a hand in other issues, such as the desegregation of restaurants and motels.

Mayor Julian Stinson's all-white racial advisory committee has met with a group of nondemonstrating Negroes, only to be presented with the same demands made earlier by demonstrators.

The Negro movement, faced with mounting arrests, police harassment and a heavy drain on jail bond funds, has been ground down to a minimum effort in demonstrations.

Sporadic sit-ins and small marches continue, although Sunday's protest drew less than 100 of the 1,000 marchers predicted by Negro leaders.

The buying boycott against white merchants is beginning to pinch, however. There is no official measurement of its effectiveness but one businessman said today he knows of sales losses at some stores ranging between 1 and 20 percent.

The frustration of Negro leaders is heightened by reports that other South Side communities are making rapid concessions to Negro groups far less militant than Danville's.

NEARBY TOWNS ACT

The city council in Martinsville, 30 miles away, agreed this week to appoint a biracial committee after two meetings with a Negro group seeking more municipal and private employment. South Boston, 22 miles to the east, has made similar conciliatory moves.

Rapid desegregation has come in Greensboro, N.C., 50 miles to the south, and in Lynchburg, Va., once regarded as a stubborn center of segregation.

In attempting gains at Dan River Mills, Negroes also have asked the company to use its powerful economic position to exert pressure on the general community. The company has been picketed here and in New York.

Although Dan River's president, William J. Erwin, serves on the mayor's advisory committee, the company has not attempted visibly to move the city government. Once the controlling power in the typical mill-town fashion, the company has moved self-consciously away from its paternalistic role in the last decade and so far has resisted pleas for active intervention in the current racial stalemate.

Meanwhile, the Associated Press reported that city attorneys moved yesterday to determine the physical condition of a Negro civil rights leader who failed to appear in court on a subpena. A bench warrant was issued for his arrest.

The leader, Avon Rollins, of Knoxville, Tenn., had written in a published leaflet that blood would flow in the streets if some of the Negroes' demands weren't met. His attorneys said he was ill and could not come to court today.

Earlier in corporation court, attorneys for Danville sought to show that organizations cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee have been involved in the city's 2 months of racial unrest.

The hearing concerns whether a temporary corporation court injunction barring demonstrations shall be made permanent.

Judge A. M. Aiken granted the city's request that it be allowed to send a doctor of its own choice to examine the hospitalized Rollins, a member of the executive committee of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1963]

CALIFORNIA GETS CODE TO COMBAT DISCRIMINATION—EXECUTIVE ORDER BY BROWN APPLIES TO ALL OF THE STATE'S AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, August 3.—A code of fair practices aimed at abolishing all racial or religious discrimination by California's government and its outside contractors was proclaimed today as official State policy.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown signed a sweeping executive order, covering the first such code in California's history, on July 24, before he departed for a European vacation. Its issuance was delayed until the copies could be printed.

The 15-article code was developed in meetings held by Governor Brown with Attorney General Stanley Mosk and heads of State agencies.

Mr. Mosk is to set up and direct a civil rights task force, the Governor's office announced at Sacramento, "to insure compliance with the code and to coordinate all civil rights activities of the State."

STATE LAWS ARE NOTED

In a preamble, Governor Brown noted that the legislature had enacted laws to prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, schools, and places of business. He continued:

"These laws, enunciating the State's public policy of nondiscrimination, have been supported by executive action and upheld by judicial decree.

"But the laws, court edicts, and official pronouncements are only a beginning. If discrimination and segregation have been legally forbidden, a more subtle, but equally restrictive, de facto discrimination exists and grows.

"Justice demands that we not only banish old forms of discrimination but that we act affirmatively to assure those who contribute fully to our society a chance to share fully in its rewards."

FIRST CODIFICATION

The Governor, in a separate statement accompanying the executive order, said that "although it has long been the policy of this State not to discriminate on the basis of race, color or creed, this policy has never been codified.

"California," he said, "is proud of its fine record of minority group relations and its legislative and judicial record to eliminate discrimination, but new steps are needed.

"The code of fair practices will serve as a guide of conduct to all departments of the State in their relations with minority groups and individuals. I will expect from all departments of State government not only nondiscrimination but affirmative action to assure the quality of opportunity in every activity the State engages in."

The code requires annual reports from all State agencies on programs undertaken during the preceding year to make the code effective. This report, it stated, "shall cover both internal activities and external relations with the public and with other agencies."

All services of every State agency must be performed without discrimination, the code prescribes, and no such agency shall "become a party to any agreement, arrangement or plan which has the effect of sanctioning discriminatory practices."

CLAUSE ON ALL CONTRACTS

"Every State contract and subcontract for public works or for goods or services," another article reads, "shall contain a clause prohibiting discriminatory employment practices by contractors and subcontractors based on race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

"The nondiscrimination clause shall include a provision requiring State contractors and the subcontractors to give written notice of their commitment under this clause to any labor unions with which they have a collective bargaining or other agreement."

The article says that "such contractual provisions shall be fully and effectively enforced, and any breach of them shall be regarded a material breach of the contract."

COVERS ALL ACTIVITIES

The code covers employment services, State education, counseling and training programs, private educational institutions chartered by the State, housing accommodations, State licensing and regulatory agencies, public schools, State-administered financial aid programs and other activities.

An article on law enforcement specifies that the Attorney General's office shall encourage local law enforcement agencies to develop special training programs in the field of human relations and "to establish formal procedures for the investigation of citizen complaints of alleged abuses of authority by individual peace officers."

Governor Brown ordered that copies of the code be distributed to all State officials, employees, and to governing boards of all political subdivisions in the State. He directed that it be posted conspicuously in all State facilities.

CHARLESTON STORES END RACIAL BARS—87 FIRMS IN PEACE AGREEMENT; WIN PRAISE OF NAACP

CHARLESTON, S.C., August 2.—An agreement by white businessmen to remove racial barriers in this city today was hailed by a civil rights leader as the most significant breakthrough yet achieved by street demonstrations in the South.

John A. Morsell, assistant executive secretary of the NAACP, issued a statement in New York praising the agreement.

Eighty-seven downtown business firms have agreed to Negro demands ranging from the desegregation of store facilities to an upgrading of job opportunities. Negroes agreed to end their demonstrations, which have been held almost daily since June 9, and boycotts of white firms.

"This is the most significant and productive breakthrough yet achieved as a result of desegregation demonstrations in the South," Morsell said.

White leaders here announced, "The businesses took this step forward as their contribution to the community harmony and a further evidence of good faith in the leaders of the Negro community."

Here are the six points reached in the desegregation agreement between Negro leaders and Charleston businessmen:

Courtesy titles for all Negro customers in correspondence, conversation and accounts.

Equal job opportunities.

Freedom to use previously all-white fitting rooms, rest rooms, lounges, water fountains, and other customer services.

Serve customers in turn as they arrive at a counter.

Allow Negroes to try on hats and clothes.

Pay Negroes as all other sales personnel and attire them in appropriate clothing, when employed.

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

APARTMENT FOR RENT

At Parkfairfax, for the first time, the suburban garden apartment has been opened to the qualified Negro tenant. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.'s announcement has, for this city, a significance that is quite literally incalculable.

Because the turnover in Parkfairfax is not high, the immediate number of new tenants of whatever race will not be large. But Metropolitan's announcement sets a ringing precedent of decency and equity in a field where discrimination bears particularly heavily upon parents attempting to improve the conditions under which they and their children live. Nearly all of the middle-income housing built in Metropolitan Washington since the war has been in the suburbs. The suburbs' general refusal to rent or sell to Negroes has held them in the District, itself, where housing tends sharply toward the extremes of luxury and squalor.

Alexandria, of all the suburbs, is most urgently in need of the opportunity that Parkfairfax now offers. Alexandria has a great deal of low-income housing, with the largest Negro slums in the suburbs and as much public housing, in relation to population, as the District itself. But it contains very nearly no middle-income housing for Negroes, with the unfortunate result that the great majority of the city's Negro professional families, the teachers, ministers, physicians and lawyers, are forced to leave the city altogether in their search for homes. The rapid restoration of the city's oldest neighborhoods is squeezing Negroes out of blocks in the urban eastern end of Alexandria where they have lived for generations. The availability of comfortable and respectable homes in the western and suburban end of Alexandria carries with it, then, an immense symbolic importance.

A sufficient supply of moderately priced homes for Negroes cannot be obtained, and the unhealthy overcrowding of the District cannot be relieved, without the willingness of suburban builders and landlords to deal with Negroes as they deal with everyone else. Both city and suburbs owe the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. a special debt for its example of sound business leadership.

THE 3M COMPANY PROVIDES FUNDS FOR EXPERIMENTS IN EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of Senators to a gesture of unusual magnitude and magnanimity on the part of one of our Nation's foremost business corporations, the 3M Co. of St. Paul. In case anyone does not know the meaning of the symbol "3M," it represents Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. On August 13 the company announced the 3M assistance grant to education program.

Under the provisions of this program 3M will provide a $3,000 visual communication center to each of 500 schools throughout the United States. This is a $1.5 million grant—a figure large enough to be meaningful even to those of us who are accustomed to dealing with the national budget. These schools will be selected first by local selection committees and later reviewed by a national selection committee. Elementary schools, secondary schools and colleges, public and private, are all eligible to submit proposals concerning the planned use of such a center. There are no strings attached. The national selection committee consists of representatives of the various levels of education and the educational press.

Each recipient will receive the "Thermo-Fax" visual communications system. This system includes a complete line of classroom and portable overhead projectors and incorporates an economical method for preparing transparencies for overhead projection.

As Bert S. Cross, president of 3M, stated in announcing the grant:

It is the teachers who must assimilate the latest knowledge in their fields and pass it on in a stimulating fashion to their students. Textbooks once regarded as basic are quickly made obsolete. Facts that were once committed to rote must be reevaluated in terms of modern findings.

One of the greatest problems in the field of education involves research and experimentation. Local boards of education are so busily occupied with meeting the financial problems involved in providing sufficient classrooms and teachers that money for experimental techniques are rarely considered or approved. It will therefore be particularly beneficial to progress in American education that these demonstration centers are established and we are indeed appreciative of the efforts of 3M in providing for their establishment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a fact sheet and press release relating to the 3M assistance grant to education program.

There being no objection, the fact sheet and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 3M/AGE FACT SHEET

THE 3M ASSISTANCE GRANT TO EDUCATION PROGRAM

The $1.5 million 3M assistance grant to education program will provide a $3,000 visual communication system to each of 500 schools throughout the United States. The selection of the schools will be made following a two and a half month period during which school principals and administrators will be invited to submit proposals briefly describing why their school should receive a grant. These proposals will be reviewed by local selection committees of educators in 180 areas throughout the country. Their selections will be forwarded to a national selection committee of prominent educators and publishers. After proposals are reviewed by the national selection committee, the final 500 selections will be made, and the grants awarded.

WHY

The 3M Co. is aware of the vital problems which confront our schools: The steadily increasing number of students, the tremendous pressure to develop qualified graduates who will become the leaders of government and industry, the need for capable scientists and technicians. These factors demand the continued improvement of classroom teaching techniques. Through extensive research and development, 3M Co. has produced a visual communications system which enables the teacher to communicate better with her class. Through the assistance grant to education program, a complete system will be presented to 500 selected schools. As a result, a teaching laboratory will be established in every area of the country.

The 3M Co. hopes other organizations such as foundations and private firms, will provide these pilot laboratories with other tools to aid in the teaching process. 3M hopes that this grant will be the first step in establishing a pattern of contribution to education by industry. Each of these 500 teaching laboratories will become a workshop to enable teachers to develop their own creative teaching techniques. The roster of grant recipients will be made available to schools of education and any primary or secondary school interested in improving teaching.

HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK

The 180 "Thermo-Fax" distributors in the United States will choose a local selection committee, consisting of local school board members, school administrators, curriculum directors, audio-visual coordinators, principals, and teachers. The distributors exercise no vote. Information about 3M/AGE, including the proposal form will be mailed to State and local school administrators and school principals throughout the country. The proposal calls for a detailed description of current and anticipated uses of visual teaching aids in the school. School officials will be asked to elaborate on any research projects underway in this area, as well as any other teaching developments employing visual communication. These proposals will be screened by the local selection committee. The top proposals will then be forwarded to the national selection committee which will meet for the final selection phase in St. Paul, Minn. Awards will be announced December 10, 1963.

THE NATIONAL SELECTION COMMITTEE

The national selection committee consists of representatives from various levels of education and the educational press.

THOSE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY

All schools (public, private, and parochial) on all levels, including college, secondary, and primary, are eligible. In no case will selection of a proposal be contingent upon present or future purchasing of any 3M Co. product. Each "Thermo-Fax" distributor will mail proposals to all educational institutions in his area. Additional proposals will be available on request, either through the dealers or directly from 3M Co. Proposals must be submitted to local selection committees by November 15, 1963.

THE AWARDS

The $3,000 package of modern visual education aids is comprised of the "Thermo-Fax" visual communications system. This system includes a complete line of classroom and portable overhead projectors and incorporates an economical method for preparing transparencies for overhead projection. This includes:

1. Ten model 66 classroom overhead projectors.
2. One model 60 portable overhead projector.
3. Two model 45 4-second transparency makers (produces transparencies in 4 seconds from a variety of source materials such as newspaper articles, students' homework or class assignments).
4. Transparency film—3,100 sheets.
5. "Thermo-Fax" copy paper—500 sheets.
6. A special teacher training workshop in the operation of the visual communication system.

THE 3M AND VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS

Operating on the premise that "The most effective teaching machine ever invented is the teacher," 3M Co. has produced its comprehensive visual communications system to function as an education aid—a tool for the teacher.

Overhead projection is a relatively new and dramatic method of presenting facts and ideas clearly, concisely. It was designed to assist the speaker to communicate with his audience effectively and with the greatest amount of impact.

This new method of teaching has four primary advantages:

1. The teacher employs the projector in front of the class, facing her pupils, thus maintaining eye contact.

2. The room remains well lit. Projected images can be seen clearly under normal lighting conditions.

3. Student attention is easy to control and student participation is stimulated.

4. The equipment is simple to operate.

The ease with which transparencies can be made from virtually any printed or written material enables teachers to employ a host of additional subject materials into her everyday classes. Teaching of such subjects as mathematics, geography, science, art, and music is simplified by this teaching method. This method offers a dramatic means for projecting student work to the class.

Through 3M/AGE, the company will make this equipment available to teachers in 5,500 classrooms in the United States.

NEW YORK.—A $1.5 million assistance grant to schools across the country to encourage creative teaching was announced today by Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

Bert S. Cross, president of 3M, told a press conference here that the grant would provide $3,000 worth of visual communications equipment to each of 500 schools. He said that the company hopes that each of these schools will in fact become a teaching laboratory where new teaching techniques can be developed.

Cross said he hopes other manufacturers, textbook publishers and foundations concerned with education will follow this pattern by contributing their ideas and capabilities to these selected schools.

The schools will be selected on the basis of a written proposal submitted by principals and administrators which will briefly describe techniques of employing visual aids in the classroom, now and in the future.

All schools, public, private, and parochial on all levels, including college, secondary, and primary are eligible.

Through this program, the St. Paul, Minn., firm will present a complete visual communications system consisting of transparency makers and overhead projection equipment to each school selected by a national selection committee of leading educators and publishers.

All proposals must be submitted to the local selection committee no later than November 15. Local selection committees will review these proposals and submit the best to the national selection committee which will meet in St. Paul to make the final 500 selections. Announcement of the grant recipients will be made in December.

In no case will selection of a proposal be contingent upon present or future purchases of any 3M company product. The equipment will become the permanent property of the recipient school.

The 3M company, constantly emphasizing the importance of research throughout its history, has developed a system that enables the teacher to make instant transparencies of virtually any material she wishes to use as teaching aids in the classroom. These can be shown to the class on overhead projectors.

"Of course," Cross noted, "these methods are already in use in some schools. But they will in the next decade become as common as chalkboards."

"Today, there is a general awareness that U.S. education is facing a double challenge—burgeoning school enrollment and the need to absorb knowledge discovered as recently as yesterday. Educating record numbers of students in the complex facts of a swiftly changing environment places a heavy responsibility upon the teachers of America."

Mr. Cross emphasized that this program is based upon the conviction that the teacher is and must remain the dominant force in the education process. He said that to be truly effective, all classroom equipment should be designed to help the teacher do a better job.

He concluded that "3M company hopes that our grant program will further the process along by helping more teachers to discover new ways to motivate and inform their students."

FINANCING EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, another item with important implications for education has attracted my attention—as I think it should that of all Senators. The research council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement has issued a statement in the form of a brochure entitled "Fiscal Policies to Meet the Needs of Great City School Systems in America."

Their statement notes the dimensions of the problem confronting our local communities in financing their educational systems with the present inelastic tax sources available to them. It also presents guidelines for the solution of these problems. I believe they are particularly well-balanced and recognize the need for local responsibility, as well as the limitations of the sources available to them. These guides may be summarized by the general formula:

Total cost of budgetary needs—capital and operating budgets—equals share from local taxes, plus share from State sources, plus any needed share from Federal sources.

It further states:

The share from Federal sources should support those programs which are in the national interest and should also supplement the State and local shares in relation to unmet financial needs.

While the guidelines presented are broad enough to be applicable to all situations, they constitute a framework within which our people can continue to control the education of their children while meeting society's needs for a populace with the necessary technological and social skills and understandings, to permit our Nation not only to maintain our present position, but to move forward with confidence.

I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the brochure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FISCAL POLICIES TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN AMERICA—THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITIES PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This statement was produced as the result of a report to the board of directors of the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement.)

(Representatives from the great cities: Howard Aker, Milwaukee; Dwight E. Beecher, Buffalo; James D. Berry, Detroit; H. S. Brannen, Houston; Edward Butler, Detroit; Jack P. Crowther, Los Angeles; Bernard E. Donovan, New York; Orlando F. Furno, Baltimore; James K. Helms, 3rd, Philadelphia; Donald Hill, Chicago; Merwin L. Himmler, Pittsburgh; Sam Lawson, St. Louis; Charles J. Lynch, Boston; William H. Ohrenberger, Boston; John P. Schaefer, Pittsburgh; William Simmons, Detroit; Karl O. Suessenguth, Cleveland; and Michael Wach, Cleveland. Consultant, William P. McLure, University of Illinois. Members of the writing and editorial committee were Jack P. Crowther, Bernard E. Donovan, Orlando F. Furno, and William P. McLure.)

"If we were to suppress our educational system for a single generation, our equipment would decay, most of our people would die of starvation and intellectually and spiritually we would slip back 4,000 years in human progress."—HERBERT HOOVER.

The public school systems of the great cities in America are in serious financial difficulty. Costs of education are rising faster than revenues. The situation is approaching a crisis with harmful effects not only in the cities but also in the Nation at large. Every thoughtful citizen bears the responsibility to give this problem his careful attention.

Cities lack sufficient access to tax resources to provide adequate financial support for their many vital governmental operations. In particular, they are unable to utilize equitably their economic resources for education. The issue is a matter of proper fiscal policy. Steps should be taken so that the desire of the public for a quality program of education may find unequivocal expression in State laws. These laws should contain policies which serve as guides to solutions of this problem.

The great cities, like other communities throughout the Nation, are investing too little of their economic resources in education. Citizens need to take careful stock of the crucial importance of education to their well-being and to give education a high priority among the things they value in our society. The public must take action through their representatives in Government to secure appropriate fiscal policies to remedy the situation.

Fourteen of the great cities in America are conducting studies of fiscal problems in their school systems. The initial findings suggest some policies which could point the way out of the present dilemma in these cities, and possibly in other types of communities as well.

THE PROBLEM

In the great cities, and in other school systems as well, the problem is this: Under present fiscal policies, boards of education do not have enough money to provide the kind and quality of educational program needed for the well-being of our society. Fiscal needs far outrun the potential funds from prevailing revenue sources.

Why has this problem arisen? The increased fiscal needs are chiefly the result of a combination of factors:

(1) rapid increase in the school age population; (2) shortage of qualified teachers prepared to cope with the educational problems of great cities; (3) obsolescent school plants; (4) need for additional plants at ever-increasing site and construction costs; (5) high population density; (6) great population mobility; (7) excessive retardation and failure of pupils; (8) large numbers of dropouts; and (9) performance of functions which are not intrinsically educational.

Boards of education are operating schools with budgets which are inadequate to cope with the problem facing them. Sources of revenue are too restrictive, too inelastic in relation to the fiscal demands of education and the ability of the economy to meet those demands. The property tax is the predominant source of funds. This source is relied upon heavily for other local functions of gov-

ernment. In some States, the city school systems have been given some relief in the form of local nonproperty taxes. These sources, in the main, provide only a partial solution. States that have gone farthest toward a solution of this problem have relied on property taxes at the local level and nonproperty taxes at the State level. However, inadequate financial support persists in varying degrees. No State has put its fiscal policies in complete order on this important issue.

THE SOLUTION

The following policies offer promise as guides for a solution to the fiscal need of the school systems in the great cities:

1. The financial support of public education should be a responsibility shared by all citizens and all levels of government.

In every State the provisions for financing schools are established by the legislature. It is incumbent upon each State legislature to reassess its fiscal system for school support and to adopt measures which are essential to the support of public education. Local school officials cannot act for the citizens beyond the limits set by State law. When the limits on finance make it impossible to operate the schools to obtain a desired quality, the citizens can turn to the legislature which is the source for provisions to remedy the situation. If there are problems which can be solved better through action of the Federal Government, citizens can call upon this Government to participate.

2. The State program for financial support should recognize the complex needs of the city school systems but the determination of the needs should be the responsibility of the local boards of education.

School systems must organize instructional programs and special services for a wide range of students. There are the highly gifted, the physically handicapped, the slow learners, the emotionally disturbed, those who need special vocational training earlier than usual, the dropouts who might be persuaded to return under new circumstances, and older adults who need further schooling. The great cities have a disproportionately large number of pupils who need special guidance and instruction in small groups, if not individually. Special services to meet these needs increase the operating costs. Capital needs for buildings and facilities to maintain up-to-date programs require large expenditures in addition to operating costs. If the State financial program does not include provision for these costs, the local tax base may be overburdened or sufficient funds for effective operation may not be available.

3. The measure of the local school district's ability to contribute to the support of education should be in terms of the total burden of local government cost borne by the local tax base.

The local tax base should not be expected to bear more than a fair burden in the total load that it carries for education and other services of government. A reasonable limit of financial support which the school district should be expected to obtain from the local tax base is dependent upon the burden placed on this base by other local governments. As the amount of local tax for other government goes up, there is less left for education.

4. Local boards of education should be free from unreasonable restrictions in the administration of fiscal affairs, from undue controls by other governmental agencies, and from cumbersome legal procedures at State and local levels which thwart effective expression of citizens.

A great many factors shape the detailed needs of the educational program in a local school district. No two districts are exactly alike. When school boards are hampered in the exercise of their judgment to solve the great variety of problems facing them, the education of individuals suffers. The most serious restrictions on school boards are powers which some legislatures give to officials in non-educational government to: (1) approve the school budget, (2) make supplementary appropriations, (3) set the school tax limit, and (4) exercise accounting control in the administration of the budget.

5. The fiscal procedures for adequate school support should provide the school districts with direct access to taxes which can be administered best locally and indirect access to those which can be administered best at the State level.

The property tax is by far the most important of all tax bases to be administered locally. Some legislatures permit local school districts to levy certain non-property taxes as minor supplements. Generally, nonproperty taxes on income and business transactions are more suitable for collection by State government and distribution to school districts through objective procedures. Thus through the State government citizens have indirect access to other tax bases which cannot be administered effectively at the local level. The combination of direct and indirect access to taxing ability should provide (1) an adequate amount of funds, and (2) a reasonable equalization of the total tax burden among various tax bases for support of all State and local governmental functions.

6. The State fiscal plan should include objective procedures to provide adequate funds for operating expenses and capital outlay and debt service payments.

The costs of a program of education of adequate quality for all students vary from one community to another depending upon conditions under which schools must be operated. One extreme situation is in rural areas where transportation and small schools add to the cost. Another is in the great cities where high density of population and disparity in the makeup of the school population add extra expense. Unless these overriding costs which are beyond the control of local school boards are taken into proper account in the procedures for distribution of State-collected funds, the educational programs suffer. Objective procedures for this purpose must be tailormade in every State to fit the variety of circumstances among the school districts. In districts with fast-growing school population, capital outlay and debt service costs for replacement and expansion of school plant facilities often reach as high as a third of the operating budget. The State fiscal plan must include adequate provision for essential elements of operating costs and sufficient resources for capital outlay and debt service to avoid crippling the education program.

7. The Federal Government should participate in the support of education when the national interest requires it and when local and State resources are insufficient to provide an acceptable educational program.

There are wide differences of opinion about the role of the Federal Government in the financial support of education. However, two principles relating to unique need seem to be gaining favor among citizens: (1) Support of such activities as special programs for training persons in critical fields and for research and development in strategic areas required in the national interest, and (2) assistance in meeting educational needs which cannot be met with reasonable effort by States and local school districts on their own.

8. The level of financial support of public education should be kept responsive to the fluctuations of inflation and deflation in the price structure of the economy.

School costs vary in accordance with the amount it is necessary to spend for personnel services, consumption of material goods, and capital facilities. The State fiscal plan must be flexible enough to provide appropriate adjustment of these costs as prices change. In periods of economic inflation the quality of education suffers unless school costs are adjusted upward in adequate amounts. In periods of economic deflation these costs, with care, can be adjusted downward without sacrificing attained quality. However, periods of deflation are times to consider possible gains in unattained quality through holding the line on school costs to the extent necessary for this purpose. Insofar as educational needs warrant it, the support program should finance capital needs in periods of deflation to take advantage of lower construction costs which will in turn help stabilize the price structure.

These policies call for dynamic participation of all levels of government in supporting public education; these policies permit citizens complete access to their true economic ability; and finally, they provide for the equalization of tax burden for the support of public education. A summary of these policies may be stated in a general formula as follows: Total cost of budgetary needs (operating and capital budgets) equals share from local sources plus share from State sources plus any needed share from Federal sources.

The basic principles for determining amount of funds for each of the elements in this formula are:

Total cost of budgetary needs

The estimation and justification of fiscal needs are the responsibility of the local board of education. Conditions for providing educational programs of excellence are complex and variable among school districts. Provision should be made in the budgetary costs for proper allowance of all essential components of the educational program.

Share from local taxes

The local share of costs should constitute that proportion of the total budget which can be supported from the local tax base in accordance with ability. A fair tax burden on the local tax base should include the burden of support on this base for noneducational functions of government.

Share from State taxes

The State share, indicated in the formula, should be in proportion to the extent to which the prescribed burden on the local tax base is utilized. The State should set minimum and maximum percentages for sharing in the cost of local budgets. A minimum percentage would provide some State funds to the districts of highest ability. A maximum percentage would set the limit of equalization to the districts of lowest ability.

Share from Federal taxes

The share from Federal sources should support those programs which are in the national interest and should also supplement the State and local shares in relation to unmet financial needs.

THE CONCLUSION

The public school systems in the great cities face a crucial challenge to provide the kind of education that is necessary to meet the social, economic and technological changes taking place today in America. This challenge cannot be met without a renewed determination by the citizens. It cannot be met without adequate financial support to provide the school systems with the necessary vigor to accomplish the task expected of them.

These policies are guides for citizens to take resolute action in ways that they deem appropriate through their local, State, and Federal levels of government. These guides are pointed to the solution of the fiscal problems in the great cities. They possess flexibility for development of procedures to meet the variable problems among these cities. They are applicable to all types of public school systems in the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JACK TOOMEY, OF THE LEWISTON, MAINE, DAILY SUN

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, a truly great man of Maine passed away last Thursday. He was a quiet man. He was a kind man. He was not physically large—but he was a giant in terms of journalistic integrity and ability. There was not the slightest shred of unfairness, pettiness, or meanness in him. He always had a smile for everyone—even those with whom he might disagree. He never indulged in needling. He never was afflicted with the opinionated "ivory tower" mental disease that some editors and editorial writers suffer from.

He was a friend of the people. And he was a very dear friend to me. I speak of the late Jack Toomey, of the Lewiston, Maine, Daily Sun. His death is an irreparable loss to me. No one will ever take his place.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in presenting a resolution of support for the nuclear test ban treaty, adopted by an outstanding U.S. veterans organization, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at its recent national convention in Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Whereas the U.S. Government, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. have, through negotiation, finally concluded a treaty to eliminate nuclear testing from the atmosphere, outer space, and under water; and

Whereas President Kennedy has interpreted this treaty as the first step toward a world free from nuclear warfare; and

Whereas this first step will effectively eliminate contamination of the atmosphere which menaces the lives of future generations, as well as the current one; and

Whereas the treaty represents a limited step toward peace without surrendering the means of protecting our own security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 68th annual national convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 4–11, 1963, commends President Kennedy and salutes Under Secretary of State Harriman for the achievement of a most meaningful step toward a peaceful and tranquil world; and be it further

Resolved, That (1) We support and endorse the treaty; (2) we call upon the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty; and (3) each Jewish War Veterans member be urged by all echelons, through every means available, to call upon and encourage their Senators to support ratification of the treaty.

THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on Monday, August 12, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, gave testimony to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and other Senators covering his views about the proposed treaty which, if adopted, would ban nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, but not underground tests providing the test produced no radiation fallout upon the people of other nations except those of the nation making the test.

In that hearing I asked the Secretary of State a number of questions to which he gave answer. My mail has been heavy asking me for a recitation of the questions which I put and the answers which were given. Believing that the Members of the Senate and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might be interested in the thoughts impliedly and expressly stated by me and those stated by the Secretary of State on the treaty embodying the nuclear test ban, I ask unanimous consent that that part of the testimony dealing with the exchange of thoughts between the Secretary of State and myself be printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator LAUSCHE. Mr. Secretary, I will try to develop thoughts with respect to the life of the treaty. In the 10 minutes it may be a little bit difficult. I understood you to say this morning that in discussing article IV of the agreement concerning how it might be terminated that the Russian representatives took the position that renunciation is a matter of sovereign right and, therefore, required no delineation in the treaty; is that correct?

Secretary RUSK. Yes, sir; and that has been a rather general approach of theirs to this problem.

Senator LAUSCHE. That is Red Russia takes the position that when it makes a treaty, in the absence of specifying a particular period of time that it is to endure, it has the inherent and sovereign right to terminate it whenever it pleases?

Secretary RUSK. That is a general point of view, sir. I would not want to say that that is flat and comprehensive over every issue. I would have to be advised on that point.

Senator LAUSCHE. If we approve this treaty I am quite certain that the Congress as well as the administration would contemplate executing it in the spirit and in the letter. May I have your opinion on that subject?

Secretary RUSK. I think there is no question about that.

Senator LAUSCHE. And if that is the fact, not only the Congress but the administration and the people of the country should weigh what the probability is of Russia's attitude concerning the fulfillment of the promise.

Secretary RUSK. All right, sir.

Senator LAUSCHE. With that premise laid, I want to recite here Russia's conduct of the past, and I begin on February 2, 1920, when it made separate peace treaties with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, recognizing the independence and autonomy of these countries and renouncing voluntarily and forever all rights of Russia over these people.

On June 16, 1940, in the face of that treaty, Soviet troops occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

I go to Iran. There was a tripartite alliance on January 29, 1942, to which Red Russia was a signatory, and it promised to withdraw its forces from Iranian territory.

In 1945 Red Russia equipped the rebels with Soviet arms and Red army uniforms. Iranian forces were neutralized by Red army troops.

In January of 1946 Iran appealed to the United Nations charging the Soviet Union with violating the agreement and interfering with its internal affairs, and nothing was done about it.

I now go to Yalta. We heard so much about it. In the Yalta Agreement, Red Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom agreed to assist liberated people to form interim government authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest establishment through free elections, and I want to repeat that, free elections, and the right of self-determination of governments responsive to the will of the people.

Now, the violations: In Hungary, acting through the Hungarian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Hungary, Red Russia suppressed the will of the Hungarian people by installing the minority Communist dictatorship and denied Hungary fundamental freedoms. The same thing was done in Roumania and Bulgaria.

I now go to Poland. In 1932 on July 25 Red Russia signed an agreement that there would be no aggression of Red Russia on Poland and none by Poland on Red Russia. We all remember this stab in the back on September 17, 1939, when Poland was fighting Germany on the west and Red Russia attacked Poland on the east.

I now go to the United States. In 1933 when Red Russia was begging the United States to establish trade relations with Russia, just as Kadar is now doing, and Litvinov wrote a letter to our Government committing himself that on Russian soil no agency would be permitted to exist contemplating intruding communism upon other nations of the world.

In violation of that Litvinov letter undoubtedly about which you know, the Comintern was in existence and they were attempting to communize the world.

No. 10: Finland. There was an agreement that before Russia and Finland were engaged in war that the issue would be submitted to arbitration, and that in no event would resort be made to war until 3 months after the report of the arbitrators. On November 26, 1939, the Soviet Government attacked Finland.

I now come to Hungary of 1956. When those patriots took control of the government and Imre Nagy was in charge, Red Russia said "We will remove the Red Russian troops. Pravda will tell the story."

The story was carried throughout the United States, but while we were relying upon that promise they were bringing in their tanks and their guns and their military men.

No. 12, German reunification. On July 23, 1955, the Foreign Ministers of the Governments of France, United Kingdom, the United States, and Red Russia stipulated, the heads of Government have agreed, that settlement of the German question shall be by means of a free election. That was repudiated and broken.

We now come to China, subject 13. The alliance between the Republic of China and the Union of Red Russia agreed to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the coming of peace following World War II, and to act according to the principles of mutual respect for their sovereignty. That treaty was broken.

Then we come to the very significant Potsdam agreement on Germany. It was promised that Germany would not be scalped and denuded of all its economy. The signatories to that promise kept it except Red Russia, and it carried out everything it possibly could causing us to pour huge sums of money into Germany to reestablish the economy. There were other commitments made in the Potsdam agreement that were broken.

I now come to the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, which is significant. The Kellogg-Briand Treaty outlawed war as an instrument of national policy. The Red army invaded Manchuria on October 12, 1929, 1 year after

it promised to outlaw war. Here we are sort of outlawing the nuclear tests. I wonder how long we can rely on that.

Japanese war prisoners. It was agreed by Red Russia that it would return those prisoners. It still hasn't done it.

Korea, item No. 17. It was agreed on December 27, 1945, there shall be set up a provisional Korean Democratic Government. There shall be a Joint Commission to provide a four-power trusteeship of Korea for a period up to 5 years. From the very beginning, the Russian representative refused to collaborate and to act in pursuance to that agreement.

No. 18, the return of German prisoners of war from the concentration camps, it still has not been done. Then we have had the peace treaties with Hungary again and Rumania and Bulgaria also violated.

Now, may I ask, Mr. Secretary, which is the last agreement that Red Russia has violated? I have in mind the Cuban commitment that we would have the right to inspect and ascertain whether the missiles were removed. Am I correct in that or not?

Secretary RUSK. That was a basis for the exchange, basis of the exchange between the President and Khrushchev during the week beginning October 22.

Senator LAUSCHE. That promise was not kept.

Secretary RUSK. That is correct, sir. As you recall, Castro would not accede to that.

Senator LAUSCHE. Yes. That is, the commitment was made that neutral nations would be permitted to go in and see whether the missiles were removed. That commitment was not executed, is that correct?

Secretary RUSK. That is correct, sir; but there were certain alternative arrangements that were made, as you remember.

Senator LAUSCHE. I have a letter here from the State Department saying that we are not bound by the promise not to invade or any of the other promises that we made because the commitment of Khrushchev was not kept to allow us to inspect.

Now, I ask you, in the face of this fragmentary recitation of breaches of commitments, if we are to judge Red Russia in the future by what it has done in the past, what can we expect?

Secretary RUSK. Senator, I am quite familiar with this somber story. I think myself that we should consider whether or not it is the present intention and purpose of the Soviet Union to comply with this treaty without necessarily at this stage trying to guarantee to ourselves that this will be their attitude forever into the future.

I believe that there would be no particular reason for them to enter into this treaty unless they had a present intention of living up to it, for two reasons. One is that violations of this treaty are highly subject to detection, and the cost to the Soviet Union throughout the world in terms of quick signature, and a quick violation would be very high.

Second, they have paid a significant price in their terms for this treaty, because this has precipitated in the sharpest possible form the attack by Peiping on the Soviet Union based upon this treaty, and this has created even deeper divisions and more hostile divisions within the Communist world than had occurred before. But we can't ignore the record that you have exposed here this afternoon.

Therefore, we must ask ourselves whether the interests of the United States are adequately protected in the event of violation. I think that answer is "Yes," but I think this is an answer that the Senate has to find out for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator's time is up.

Senator LAUSCHE. Just one-half minute.

For 5 years in the Foreign Relations Committee, behind closed doors and to questions put to you since you have become Secretary, I argued that there never can be a consortium between the 700 million Chinese and the 240 million Russians. Red China is looking for lebensraum, and its eyes are directed into Russia, and that was inevitable in my judgment, as it will grow worse as time goes on.

THE FIRST NATIONAL EASTERN ORTHODOX RELIGIOUS-CULTURAL FESTIVAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Pittsburgh, Pa., will be the host city of two major religious events of the Eastern Orthodox faithful from August 24 through August 31.

Beginning on August 24 the Greek Orthodox Youth of America—GOYA—will begin its 12th annual international GOYA conference under the theme "Unity in Faith and Tradition." Several thousand delegates throughout the United States and the Western Hemisphere will be attending this important religious conclave, which will feature the spiritual leader of the 2 million Greek Orthodox faithful, His Eminence Iakovos, the archbishop of North and South America, and the spiritual leader of the Pittsburgh, Pa., diocese, the Right Reverend Theodosios.

On the last day of the conclave, the first national Eastern Orthodox religious cultural festival will take place, August 31, at the multimillion-dollar Civic Arena in Pittsburgh, where an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 Orthodox Christians will attend. This event is sponsored by the Council of Eastern Orthodox Youth Leaders of the Americas, representing 7 youth organizations consisting of more than 800 chapters with 55,000 members.

There are approximately 6½ million Eastern Orthodox faithful in this country. The honorary chairman of the Eastern Orthodox religious cultural festival will be the Right Reverend Theodosios and the Most Reverend Benjamin.

Mr. President, I wish the Greek youth conclave and the Eastern Orthodox religious cultural festival great success, and ask unanimous consent that the two articles taken from the Chicago Greek Star-Press noting these religious events be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

ORTHODOX YOUTH GROUPS TO DEMONSTRATE UNITY AT PITTSBURGH FESTIVAL

The First National Eastern Orthodox Religious-Cultural Festival ever to be held in America, will take place on Saturday, August 31, at 3 p.m. in the multi-million-dollar Civic Arena in Pittsburgh, Pa. This historic and unprecedented event will be a gigantic gathering of an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 Orthodox Christians from across the United States, Canada and Mexico. The festival, sponsored by the Council of Eastern Orthodox Youth Leaders of the Americas, will be primarily a religious service with the highest ranking Orthodox prelates of the Orthodox churches in America attending and participating in a great vespers service. The Most Reverend Benjamin, Russian Orthodox archbishop of the Pittsburgh diocese, will officiate during the vespers service. The Greek Orthodox primate, Archbishop Iakovos, chairman of the standing conference of Orthodox bishops in America and a president of the World Council of Churches, will address the huge throng of Orthodox faithful on behalf of the Orthodox Church. The only other speaker will be Richard G. Joseph of Toledo, Ohio, chairman of CEOYLA.

The festival will be featured on the CBS national network radio program "Church of the Air" on September 1, and the CBS–TV show "Lamp Unto My Feet" on September 8. The Voice of America will beam a special broadcast on the festival to the Iron Curtain countries and to Greece.

The Council of Eastern Orthodox Youth Leaders of the Americas (CEOYLA) represent 7 Orthodox youth organizations consisting of more than 800 chapters with 55,000 members.

The festival program will begin at 3 p.m. with a colorful procession. At least 100 acolytes, 150 Orthodox priests, deacons, and seminarians and the Orthodox bishops and archbishops (or their designated representatives) of the Orthodox churches in America will participate in a beautiful vespers service. The festival will feature a 1,000 voice choir (composed of 7 individual choirs, one from each church jurisdiction, Russian, Greek, Syrian, Serbian, Ukrainian, Carpatho-Russian and Rumanian) which will sing a capella the ancient Byzantine hymns and responses, under the direction of Father Vladimir Soroka of Charleroi, Pa. The vespers will be conducted in several languages: English, Greek, Slavonic, Arabic, and Rumanian.

The United Christian Youth Movement (UCYM) in the United States will sent observers to the festival. The Orthodox youth organizations are members of the UCYM.

Orthodox and Protestant theologians from throughout the world (who will be attending the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in Rochester, N.Y.) are being invited to attend the festival by Archbishop Iakovos as the guests of the standing conference of Orthodox Bishops in America.

The Eastern Orthodox Religious Cultural Festival Committees are: honorary chairmen, the Most Reverend Benjamin, Russian Orthodox archbishop of the Pittsburgh diocese and the Right Reverend Theodosios, Greek Orthodox bishop of the Pittsburgh diocese; National Festival Committee chairman, Ross Chepeleff, Detroit, Mich.; public relations director, Ernest A. Villas, New York City; treasurer, Cornel Cotosman, Chicago, Ill.; religious committee, Allegheny County Orthodox Clergy Association, president, Father Basil Gregory, Pittsburgh, Pa.

After the conclusion of the festival program, a reception open to the public will be held in the Penn-Sheraton Hotel at 8:30 p.m.

PITTSBURGH FESTIVAL TO BE TELEVISED ON SEPTEMBER 8

Archbbishop Iakovos, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America and chairman of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, will deliver a special message on the national radio program "Church of the Air" over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Sunday, September 7, 1963, at 9:30 a.m., eastern daylight time. On this program, a Serbian and Syrian Orthodox choir will sing traditional religious chants.

The broadcast will emanate from Pittsburgh, Pa., to commemorate a mammoth Eastern Orthodox Religious-Cultural Festival which will be held under the auspices of the Council of Eastern Orthodox Leaders of the Americas (CEOYLA) in the new $20 million civic arena in Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday, August 31, from 2:30 to 6 p.m.

The festival which was being planned by Greek, Rumanian, Russian, Carpatho-Russian, Syrian, and Ukranian Orthodox youth groups through CEOYLA for 5 years, will be one of the most historic events of eastern Orthodoxy in America, and is aimed at demonstrating that the Orthodox groups here

are united in spirit and intent, as well as in doctrine and belief, and that they represent a major faith in this country with a total membership of over 6 million.

The festival will feature a great vesper service in the civic arena at which Orthodox Hierarchs will be present, and for which a 1,000 voice choir will sing hymns and responses. The program will be open to the public and over 15,000 are expected to attend.

Various ethnic groups of CEOYLA will hold their annual conventions in Pittsburgh from August 24 through the Labor Day weekend. Archbishop Iakovos will make a major unity address at the banquet of the Greek Orthodox Youth of America (GOYA) on Tuesday evening, August 27.

On the following Sunday, September 8, at 10 a.m., eastern standard time, the CBS national TV series "Lamp Unto My Feet" will televise highlights of the festival from films taken on August 31.

CONGRESS NEEDS ACCESS TO SCIENTIFIC ADVICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senators will remember that last week I introduced a bill (S. 2038) to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. This office will serve the Congress in a purely advisory capacity. It would have no legislative authority. It would in no way diminish committee responsibility or the balance between the Houses. COST, modeled after the legislative counsel, would consist of two small offices of experienced scientific generalists: one office for the Senate, one for the House. COST would maintain a register of responsible talent at work across the whole spectrum of science. The scientists on this register would be available for consultation by letter or on a short-term full-time basis. Should any committee desire to make use of these consultants, it would, of course, be responsible for the financial arrangements. COST itself would act as a clearinghouse in the sciences for the Congress.

It has been suggested that the office be made a part of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It is my thought that COST would serve the Congress in a more effective manner, however, if it were an actual, physical part of each House. It would be useful to have the COST staff immediately and readily available for informal discussion and assistance to Members and to committees' staffs—much in the manner in which legislative counsel works. Certainly in terms of expense it would make little difference whether the office was a part of Legislative Reference or a small highly professional independent operation.

This is, of course, a nonpartisan proposal. COST would serve all Members in either party with impartiality.

I am pleased, therefore, that the proposal has now been introduced on the House side by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey. Its number is H.R. 8066. Congressman WIDNALL is a respected member of the Republican Party and I am honored that he has given his endorsement to my proposal.

An interesting article has been brought to my attention in the July 25 issue of Science magazine. This article surveys the relationship between science and Government, calling it truly both "growing and troubled." This article points out that the two areas became "incredibly intertwined before anyone quite realized what was happening."

The present situation—

The article goes on—

is that it is probably fair to say that if half a dozen of the Nation's elder statesmen of science should put their influence behind any scientific venture that is not patently absurd, the Congress and the Executive would tag along.

The Executive has developed a means to cope with this growing area of interest; the Congress has not.

Nevertheless, on a broad range of issues, from fish flour to the supersonic transport, the executive branch has taken effective steps to make certain that left and right hands are in close communication as they shape scientific policy. However, Congress, for a variety of real and manufactured reasons, has not remotely begun to move in the same direction. Its apparatus for dealing with science is pretty much unchanged from the days when the Federal R. & D. budget would not have covered the electric bill at Oak Ridge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article, by D. S. Greenberg, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I have received several most thoughtful and troubled letters from executives in the research and development industries. To a man they are concerned that we in the Congress are presently unable to give the informed and searching consideration to the administration's scientific proposals which our constitutional responsibilities demand. I ask unanimous consent that these letters may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, I am pleased to note, Chemical Week, in its August 17, 1963, issue, has endorsed the proposal to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. I ask unanimous consent that this article, too, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

This proposal to establish an Office of Science and Technology to serve the Congress is at the desk for cosponsors. Should any Senator be interested in adding his name to this measure, he may do so until the end of the week.

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

NEWS AND COMMENT

SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT: A SURVEY OF SOME OF THE MAJOR ELEMENTS IN GROWING, TROUBLED RELATIONSHIP

If an observer gets away from the forest floor and gains enough altitude for a broad look at what science and Government are doing to each other in this country, a number of large and interesting contours stand out.

First of all, with the exception of military defense and closely associated areas, scientific research turns out to be more heavily dependent on Federal money than probably any other nationwide activity. Science and Government have been in partnerships of various sorts since the early days of the Republic, but, as far as the division of financing goes, the postwar years have seen the Federal Government become the overwhelmingly dominant partner. The shift in the relationship is perhaps best illuminated by recalling the letter Einstein wrote to Roosevelt, in 1939, to alert him to the explosive potential of the atom. The letter, written at a time when the Federal Government was contributing less than $75 million a year to the sciences, suggested that funds for atomic research might be obtained from "private persons who are willing to make contributions for this cause, and perhaps also by obtaining the cooperation of industrial laboratories which have the necessary equipment."

There was no suggestion that the Government finance the work, for the simple reason that the Federal Government had not yet become the principal source of support for the sciences. Figures for the period are not complete, but it appears that research-and-development expenditures by private industrial firms were in excess of the Government's spending. Today, of course, the situation is markedly changed, and even if military research and development is excluded, Federal spending under the label of R. & D. exceeds the amount spent by industry and other nongovernmental sources.

In the fiscal year that has just ended, support for R. & D. from all sources, totaled some $16 billion. Of this amount, the Government provided about $12.2 billion. In the present fiscal year the Government's share is expected to rise to $14.9 billion, continuing a trend that has produced annual increases of from 10 to 35 percent since 1956.

Along with this affluence there has come a general willingness on the part of political leaders to take the word of scientific leaders on how national resources should be allocated for scientific purposes. The political leaders do not automatically swallow each suggestion, but it is probably fair to say that if half a dozen of the Nation's elder statesmen of science should put their influence behind any scientific venture that is not patently absurd, the Congress and the Executive would tag along.

Thus, it cannot be argued that money problems are plaguing American science today. There are spots here and there where additional funds would be extremely useful, but these are now the object of well-organized surveillance, and improved support in these areas can be confidently expected fairly soon. The problems afflicting science and government are far more subtle than mere money. Basically, they stem from the fact that in the United States the two areas had become incredibly intertwined before anyone quite realized what was happening, and, in large part, the tensions and stresses that are now becoming increasingly painful arise from an effort to define the reciprocal responsibilities and relate the relationship to the traditional political process. All this must be viewed against the fact that the American people and their political leaders have come to accept and demand a flourishing scientific establishment, for everything from better missiles to better cancer drugs, from cleaner rivers to faster commercial transport planes. And despite gloomy forecasts from persons who have been stunned to find some Congressmen suddenly turned skeptical toward scientists, the only rational forecast in the political-scientific relationship is that the Federal investment in science is going to continue to grow, probably at the rate of about 15 percent a year, for a long, long time. It is now about 2.5 percent of the gross national product, compared with about 0.65 percent when Einstein wrote to Roosevelt, and some administration planners feel that it will reach 3 percent before serious pressures develop for a reduced rate of growth.

It appears safe to assume that the money will be there for the continued support and growth of science. But there is little certainty about the circumstances that will govern its use, and there is even less cer-

tainty about the willingness of Congress to accept the view that science is a superstructure built on education, that it is ruinous to continue the present policy of nourishing the top with ample funds while the supporting base is deep in poverty. Congress has been slowly—but very slowly—yielding in this regard, with the result, for example, that the National Science Foundation (NSE) is carrying out large summer training programs aimed at improving the competence of high school science and foreign language teachers. But such efforts represent no more than an occasional splash over the dike, and they usually are achieved only in areas that bear a readily visible relation to national security requirements.

CONGRESS AROUSED

Attempts to move from specific to general support for education, even for science education at the graduate level, can generally be counted upon to rouse the ire of Congress. Such was the case last week when members of a Senate appropriations subcommittee expressed doubts about enlarging NSF's program of general support grants for institutions where NSF-supported research is conducted. The program, which is intended to overcome financial imbalances that may result from emphasis on scientific research, is seeking $18 million this year, compared with $8.4 million last year. The committee will probably arrive at a figure somewhere in between, but several members, reflecting a prevalent congressional attitude, were clearly unhappy about putting money into education without specifically earmarking it. This attitude arises from a variety of factors—among them fiscal conservatism, fear of Federal control, and failure to resolve the church-state issue—which result in Congress still standing as a massive barrier to comprehensive Federal aid for education. Its readiness to support graduate science programs is based on the Government's long-standing reliance on universities for mission-oriented research. Out of this tradition has come a willingness to support basic research and training at the graduate level. But below the graduate level the Congress has shown little inclination to give money away for education. While it is possible today for a dull graduate student to receive a generous Federal fellowship, a bright undergraduate finds little Federal assistance available outside of low-interest loans. This situation continues to prevail in the face of the fact that, if only tacitly, Congress has come to accept the principle that, since the Federal Government is the major consumer of scientific manpower, it has a responsibility to assure the supply. Thus, Congress has generally given its assent to proposals for large-scale expansion of graduate fellowship programs. The final verdict is not yet in, but it appears likely that the current session will in large part go along with administration proposals for a still further enlargement of fellowship support. Whether this can go very far without expanded support to enlarge and improve the undergraduate base is a serious question, but the congressional approach is by its very nature a piecemeal, fragmented one (mainly because the committee system spreads jurisdiction all over Capitol Hill, with little reference to the organization of science and education in the real world), and it is not inconceivable that Congress will continue to bloat the graduate levels with fellowships and other forms of support while the lower levels of education continue to suffer.

The situation is altogether different at the executive level, where substantial progress has been made in recent years to develop a comprehensive approach to the Government's relations with science. The effort actually began in World War II, but it died out at the end of that conflict and was revived only after Sputnik demonstrated the need for a continuing, high-quality scientific advisory service within the President's official family. That service is now embodied in several separate but closely connected executive organizations, which, without receiving very much attention, have come to exercise a great deal of power over Federal support for science. The power is by no means unchallenged, and the extent of it is difficult to determine, since it is not exercised at public meetings. But the White House Office of Science and Technology, in cooperation with the President's Science Advisory Committee and the Federal Council on Science and Technology, has become a coordinating point and a clearing house for Federal relations with science. Virtually all proposals involving Federal support of scientific activities pass through these channels en route to the Bureau of the Budget. Where it is felt that there are gaps in existing programs, the advisory bodies exercise the power of initiative. For example, the fellowship proposals that have been incorporated into the Federal budget originated with a PSAC panel that was called together to examine future supply and demand for scientific manpower; the question of which Federal agency is responsible for what in monitoring radioactive fallout was adjudicated at the White House advisory level; similarly, the burgeoning oceanography program, with its multiagency participation, has been subjected to scrutiny by these advisers. Sometimes the issues are trivial, and sometimes they are of major significance; sometimes the White House influence is decisive, and sometimes it has no visible effect, as was the case when the Office of Science and Technology argued for employing an earth rather than a lunar orbit technique in NASA's moon-landing program. OST contended that, since the military potential for space appears to be in the near-earth regions, an earth orbit in the lunar program would help develop techniques that could be adapted for military purposes. That was the "big picture" approach to management of scientific resources. NASA simply argued that it's cheaper and faster to employ a lunar orbit. Ultimately NASA won.

Well-established agencies, with close ties to Capitol Hill, are not always inclined to share the "big picture" approach of the White House. Nevertheless, on a broad range of issues, from fish flour to the supersonic transport, the executive branch has taken effective steps to make certain that left and right hands are in close communication as they shape scientific policy. However, Congress, for a variety of real and manufactured reasons, has not remotely begun to move in the same direction. Its apparatus for dealing with science is pretty much unchanged from the days when the Federal R. & D. budget would not have covered the electric bill at Oak Ridge.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the Federal involvement with science is that, with few exceptions, the Government has reached into the scientific community for advice on what to support and how to support it. The result is that, until recently, the scientific community—through a grand complex of advisory bodies—has written the rulebook, particularly on the now controversial issue of accountability for research funds. However, as the science budget has grown, so has congressional concern over whether the country is getting what it's paying for. It isn't enough for the scientific community to answer that research is essentially an uncertain, unavoidably wasteful process that defies the cost-accounting techniques developed for nuts-and-bolts contractors. The Congress is unhappy—hence the current dispute over NIH's accounting practices—and, in matters of this sort, it is able to turn its unhappiness into concrete regulations. In the matter of education and other facets of science, the easy course for the scientific community is to wail and moan about congressional inadequacy for judging these issues. The difficult, but more productive, course would be for the scientific community to collect its evidence and state its case. Fortunately, the National Academy of Sciences, through its Committee on Science and Public Policy, is moving in this direction. If it fulfills its aspirations, both science and Government are likely to be better off for its efforts.

AMERICAN OIL CO.,
Chicago, Ill., August 13, 1963.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I appreciated receiving a copy of your July 30 speech, "Needed: A Congressional Office of Science and Technology," which you sent me as a member of the Research Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. I am most heartily in accord with the objectives of your proposal. I, too, believe that the dangers of an uncontrolled growth of Government-sponsored research and "secret choices" involving critical decisions are very real indeed. While I have not been a party to any of the critical "secret choices," I am closely enough associated with many Government research activities to recognize the need for stronger and more objective controls than have been exercised to date.

If we are to achieve such control, it is certainly necessary that the Congress do its part and do it on the basis of technically informed choices as free as possible from political considerations. Certainly, to do this, it needs to be technically informed. Whether a Congressional Office of Science and Technology is the best means of providing Congress with this information, I do not know. It certainly appears to be a very reasonable possibility. I do know that individual members of the research committee of the National Association of Manufacturers would be happy to cooperate with Members of Congress and to offer their suggestions and counsel as to the most effective means of providing the Congress with the technical information it needs. Many of these men are also members of the Industrial Research Institute, a smaller but somewhat more cohesive organization. Its members include directors of most of the large industrial laboratories of the country. While the institute takes no official stand on legislative matters, its members are well informed and deeply concerned about this overall problem.

If I can be of any further help in support of your proposal, please let me know. By copies of this letter to Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, I am indicating to them my endorsement of your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP C. WHITE.

KENDALL REFINING CO.,
Bradford, Pa., August 8, 1963.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: This letter is in response to yours of August 5. I am glad indeed to accept your invitation to comment on your proposal and I would like to endorse it. I believe that it would be helpful for the Congress to have available to them a large body of consultants such as you propose.

I have in mind that it would be possible for most scientists and technologists to voluntarily contribute their time as might be necessary in this effort. The Government would, undoubtedly, wish to pay the expenses incurred for travel, etc. Most scientists and technologists of my acquaintance are public spirited enough and their companies are also, where they may be employed in industry, to want to do this.

It has occurred to me since reading your letter of August 5 that at least one unsuccessful research project of the Federal Government could have been avoided had an Office of Science and Technology such as you now propose been available. I refer to the attempt made in recent years to fuel a plane with nuclear power. Even though I am not an expert in the field, anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of the shielding necessary and other problems could have foreseen the failure of such an undertaking. It is my understanding that this unsuccessful project cost the Federal Government about $1 billion.

I shall be happy to cooperate with you in any way that may be indicated.

Very truly yours,

F. I. L. LAWRENCE,
Director of Research and Development.

BORG-WARNER CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., August 9, 1963.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT,
Appropriations Committee,
Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: Thank you very much for your letter of August 5 to which you attached your remarks to the Senate on the need for a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. You ask for any comments that I may have on the proposal.

I agree thoroughly that something of this sort is needed in order to give Congress the expert consultation that it requires in order to properly evaluate programs which have been developed by the executive department, which has available to it a great number of scientific experts both in and out of Government. Therefore, I would endorse the concept which you are proposing most heartily.

I think the problem has reached serious proportions, and I enclose for your background a talk that I gave recently directed at this problem.

In order to give the group you proposed the impetus and direction that it will need to be a moving force in aiding Congress, I would think it would be a good idea to have it an arm of a specific committee of Congress, say the Appropriations Committee, available to the other specialized committees for their aid. A Congressional Office of Science and Technology without a specific boss could become an orphan.

The Office of Science and Technology should concern itself not only with the evaluation of the specific proposals made by the executive branch with respect to research and development and other technological matters, but in addition should be concerning itself with the overall governmental level of science and technology and its relationship to the privately supported effort in this area, as discussed at greater length in my attached remarks. For this reason it seems logical that the Appropriations Committee is a logical home for it.

Since it will concern itself with economic values associated with the conduct of our country's technological effort, I would recommend that the Office be directed by a person who has had experience in the direction of industrial research and development, since that background has had to concern itself with evaluating the attractiveness of the scientific aspects of problems against the practical matters concerned with its economic impact, both on the short and long range picture. I would feel that if Congress were to look for someone who was an elder statesman (either recently retired or reaching that stage in his life), they could acquire someone of high caliber and great experience in this area. I further believe that the Office of Science and Technology can operate with a relatively small permanent staff, who are then able to call upon a large body of consultants with specialties in a broad spectrum of sciences so that they can bring to bear the best and most experienced minds on any particular problem on which they make a recommendation to Congress.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending the material, which I found of great interest.

Sincerely,

DONALD W. COLLIER,
Vice President, Research.

CRUCIBLE STEEL CO. OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 19, 1963.

The Honorable E. L. BARTLETT,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I was pleased to receive a copy of your interesting and very timely remarks to the Senate on July 30, 1963, regarding a Congressional Office of Science and Technology.

One instinctively resists the proliferation of bureaucracy, and I think that my first reaction to adding another organization in the Government was negative. However, your July 30 remarks, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, clearly establish the need for such an organization and rather fairly state and dispose of objections and alternatives to your recommended solution of COST.

We at Crucible have had some experience through the years with similar organizations to this group which you propose "would have a small, highly skilled, permanent, professional staff and a large body of consultants, available to the Congress to furnish advice, evaluations, and reports."

A number of us have served on what I consider to be somewhat similar organizations, such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Materials Advisory Board. From these experiences I can assure you that the skilled, professional, compact permanent staff which you envision would have full and valuable support from consultants both from the academic and industrial fields, and I agree with you that this is not only the most efficient but probably the only reliable way with which the Congress could acquaint itself with the needed background properly to consider the scientific and technologic aspects of many vital pieces of legislation with which the present and future Congresses will have to deal.

Sincerely,

E. S. MARCH,
Vice President, Technology.

[From Chemical Week, Aug. 17, 1963]

CONGRESS NEEDS SCIENCE ADVICE

"It is disturbing but true that at the present time the Congress does not understand science and it is also true that science does not understand Congress."

Thus did Alaska's Senator E. L. BARTLETT succinctly state the problem of science and technology vis-a-vis the Federal Government. The National Association of Manufacturers recognized the problem last year, prepared a formal statement for the House Government Operations Committee advocating a scientific advisory group reporting to Congress. We said (Chemical Week, Nov. 3, 1962, p. 5): "Congress needs professional guidance on Government R. & D. spending. When it reconvenes, something should be done about the problem."

Now something has been done. Senator BARTLETT has proposed a Congressional Office of Science and Technology (COST) modeled after the similar office in the executive branch but responsible only to Congress.

We are always chary of new governmental agencies. Too many of them are simply new layers piled on top of existing layers, with overlapping, vaguely defined functions and no clear guidelines to prevent duplication. Congress already has various committees dealing with science and technology, but they are composed of various Congressmen—not of professional scientists.

We are persuaded, however, by the logic of the Senator's proposal. "Increasingly," he continues, "policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and technology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country but also the liberty and privacy of every human being everywhere. If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this Nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions and that it have a role in making them. At the present time Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions, and as a result they are made, not in the Halls of Congress but elsewhere, not by the elected representatives but by unknown administrative officials.

"If the Congress does not insist on participating in these decisions, they will be made by others elsewhere. In time, the power will pass to those who make the decision."

BARTLETT conceives of COST as "a small, highly skilled, permanent, professional staff and a large body of consultants, available to Congress to furnish advice, evaluations, and reports. It would be the task of the permanent staff to ask questions for Congress, to answer questions of Congress, and to assist the Members in handling the scientific matters that come before them. It is necessary that the very best scientific opinion be brought to bear, both pro and con, on the important decisions of our society and its Government. It is also important, however, that these decisions shall be made by those responsible to the people."

That's the argument that sells us. As recently as fiscal year 1948, Federal R. & D. authorizations were less than $1 billion; in fiscal year 1963, just ended, they were over $14 billion. This is simply too much money for Congress to appropriate without a sure knowledge of what it's buying and whether it's necessary. As the governmental branch most responsive to the citizens' will, Congress needs independent expert advice.

A STORM IS BREWING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Lois Mattox Miller and James Monahan continue to perform an inestimable service for the American public through their informative and perceptive articles on smoking and health in the Reader's Digest.

Their latest review of the evidence and the prospects for action, "The Cigarette Controversy: A Storm Is Brewing" is no exception. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CIGARETTE CONTROVERSY: A STORM IS BREWING

(By Lois Mattox Miller and James Monahan)

As evidence piles up linking heavy cigarette smoking with cancer and other serious ills, the tobacco industry, the medical profession and the public anxiously await the report of a committee of scientists assembled by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Confidence, genuine or feigned, was the keynote of most annual meetings held this spring for the stockholders of the major American tobacco companies. Rising costs, dwindling profits, mounting health problems were minimized or skillfully explained away. "The cigarette industry," the New York Times reported, "is quite optimistic over its future despite the recurring lung-cancer controversy."

The president of one company assured the public that research dealing with viruses, radiation and chemicals was yielding "in-

creasing evidence that implicates factors other than smoking" as a cause of cancer. "I am personally convinced," he added, "that cigarettes ultimately will be exonerated."

However, next morning, the Times published the more informed opinion of Dr. Emerson Day, chief of cancer-detection research at the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, and president of the New York City Cancer Committee. "Long-term cigarette smoking," said Dr. Day, "has been soundly established as a factor of direct and major importance in the development of lung cancer. It is most unlikely that it will ever be exonerated, whether or not viruses and other factors are implicated."

Indeed, during the same week, "exoneration" of cigarettes was made even more unlikely by news that pinpointed inhaled smoke as a cause of other diseases far more widespread than deadly lung cancer. From La Jolla, Calif., where scientists were reviewing the year's research at a seminar of the American Cancer Society, Earl Ubell reported in the New York Herald Tribune: "Cigarettes have spread a new plague through our population, scientists have discovered. It is emphysema, a lung ailment which leaves the victims gasping for breath."

MORE THAN CANCER

For the past 8 years, Dr. Oscar Auerbach, professor of pathology at New York Medical College, has been engaged in a massive study of the changes that occur over a lifetime in the lungs of smokers and nonsmokers. Auerbach's original objective was cancer research, specifically designed to find the changes which occur in the lungs of people who had died of lung cancer, and then to determine whether the same or similar changes occur (and to what degree) in the lungs of those who had died of other causes.

During 1955–60 Dr. Auerbach and his associates obtained about 6,000 specimens of lung tissue from more than 1,500 patients who died and underwent autopsy at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in East Orange, N.J., and 11 cooperating hospitals. The specimens were sliced into smaller sections and preserved on glass slides for microscopic study. Each slide was identified only by a code number keyed to an individual case history which included a detailed and verified record of the patient's smoking habits.

The sealed records were entrusted to Dr. Cuyler Hammond of the American Cancer Society, who was in charge of the statistical phase of the study. The slides were sent to Dr. Auerbach's pathology laboratories. Without knowing whether a particular specimen came from the lungs of a smoker, ex-smoker, or nonsmoker, or whether the smoker puffed a pipe or drew draughts of tar-loaded cigarette smoke deep into his lungs, the pathologists studied slides under high-powered microscopes and recorded their findings.

The first important observation was the presence of abnormal cells which might have become cancerous if the patient had lived long enough. But the microscope also revealed other changes in lung tissue that were unrelated, or only distantly related, to cancer. These included destruction of the protective hairlike cilia and underlying cells in the bronchi; formation of callouslike surface tissue from constant irritation; thickening of the arterioles and small arteries; swelling and rupturing of millions of the tiny "air sacs" (alveoli) which form clusters on the smallest branches of the "bronchial tree" within the lung.

When the pathology reports on the thousands of slides were turned over to Dr. Hammond, he identified each by code and matched it to its case history. "The results were amazing," he says. "The pathology findings could hardly have been more consistent with the records if the pathologists had known the source of each slice and the smoking history of each patient."

SMOKERS' LUNGS

Destructive changes of all types were greatest, by far, in the lungs of heavy cigarette smokers. They were much less in light or occasional cigarette smokers, and those who smoked pipes or cigars. They were least (and some types were rare) in nonsmokers. The precancerous cells, for example, were present in the lungs of cigarette smokers almost in direct proportion to the number of cigarettes smoked. However, such cells were rarely found in nonsmokers.

There was encouraging news for ex-smokers, as well as for smokers who wonder if it is too late to quit. The abnormal cells seemed to have diminished in the lungs of ex-smokers (off cigarettes for 5 years or more); instead, the pathologists found a strange type of cell with a disintegrating nucleus, indicating that the precancerous cells begin to die off with the cessation of smoking. This natural repair process, they believe, probably goes on slowly for years after the smoker quits.

But the scientists soon realized that they were observing clinical evidence of much more than cancer. The smoke-induced degeneration of the bronchial tree, for example, could be related directly to the mechanism of heart failure.

Each lung contains about 750 million air sacs connected by a network of tiny blood vessels. Nature intended these air sacs to perform the double function of discharging the waste gas, carbon dioxide, and more important, of absorbing the oxygen which is vital to every cell, tissue and organ of the body, including the heart. But in the smokers' lungs, as shown by the microphotographs, the air sacs had become thick, spongy, ruptured, and had lost their capacity for exchanging carbon dioxide for oxygen. Also, carbon monoxide, a poisonous gas in the smoke, combines with hemoglobin more readily than does oxygen, thus impairing still further the oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood. Finally, the blood vessels in the smokers' lungs, shown unmistakably in the microphotographs, had become fibrous and narrowed, and sometimes blocked completely.

To make matters worse, nicotine in tobacco smoke temporarily constricts the small arteries throughout the body and steps up the heart rate. Thus the heart muscle, already starving for oxygen, has to pump even harder.

"A perfectly normal heart," Drs. Auerbach and Hammond reported last year, "can probably withstand these effects of inhaled tobacco smoke. But [the same effects] can cause heart failure in a person whose coronary arteries are already impaired by atherosclerosis—which applies to the majority of American males and particularly those past middle age." Dr. Hammond believes this lung-heart phenomenon largely explains why "the death rate from coronary heart disease is higher in cigarette smokers than in nonsmokers, increases with the amount of cigarette smoking, and is lower in ex-cigarette smokers than in men who continue to smoke cigarettes."

THE LUNG CRIPPLES

At the La Jolla seminar last April, the latest review of the Auerbach-Hammond lung-tissue project disclosed the striking evidence that directly linked the destructive effects of inhaled cigarette smoke to the incidence of pulmonary emphysema. Over 10 million people in the United States, most of them past 40, suffer from the disease, and the number is increasing. Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, calls it one of today's growing health problems.

Many statistical studies have shown that the death rate from emphysema (and chronic bronchitis) is higher among smokers than nonsmokers. One of the latest, "The Role of Tobacco in the Causation of Chronic Respiratory Disease," published last October in the New England Journal of Medicine, was described by an editorial in the same journal as "an impressive addition to the rapidly accumulating reports on the association between smoking and sundry diseases" and "another reminder that the medical profession has yet to take the initiative in presenting the public with a considered appraisal of the threats to health posed by the cigarette."

But now, in the Auerbach microphotographs of smokers' lungs (as contrasted with those of nonsmokers), it was possible to observe the slow, degenerative process whereby emphysema obstructs the bronchi, bloats the tiny air sacs until they are mere "blebs," and turns the lungs into over-inflated and inelastic "air traps" incapable of expiring air. Emphysema is difficult to diagnose in the early stages. The first symptoms may be shortness of breath, wheezing coughing, weakness and fatigue—signs which cause it to be confused with other common respiratory ills. But these also are signs all too common among heavy cigarette smokers.

Coincidentally with the Auerbach-Hammond report on emphysema and chronic bronchitis, Dr. Roger Larson, of the UCLA Medical School in Los Angeles, revealed to the Western Society of Clinical Research the results of "lung function" tests he had made on 600 smokers and non-smokers in Carmel, Calif. Lung X-rays and spirogram measurements showed that the lung function of younger smokers (pack-a-day or more) was about equal to the lung function of nonsmokers who were 20 years older.

The preponderant evidence linking inhaled cigarette smoke to a growing list of diseases other than cancer prompted Dr. Auerbach at the La Jolla seminar to declare solemnly, "We are becoming a Nation of lung cripples."

EVIDENCE GETS ACTION

During the past 18 months, this steady stream of evidence has prompted some strong actions. The most notable were taken in England following the publication of the report on smoking and health by the Royal College of Physicians. There the government launched a vigorous educational campaign against cigarettes using posters, leaflets, lecturers and mobile health exhibits.

The British example inspired action in Italy (which banned all cigarette advertising), Denmark, Germany and other European countries. The Canadian Medical Association declared that cigarettes created a "grave and extensive health problem" and suggested a Federal law which would require cigarettes offered for sale in Canada to bear a label warning smokers of the health hazard involved.

The harmful effects of cigarettes on health were also recognized and condemned, usually with recommendations for action, by the State medical societies of California, Maine, Utah, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida, and New York; by the Medical Society of Georgia (regional); by scores of county medical societies, and by such influential organizations as the American College of Chest Physicians, the American Heart Association and the American College Health Association.

Cigarette vending machines were ordered removed from some college campuses; a growing number of student publications dropped their lucrative cigarette advertising; and, by faculty orders or voluntary action, some students quit working for cigarette companies as hired pushers of certain brands. The sternest action came when the U.S. Air Force barred the free distribution of cigarettes by cigarette companies in its hospitals, and eliminated cigarettes from flight lunchboxes. Said the Air Force Deputy Surgeon General: "The ever increasing evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer, pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases can no longer be ignored."

If these indicated, to any degree, the nature of things to come, how could the tobacco industry view its future with confidence, and even talk about "increasing evidence" that would exonerate cigarette smoking as a cause of disease?

HOPES AND HUNCHES

The truth is that this year's brave show of confidence was put on, at least partially, to reassure investors and the general public. Privately, tobacco men talked differently. Last January, for example, Fortune quoted one who told colleagues, "Fate has conspired to make this particular moment a testing time for tobacco. The industry is being ganged by many problems."

But the industry has also pinned some forlorn hopes to its own hunches regarding two possibilities, either of which might be exploited by high-powered propaganda or strong political pressure.

The first is current research which indicates that a virus may be an important factor in causing some types of cancer. Even today, with the work still in its infancy, the industry's press agents work hard to emphasize every minor development of the virus theory, while they ignore or deny related evidence that tobacco smoke causes lung cancer.

Responsible scientists who believe in the virus theory still acknowledge that even if a virus is established eventually as an essential factor in the cause of cancer, this will not rule out the equally essential role of specific carcinogens in causing the malignant process to develop in particular sites—e.g., the tobacco carcinogens in cancer of the lung. Indeed, this may answer the moot question of why some cigarette smokers get lung cancer whereas others do not. The inhalation of smoke may be the mechanism which upsets the balance between the virus and the cells and thus triggers the cancer process.

Dr. Harold S. Diehl, senior vice president for research of the American Cancer Society, offers this simple analogy: "Herpes labialis (cold sores) is a disease caused by a virus that is continuously present in the body, but which causes trouble only when the balance between the virus and the cells of the skin is upset by local irritation, such as a common cold, sunburn or windburn."

The second possibility, from the industry viewpoint, seems more immediate and more promising than the virus theory. This hinges on the forthcoming report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health. If that report is vague, equivocal, compromising, or if it is weighted in the industry's favor, then the tobacco men can afford to relax. Legislation, for example, which might enable the Government to regulate the labeling, advertising, and sale of cigarettes (as is done now with foods, drugs, cosmetics, alcoholic beverages, and other products) will be impossible, at least for a long time to come. Moreover, a weak or equivocal report would enable industry publicists to obscure even more the scientific evidence that implicates cigarettes as a cause of disease, and to persuade the public that such evidence is merely "anticigarette propaganda."

The tobacco men are hopeful and even confident about the outcome. A handful of medical men think the tobacco men are right—they are convinced that the result will be a "coverup" rather than a solution of the problem. Both groups, however, may be guilty of prejudging the Advisory Committee's conclusions.

MORE EVALUATION

How did this committee originate? In June 1961 the leading voluntary American health organizations appealed to the White House, "on the basis of the weight of scientific evidence," for the appointment of a Presidential Commission to "recommend various ways to protect the public" from the health hazards of smoking. Instead, the President referred the matter to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nothing happened.

Then, in the spring of 1962, following the publication of the Royal College report, the President was faced with the question at a televised press conference. As a result, in July 1962, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service announced plans for an "expert committee to study the impact of smoking on health." The committee would first determine the "nature and magnitude of the problem" and then, at some later date, make "recommendations for action."

Medical associations, voluntary health groups, Federal agencies, and the tobacco industry were invited to nominate candidates for membership on the committee. There was one proviso, however: "Scientists who have already taken a strong public position pro or con will not be chosen." Names of some 150 candidates were resubmitted to the participating groups, who were told they could remove individual names "for any reason whatsoever." On October 28 the Surgeon General was able to announce his final selection of 10 scientists—men of known integrity and professional competence.

But doubts about the project were voiced from the outset. Science, official weekly of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said it "apparently reflected a desire by the administration to move the Government off dead center on the tobacco issue, without delivering too severe a jolt to the tobacco industry."

Later, in a letter to Science, three distinguished cancer researchers added: "What useful purpose can be served by another committee to study the tobacco and health issue? The subject has been studied by at least 10 official and voluntary research and health agencies in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and by the World Health Organization. Since the evidence concerning smoking as a health hazard has been assembled and presented so often in the past, there is little excuse for a long delay in answering the question: Is there sufficient health hazard from smoking to justify doing something about it?"

The scientists noted that, since 1950, when the first evidence appeared linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer, little action has been taken. "A conservative estimate of the price of this delay is a quarter million unnecessary deaths (and the accompanying suffering and economic loss). This delay is not happenstance. The tobacco industry has mounted a well-organized and well-financed public relations campaign. The industry experts have developed obfuscation and special pleading into a fine art."

The attitude of the tobacco industry did little to dispel misgivings about the Surgeon General's approach to the problem. The industry, in the past, dismissed all authoritative studies that found cigarettes harmful to health as "sweeping assumptions" and "extreme and unwarranted conclusions." The Royal College report was called "a review of old data without any new research findings."

But now, for some reason, the tobacco men heartily welcomed the new Advisory Committee's "comprehensive review" of the same evidence. Somehow this implied a hope or belief that, this time, the job would be done "without delivering too severe a jolt to the tobacco industry." Last January, the trade journal Tobacco suggested that the worst that could come of it might be Government insistence on "honest" advertising, "full disclosure" of possible ill effects, and "other pressures to stop advertising pointed at youngsters." Then there was this significant statement: "But the Government is operating at a fiscal deficit, and the tax take last year from cigarettes alone was more than $3 billion. The preliminary report may not be too harsh.

DELAYED PUBLICATION?

The Surgeon General's Advisory Committee is still busy studying and evaluating. The report, originally promised for last spring, will not be published until this fall, and there are rumors that it may even be held over until 1964. Most medical men accept this as an encouraging sign that the committee is working hard, digging deep, avoiding hasty judgments. A few, however, attribute the delay to "obfuscation" by the tobacco companies.

What seems to be a fair, well-informed opinion of the probable outcome is expressed by a scientist who is close to the committee but not a member of it. "I have complete confidence in the committee's integrity," he says. "I believe they are trying to do a meticulous and impartial job. But in their efforts to be fair to everyone, they may very well come up with a report which the general public will consider vague, even 'weaselworded.' I do not believe they have been subjected to any direct pressure. But the awareness of possible consequences to a $7 billion industry, the stock market, and the Federal tax revenue hangs over them like a dark cloud."

The cigarette controversy, certainly, is about to enter a new phase. Whether this will be the showdown or merely a coverup remains to be seen.

SUBSIDY ALLOCATIONS TO FEEDER AIRLINES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to make note today of a report, issued last week by the Civil Aeronautics Board, concerning subsidy allocations to feeder airlines in many sections of the country. The report was made public amid a background of speculation in Kansas, especially as the CAB recommendation would affect five western Kansas cities which presently are served by feeder-airline service.

After reviewing the CAB report, I find that the facts indicate that the CAB recognizes that these cities must be given a sufficient trial period with adequate service, before any decision on addition or cessation of service is made. I commend the CAB on its approach to this problem of feeder-line service. I know that our five Kansas cities will develop their passenger traffic within the period of time allotted by CAB before hearings would be initiated.

In the case of our five Kansas cities, two will receive additional flights per day, if this report is accepted. One of our cities had an increase in flights per day in May of this year, and its passenger traffic has shown an improvement of more than 100 percent.

Although this report will not become effective until it is reviewed by a special committee headed by the Secretary of Commerce, and including representatives of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers; Congress will finally determine the report's merit and whether it should be placed in effect.

I urge this special committee, which has been empowered to review the CAB report, to study carefully the figures compiled by the Board and to recognize that an adequate number of daily flights, where presently in effect, and which are producing the desired amount of passengers necessary to retain CAB certification, remain unchanged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH DISTRICT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

FLORENCE ANN SEYMOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, S. 979, be returned to the calendar, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 373, Senate Resolution 186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 186) to pay a gratuity to Florence Ann Seymour.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH DISTRICT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 979, which had been the pending business and was to have been considered today, has been set aside and returned to the calendar because Senators who are vitally interested in the bill have asked for this consideration. The bill will be taken up next month. In the meantime, there will be meetings of the Judicial Council, meetings which are important with relation to the bill. I merely wish the Senate to be on notice that the bill has been only temporarily set aside, in order to accommodate conferences of judges and certain Senators who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary and are vitally interested in the subject.

NEEDED: FREQUENT LONG-RANGE FORECASTS OF RECEIPTS AND SPENDING BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this will be the third in a series of speeches I am making on recommendations that have been made by the Subcommittee on Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee on changes in the way to make the budget a more workable and useful document for Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, when does the administration expect that we will balance the budget if we do not have tax reduction? When does the administration expect that we will balance the budget if we do have tax reduction? What is happening to Government expenditures and tax receipts at the present time? How are the changes that are now occurring in the amounts of Government expenditures influencing the private sector?

I think these are relevant questions. They are certainly questions that each of us as Members of Congress should have answers to at the present time if we are to legislate effectively. However, not one of these questions can be answered from the budget information currently provided.

The only estimate on this subject the country has from the administration is based on the original and quite different tax proposals of the administration and on some very general estimates about increases in expenditure programs. Both of these broad assumptions are now out-the-window.

Congress and the Nation suffer seriously because the latest and most comprehensive estimates of future Government spending and revenues are not made available systematically. They easily could be.

I have indicated in past speeches on this floor, during the last several weeks, several of the recommendations contained in a report by the Economic Statistics Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Joint Economic Committee. This report, entitled "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," makes a series of proposals concerning possible changes in the budget which could make it more useful and more meaningful for Members of Congress. In my previous speeches, I have discussed a number of these proposals. Today, I should like to discuss the suggestions dealing with the timing of budgetary information.

FORECASTING DIFFICULT, BUT VITAL

Mr. President, those who prepare our budget seem to have almost a fear of the future. I share one facet of this fear: I think that we, as social animals, are incapable of accurately forecasting our own future behavior. Such predictions are especially tricky in the economic realm, where the added dimension of dollars is tied to every psychological change by individuals and groups. Economists have not been noted for their accuracy in forecasting, and I share their trepidation concerning future forecasts. However, I think their skill is better than no skill, and that to the best of their abilities they should take responsibility for "guesstimating" the nature of future economic trends.

I am worried, however, that the fear of the future perhaps goes somewhat deeper than simply a lack of reliance upon forecasting ability.

I am sure that is the case, because often I have found, when as a member of the Joint Economic Committee I have questioned eminent economists, that there is very little reluctance on their part to forecast or to estimate, and that there is a great deal of confidence in the validity of their estimates. Yet we in Congress do not receive the benefit we could receive from the estimates made by these very competent and able men. We do not have the benefit of their forecasts, and they are the most gifted economists in the Nation. But perhaps such forecasts are so extreme that there exists an unwillingness to reveal their results. Yet it is always better to know the best judgment of qualified experts on the nature of future problems than to assume that the future is a black and empty abyss. I believe, therefore, that every administration should be required to make and to publish long-range forecasts—by which I mean for 5 years—of the way in which Federal expenditures and receipts are expected to change.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION, NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION HAS DONE IT

This is not an exacting or an extreme proposal. The outgoing Eisenhower administration in 1960 provided 10-year forecasts for both expenditures and receipts. The techniques and procedures are well known, both in the business community, where such forecasts are viewed as essential for investment decisions, and in the economic profession. For example, an organization with its headquarters here in Washington—the National Planning Association—regularly provides 5-year and 10-year forecasts on all sectors of the economy; and these forecasts have proved extremely useful to Congressmen and to others.

ESSENTIAL TO KNOW TOTAL COSTS OF PROGRAMS

There is another reason for insisting upon these longer range forecasts in the budget: Not only is it important to know the most likely future pattern of general expenditures and receipts; it is also essential to know the total costs of contemplated specific expenditures. Under present budgetary procedures, if a new capital acquisition by the Federal Government is to be built over a period extending beyond 1 year, the total anticipated costs of the project are never provided in the budget document.

We simply do not know—for we are not told—how much it is going to cost or how much the full burden of cost will be in the future. That fact is not revealed in the budget document, although the budget could show the total cost burden on the economy or the benefit of such spending—if it does have any—on the economy generally.

For example, a dam which may take 3 years to build will have roughly only one-third of its total cost included in the budget. Thus, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress cannot have information on the expected total expenditures at the time when initial decisions concerning the feasibility of the project are made. Here, again, predictions are hazardous, and exactness cannot be expected. On the other hand, it should be possible to make fairly reasonable estimates with respect to individual projections; and such estimates would seem to be essential to good budgetary management by the Congress.

Does this proposal make practical, workable sense? The experience we have

had indicates the answer is "Yes." We now have the results of laboratory experiments conducted in this area of long-range projections. These experiments have proven quite successful. Not only have advance forecasts yielded information about the future; they have also produced some important byproducts, in the form of revealing future problem areas which policymakers will need to face. They contribute, in other words, storm warnings of problems which otherwise might become urgent at the time when they actually emerge.

The laboratory tests to which I refer are to be found in various agencies of the Government. The principal instance of long-range forecasting currently in use is in the Department of Defense, where of course forecasting is by far the most difficult because the amount of spending is the greatest and changes have to be made as the very rapid changes in military technology proceed. One would think that if there were any area of Government in which forecasting spending would be difficult it would be the area of defense. Yet there, under the very efficient management of Secretary McNamara, such forecasts are made. In the Department of Defense, 5-year extrapolation into the future for the entire Department, in all of its operations, is updated monthly. This method has been found to work well in the Defense Department. More than half the Federal spending is concentrated in this agency. Why could not this method be extended to the rest of Government? Many other agencies of the Government are using similar long-range forecasts, but they are not brought together in the budget document, so that Members of Congress, members of the business community, and economists generally, will be in a position to forecast, predict, and understand what will happen in the future on the basis of how the Government will contribute to the economy.

UP-TO-DATE FIGURES ON BUDGET NEEDED NOW

Mr. President, I also wish to address myself to another question of budgetary timing—namely, the timing of the release of budget figures themselves. In January of this year, the budget for the fiscal year 1964 was presented to Congress by the President. It is now August—8 months later; yet today we have no better figures on the nature of Government receipts and expenditures than we had last January. Surely it is not too much to ask for more frequent revisions of budgetary estimates. The Government provides this type of information with respect to the private sector of the economy, and provides it very usefully; yet it does not provide current figures on its own operations, even though these operations are closely related to the private economy.

It has been argued on occasion that revisions of forecasts are difficult because Congress is slow in making decisions. For example, this year many of the total appropriations bills have not yet been enacted by the Congress. It is further argued that the Bureau of the Budget should not be placed in the awkward position of forecasting the nature of final congressional enactments.

It seems to me that these arguments have some merit. However, they certainly do not apply in the case of Federal receipts and here revisions could be made as quickly as changes in the economy manifest themselves.

Incidentally, insofar as congressional enactments are concerned, they can be made as soon as the Congress acts. We have acted on some measures during the present session of Congress. Both the House and the Senate have acted, and we have acted in concert.

Moreover, the objections are not applicable with respect to appropriations legislation already enacted. The objections are also not valid in the forecasting of continuing or permanent and indefinite appropriations. Better estimates should be available now than were available in January concerning anticipated interest payments on our national debt. Probably better estimates could be made on veterans' programs, on agricultural outlays, and on a number of other areas of expenditures that are either not influenced by current legislation or are only influenced to a very limited extent. In any case, of course, the Bureau of the Budget does make forecasts concerning the enactment of administration programs when it makes its January budget estimates and similar forecasts could be provided at other times throughout the year.

JULY, OCTOBER REVISIONS IN BUDGET ESTIMATES

I would urge, therefore, that the Bureau of the Budget consider various alternative approaches by which additional budget data could be made available to the Congress. One of these approaches would be to make periodic revisions in budget estimates. These revisions might be regularly scheduled for July and October, as well as in January. To the extent that appropriation legislation was not enacted in time for the forecasts, the Bureau of the Budget could simply continue existing forecasts.

An alternative to this approach would be to revise expenditure forecasts after each significant piece of legislation was enacted. A similar procedure is currently used by a number of State governments, according to testimony provided to the Statistics Subcommittee in our hearings on this subject, and apparently the method works quite well.

A number of the budget directors of States appeared before the committee. It was their experience that in the great laboratory of experimentation which we have in the experiences of the 50 States this method of updating forecasts on the basis of legislative enactment was a very efficient and satisfactory way for all concerned to bring up to date the record of State spending. In the same way there is no reason why the method could not be applied successfully to Federal expenditures.

QUARTERLY BREAKDOWN OF BUDGET NEEDED

The final recommendation on the subject of timing contained in our Committee report is that the budget amounts now shown simply on an annual basis should be broken down by calendar quarters. The significance of this proposal lies in the fact that intrayear changes can occur in government receipts and expenditures, and these changes are concealed by annual data. In the calendar year 1963 for instance, it was originally estimated that some of the President's tax reduction program would go into effect. However, also in calendar 1963, a $2 billion tax increase under the social security program did go into effect.

Therefore, while on an annual basis there might well have been net tax reduction in 1963, for at least the first half of the year there were tax increases—and substantial increases, $2 billion increases—which probably served to repress the economy. That was not included in the budget but should have been and could have been very easily.

In making forecasts concerning the economic impact of the Federal Government, it was obviously important to know that tax pressures on the economy were rising during the first half of the year even though they might well have been offset later in the year.

Many other examples could also be given. Defense contractors would like to know not only the amount of additional contracts that will be let but also roughly when, in a particular year, the contracts will be let. Such information would clearly facilitate planning and investment programs by private industry.

Mr. President, time is a valuable asset to the Federal Government as well as to individuals and companies. It should be used and used well. The recommendations I am describing here today are designed simply to obtain greater information within the Federal budget concerning the measurement of the asset of time.

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

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

FACTS ON THE OFF-BASE DISCRIMINATION CONTROVERSY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in days past the Senate has heard discussed what is known as the Gesell report. This report was filed by a distinguished committee with the President of the United States several months ago. It relates to equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States. One of the most carefully read periodicals by Members of the Congress—and I would hope by many others—is the Congressional Quarterly.

In its issue of August 16, 1963, Congressional Quarterly has its typically inclusive, readable, informative summary of the events which occurred following the issuance of the Gesell report. Since this collects in summary form many points of view which have been expressed about a matter which I hope concerns all of us, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Congressional Quarterly, captioned "McNamara Antidiscrimination Directive Stirs Controversy," may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

McNAMARA ANTIDISCRIMINATION DIRECTIVE STIRS CONTROVERSY

The Defense Department's recent directive covering off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen has been widely attacked by southern Congressmen as a club to force integration in communities near military bases. But Defense officials say it will be far less sweeping in its effect than initial reports and interpretations indicated. The order was bound to provoke controversy, landing as it did in the midst of this summer's heated civil rights fight and aimed as it was at the Nation's Military Establishment, which is preponderantly located in the South. (See chart, next page.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

The directive was the outgrowth of a report by a special group appointed over a year ago, in June 1962, by President Kennedy and headed by Washington Attorney Gerhard A. Gesell. The Gesell report which was submitted June 21, 1963, and forwarded from the White House to the Pentagon, is a 93-page documentary of problems still encountered by Negro servicemen on military bases as well as in nearby communities. The report made a battery of suggestions for change. It was promptly branded an "infamous document" by southern Congressmen, who have aimed as much fire at the report as at the directive. (The Gesell Committee is now studying the problems of Negroes in the National Guard and Reserves and those stationed overseas.)

The southerners' basic charge is that the Administration plans to use the military as an instrument for social change. The Pentagon's basic argument is that it is strictly and simply concerned with military effectiveness, which is impaired by demoralizing segregation.

CONTENTS OF DIRECTIVE

The primary misconception about the directive, according to Defense officials, was that the Department planned to make broad use of its "off limits" powers to declare whole communities out of bounds for servicemen. "We hope never to have to use the off-limits sanction," says one Department official. What the July 26 directive did was the following:

Stated that it was the Department's policy to conduct all of its activities in a nondiscriminatory way and that discriminatory practices against servicemen, "all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel, and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness."

Vested the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) with responsibility for protecting the civil rights of members of the Armed Forces and authorized establishment of a new Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

Directed the military services to issue instructions, regulations and manuals regarding the protection of civil rights on base and off base, and to institute in each service a reporting and monitoring system.

Held base commanders responsible for combating on-base and off-base discrimination, and directed that "in discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States."

Directed the military departments to develop the outlines of implementation plans by August 15.

The off-base sanction, therefore, was raised negatively, in the context that it should not be used unless absolutely necessary, and only with the approval of the civilian Secretaries. "This was the least offensive way," said one Defense official, "because it works into the system gradually." "There is no desire to place anything off limits," says another, least of all entire communities. Early press reports had indicated that the Department would declare off limits whole areas where there was "relentless discrimination." This term did not appear in the directive, but was contained in a memorandum to President Kennedy from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara reporting on the Department's new antidiscrimination directive. The memo included the following sentence: "The (Gesell) committee suggests using a form of the off-limits sanction when, despite the commander's best efforts with community leaders, relentless discrimination persists against Negro servicemen and their families." The Secretary continued: "Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less than that caused by off-base vice, as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary. While I would hope that it need never be put in effect, I agree with the committee that a like sanction against discrimination must be available." It is obviously hoped that the mere availability of the sanction will be an effective bargaining lever in negotiations with local officials and businessmen.

Top 10 States in terms of pay and allowances drawn by servicemen stationed within their borders

State	Pay	Servicemen
California	$820,436,000	214,861
Texas	726,590,000	177,318
Virginia	321,560,000	86,396
Georgia	312,497,000	83,773
North Carolina	302,806,000	87,489
Florida	263,167,000	62,864
Washington	184,895,000	46,831
Maryland	184,317,000	48,048
Illinois	181,462,000	45,645
Kentucky	177,817,000	49,909

Defense officials emphasize that they will move slowly and that they do not and cannot have an overall plan. "It will depend on the community," says one. "Maybe the problem is movie houses in one place, and somewhere else it's housing or schools." Base commanders will have primary responsibility for assessing the problems. The new civil rights office, headed by Deputy Assistant Secretary Alfred B. Fitt, will travel, supervise, support, advise and cajole.

The process, however, will be essentially carried out through the services' command channels, and the emphasis will be on negotiations at the local level.

Some observers have expressed doubts that the base comanders are up to the job. The Gesell report said that "the record of base commanders in dealing with such problems has not been impressive." It blamed this on a lack of specific directives or assurance of support from higher up the command ladder and on the commander's own attitudes. "As a group," said the Gesell report, "they do not believe that problems of segregation and racial discrimination in the local community should be their concern." Most of the commanders' community contacts have been with the white power structure interested in preserving a peaceful status quo.

However, Pentagon officials expect the commanders to be cooperative. Says Fitt: "I expect the same doubts were expressed in 1948 when President Truman integrated the troops. The commanders may have had personal problems with this, but they did it." The main job, he says, is "to get instructions to the commanders and then back them up and down the line."

NEGRO SERVICEMEN'S PROBLEMS

The commanders have a long list of problems facing them. Both the Gesell report and Department investigations found that Negro soldiers, who are almost without exception thoroughly integrated with their white colleagues on the bases, frequently meet with discrimination on all fronts once they go into town.

(The Committee found just a few examples of remaining discrimination on base, and said these resulted largely from a lack of communication between commanders and their men. The Pentagon is working to correct this. The report also cited the lack of Negro officers in the services. Pentagon officials said all efforts were being made to see that promotions are given on strictly nondiscriminatory grounds, but that what is most needed is time for Negroes, who did not begin to come into the services in any large numbers until the 1930's, to gain sufficient time and experience for high posts. The normal cycle, they said, is about 30 years before an enlisted man becomes an officer.)

In many locales, Negro soldiers cannot go to a bar or restaurant with their white friends; they must ride segregated transportation facilities; their children must attend segregated schools; they cannot find adequate or decent housing for their families. Negro and white soldiers walking down the street together may be told by local police to "break it up." These conditions, says the Gesell report, "are a constant affront and a constant reminder that the society they are prepared to defend is a society that deprecates their right to full participation as citizens." Some results of the discrimination, according to the report, are that many Negro military families separate "to protect their children and to maintain some degree of dignity," and that "there are bases where Negro personnel confront such intolerable conditions off base that almost any device will be employed to effect a change in duty assignment." (The services generally deny transfer applications based solely on discrimination problems.)

Number of military personnel stationed in each State, and annual payrolls, as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Number	Annual pay and allowances
East (percent)	14.6	14.6
Connecticut	4,933	$18,682,000
Delaware	8,111	$36,286,000
District of Columbia	19,402	$74,107,000
Maine	14,068	$61,783,000
Maryland	48,048	$184,317,000
Massachusetts	33,796	$137,882,000
New Hampshire	8,311	$36,140,000
New Jersey	41,522	$158,247,000
New York	38,914	$157,488,000
Pennsylvania	15,438	$57,800,000
Rhode Island	7,243	$27,363,000
Vermont	464	$1,995,000
West Virginia	630	$2,491,000
West (percent)	27.4	27.4
Alaska	31,452	$126,568,000
Arizona	21,501	$87,434,000
California	214,861	$820,436,000
Colorado	36,568	$147,852,000
Hawaii	41,586	$152,291,000
Idaho	6,125	$26,953,000
Montana	9,494	$42,587,000
Nevada	8,286	$36,036,000
New Mexico	22,660	$95,827,000
Oregon	4,905	$21,593,000
Utah	4,688	$19,561,000
Washington	46,831	$184,895,000
Wyoming	3,793	$17,031,000
Midwest (percent)	12.3	12.9
Illinois	45,645	$181,462,000
Indiana	8,418	$35,092,000
Iowa	1,476	$6,249,000
Kansas	36,954	$147,332,000
Michigan	22,156	$96,731,000
Minnesota	5,260	$21,859,000
Missouri	25,855	$98,737,000
Nebraska	18,621	$82,596,000
North Dakota	10,208	$45,859,000
Ohio	18,935	$81,924,000
South Dakota	5,960	$26,717,000
Wisconsin	4,422	$18,624,000

Number of military personnel stationed in each State, and annual payrolls, as of Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

	Number	Annual pay and allowances
South (percent)	144.4	143.5
Alabama	21,522	$85,075,000
Arkansas	12,420	$52,032,000
Florida	62,864	$263,167,000
Georgia	83,773	$312,497,000
Kentucky	49,909	$177,817,000
Louisiana	30,708	$121,800,000
Mississippi	29,241	$130,230,000
North Carolina	87,489	$302,806,000
Oklahoma	31,137	$122,682,000
South Carolina	42,528	$167,618,000
Tennessee	18,863	$74,124,000
Texas	177,318	$726,590,000
Virginia	86,396	$321,560,000
Total United States	1,654,554	$6,517,332,000

Source: Department of Defense.

The report says that many of the problems are found in the North as well as the South, and that the housing problem is almost universal. "Some bases established in States such as the Dakotas," the report says, "have confronted forms of segregation and discrimination which have much of the same rigidity found in certain Southern communities."

The committee recommended that the commanders work with biracial community committees. It said there were indications that local proprietors in many areas would cooperate if there were a uniform policy.

Defense officials do not pretend that the new directive will solve all of these problems. Fitt outlined the possibilities for progress in the various fields as follows:

Community activities: The Department already had a fixed policy that armed services bands, choirs, sports teams, etc., or representatives of the base, should not participate in community activities if there is segregation. In some areas this has not been carried out, but that will not be the case in the future because of the new instructions.

Transportation: Sometimes transportation facilities which permit integrated seating on base require Negroes to change seats once the bus leaves the base; in other cases there is desegregated seating on the main route to and from the base, but not elsewhere in town. More and more transportation systems in the South are desegregated and, according to Fitt, "there are so many alternatives of travel that commanders can work something out here."

Public accommodations: This, according to Fitt, "is one obvious area of concern to commanders. We're talking here about the ability of a man to buy a sandwich, to go to a park, to go to the movies, to go to a bowling alley. This is a typical kind of activity of men in their free time. When all avenues of that kind of wholesome activity are barred to a serviceman, it has an obvious damaging effect on his morale and effectiveness. Commanders ought to be able to achieve substantial progress for their men in this area because it's so incontestably a reasonable proposition."

Segregation of public facilities in communities adjacent to military installations

Types of segregated public facility	Number of surveyed installations and activities with such segregated facilities [1]		Number of personnel stationed where facilities are segregated		Percentage of surveyed installations and activities with segregated facilities	
	Army	Navy	Army	Navy	Army	Navy
Public schools	48	143	178,109	58,500	24	25
Restaurants and bars	68	238	257,893	110,000	34	43
Theaters	63	223	232,301	105,000	31	40
Swimming pools	19	226	178,201	102,000	9	40
Golf courses	38	164	190,931	82,000	19	29
Beaches	10	203	123,5 2	90,000	5	36
Bowling alleys	32	194	205,901	103,000	16	35
Libraries	10	49	130,179	28,000	5	9
Public transportation	4	47	41,091	22,000	2	8
Hotels, motels	12	252	205,618	141,000	6	45
Churches	23	163	127,402	70,000	11	29

[1] The Army survey for this table covered 201 installations and activities, while the Navy survey covered 559. Each installation and activity surveyed had 100 or more military personnel assigned to it. Less complete analyses by the Air Force and Marine Corps indicated similar patterns.

Source: Gesell report.

Schools: This presents a different kind of problem from trying to get a community to let servicemen walk down the street together or bowl together. Progress in this area will continue to depend largely on protracted litigation. If Congress approves the President's civil rights bills' provision giving the Government the power to bring school desegregation suits, this will make a difference. In the meantime, the Government has filed five suits for the desegregation of schools in districts which receive Federal aid because they have been "impacted" by military installations. The morale of the troops was a major factor listed by the Government in arguing that it should have the right to bring the suits. The Government has won one of the suits at the district court level. Two others were lost and are on appeal. Also, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which administers the "impacted areas" school program, in 1962 announced that it would build its own on-base schools for the children of Federal employees who live and work on Federal installations if the off-base schools were segregated. The first such schools will be open for the fall, 1963, term. Only elementary schools have been built, because in most cases there were not enough pupils to support high schools. HEW took the position that the law did not allow it to build schools for children whose parents lived or worked off base (Weekly report, p. 292).

"Progress in this area will obviously take a long time," Fitt said, "because there are no alternatives in the case of schools. But the commanders can make a persistent attempt to get equal schooling for their men's children, and many have done so."

Housing: The housing problem, Fitt says, "is probably the most difficult of all and certainly the most pervasive. It is particularly hard for the commander to do anything about rental housing." The Gesell report recommended that the Government plan for additional Government-owned or controlled housing where the problem is severe and that it make sure that information on FHA-insured housing, which must be available on a nondiscriminatory basis, is made known to servicemen. The Pentagon is looking over these possibilities. (In one little-noticed action earlier in 1963, the Pentagon established the policy that service bulletin boards throughout the country could not be used to advertise the sale of housing which is not available regardless of race, color or creed.)

The Defense Department parts company with the Gesell report on a number of recommendations. The report recommended that if all else fails, the Department should consider curtailing or closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. McNamara's memo to the President said that he did "not regard this as a feasible action at this time." Thus he did not totally shut the door on the proposal.

The Gesell committee also recommended that every base should have a specific officer to whom Negroes faced with discrimination can take their complaints. The Department feels that there are various ways this should be handled. The challenge, they say, is to let the victims of discrimination know that there is some point to raising their grievances.

One recommendation which southerners jumped on was that "it should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement." One Defense official said that "any commander who makes an especially commendable performance in this field as in any other field will be recognized, but this does not mean that officers will be promoted solely on the basis of singular accomplishments in this field."

Southerners have charged that the Department is exceeding its powers by involving itself with off-base conditions, and is wrongly using the Armed Forces as instruments of social reform. Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, July 31 told the Senate that this could "only result in irreparable injury to the military profession" and that it was "a grave and serious challenge to the long-established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities." Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, insisted that by law the military has no control over the civilian areas outside the military base. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, pointed up the irony of the controversy by charging that the directive was "a complete flip-flop from the administration's concept of the danger of a military man taking over." Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged that it was "the beginning of the police state and the commissar program in America." Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, charged that the Gesell committee had recommended that "the defense functions of the military forces be subordinated to achieving the goal of complete integration."

Defense officials go out of their way to deny that they have embarked on a general civil rights crusade or are using the military as instruments of social change. Says one: "We are not trying to change the life of a town, but the way they treat servicemen. Our policy is military effectiveness; in pursuit of this we are asking the military to see that there is no segregation." They reject the argument that they are exceeding their powers. "We have the power to restrain our own troops from engaging in activities which are deleterious to their morale," says one official. "Nothing is more deleterious to their morale than to have some allowed to participate in some activities and others not because of color."

Thus, the southerners argue that the Pentagon does not have the power to compel the desegregation of public accommodations; the Pentagon argues that it is not desegregating the restaurants, etc., but is prepared to order its men not to patronize those which are segregated.

In the course of attacking the order, GOLDWATER charged that Fitt and others

went into communities "armed with dossiers on the businessmen of the community, dossiers complete with every figure the committee can get out of income tax returns." The Pentagon issued a flat denial.

Those who attacked the order took pains to say that they were not attacking McNamara himself. They said that the directive had undoubtedly been foisted on him by others in the administration, probably Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy (a more vulnerable political target in their districts). Defense officials laughed at the suggestion that the directive had been forced on McNamara against his will.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, not having engaged in the earlier discussion on this report, I wish to make it very clear that I feel that the recommendations of the committee and the action by the Secretary of Defense in response to it should be hailed by all Americans.

PROPOSED LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the question of inspection must be raised and resolved in our considerations of the proposed limited nuclear test ban treaty.

As it stands, of course, the treaty contains no provision for inspection. We are told that it does not need such a provision, that we can check on the performance of the signatory nations by the use of our detection devices. That is not true. There is one entire area of the treaty proposal which cannot be checked by black boxes, or satellites, or ionization counters or any technical means.

That area is section 2 of article I. Let me read it:

> Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to in paragraph 1 of this article.

The wording seems clear to me. A nation that signs this treaty will not cause a nuclear explosion, or test, anywhere in any of the banned environments. A nation that signs this treaty would pledge not to encourage any such test. A nation that signs this treaty would not participate in any such test.

Let us now get down to cases. That clause says that we will not cause, encourage, or participate in regard to any tests that, for instance, the French might carry out. That clause says that the Soviets will not cause, encourage, or participate in regard to any tests that Red China might carry out, to cite just one of the nations that could be involved on their side.

How in the world can any such clause be meaningful if there is no way to inspect it for possible violations?

And how in the world can it be inspected for possible violation through existing technical means? The answer seems clear. It punches a major hole in the validity of the treaty.

Cannot the Soviets immediately claim that we are violating that clause by sharing nuclear information with France? Cannot we immediately ask what protection there is in the treaty against Soviet participation in tests inside the vastness of China? Talk of splits between the Chinese and the Soviets are no more meaningful in this respect than talk of splits between ourselves and the French. We still know whose friend is whose, and what the possibilities for violation actually are.

Secretary Rusk has commented on this by saying that we will not cause, encourage, or participate in regard to French nuclear testing. He can be believed, I am sure. Whether the Russians will share that belief, I cannot say. But Secretary Rusk, in commenting on the other possibility—of the Soviet working the Red Chinese—simply says that he does not believe they will. That is scarcely the sort of assurance on which a treaty can be based.

Inspection of the shipment of fissionable material would be just one of the sorts of inspection that this particular clause of the treaty seems to raise. Transfer of technicians and even of information seems another area. In short, it cries and begs for rigorous inspection and yet provides for absolutely none.

In that way it is symbolic of the entire treaty. It seems only half thought through in its implications. I urge that the Senate try to supply some of the thinking so obviously lacking, lest the mistakes of a few negotiators become the peril of an entire nation, of an entire way of life.

I have spoken of one part of the treaty which demands actual, physical inspection and which will make the treaty meaningless without it. I do not want to gloss over, by that single point, the general impact that this treaty has upon the principle of inspection to which we have hewed until this very proposal.

We have, through countless negotiations with the Soviet, placed the heaviest emphasis upon the need for international inspection of arms agreements. That principle now is dropped in the proposed test ban treaty.

How, having finally renounced our demands for inspection, could we expect to press those demands in future arms control agreements with which we may be faced?

Our position in the United Nations also has reflected part of this problem. We have long been firmly opposed to declaratory treaties, those treaties which simply declare a goal but provide no realistic machinery for inspection, maintenance, or effectiveness. The proposed partial nuclear test ban treaty is surely just such a declaratory treaty. Does it establish a broader precedent than even the arms control precedent? Will it, indeed, establish an entire new avenue of American diplomacy and relationship to international agreements of all sorts? Surely we must not beg this question in studying the proposed treaty.

The people of the United States have, and their representatives have, surely arrived at consensus on the need to inspect, and carefully provide for inspection of any treaty signed with the Soviet Union. Our experience in Cuba alone shows how easily we may be burned. Even with supposedly good air inspection, how long did it take before this Nation was permitted to awaken to the presence of Soviet missiles there? It took almost too long. We risked our lives then. How much more would we be risking our lives now in signing a treaty dealing with the mightiest weapons of all but with no inspection beyond sniffing the air, feeling the ground, or scanning the skies?

No, the question of inspection is not one that is apart from this treaty. Inspection is deeply involved. It must be involved. I call on my colleagues to give this matter their most serious and urgent consideration.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator knows that the test ban treaty which is now the subject of hearings provides a very effective means by which this country can protect its security interests, that is, by prompt withdrawal in case there is any violation. We can do this on our own volition, by serving notice on a 90-day basis; or, if we presume that there has been a violation, we can withdraw immediately.

I am sure the Senator knows that it is the intention of this Government, from all the reports that have been given to us in the hearings, to maintain at peak performance our laboratories and scientific teams in the field of nuclear science and in the field of nuclear weaponry. We intend to maintain testing equipment for atmospheric, underwater and outer space tests at a ready alert, and to engage in an extensive series of underground tests, which are costly and time consuming—an area of testing the Soviet Union has not perfected but one in which we have expert knowledge.

Finally, I point out to the Senator from Arizona that when raising these doubts—which surely is a legitimate activity on the part of any interested citizens or Senator—it is also important to cite what we do to overcome the doubts. For example, we have the most extensive system of inspection and detection of nuclear explosions of any nation on the face of the earth. We have acoustical, electronic, and seismic detection and identification systems. Those systems are tied in with those of other countries.

The particular treaty under discussion would not cover underground tests for the purpose of inspection. Our international inspection system was primarily directed toward the underground tests. In this environment we needed on-site inspections within the Soviet Union to be able to ascertain whether there had been a violation by underground testing. The problem here is one of differentiating between earthquakes and underground nuclear explosions. This requires an extensive system of seismic stations surrounding the Soviet Union and within the Soviet Union, and a freedom to move within the Soviet Union for on-site inspection.

The limited nuclear test ban treaty relies upon the national systems of surveillance; seismic, electronic and acoustical systems, plus the regular intelligence services of our Government and of friendly countries.

Furthermore, the treaty will be signed by many scores of nations, all of whom

have a stake in seeing the treaty enforced and observed.

I rise to protest the strawmen that are set up day after day for someone to come in later and knock down and say, "I have proved my point."

The basic structure of this treaty was submitted by the previous administration; it has been recommended by Members of Congress, by resolutions. The treaty before us is the most simple and direct treaty we could sign in our national interest. The testimony reveals that it is in our national interest. I do not feel that we ought to be frightening the American people as to what is in this treaty or what it means to our security.

The treaty provides every safeguard that could possibly be provided. The treaty provides more safeguards than there were in the so-called uninspected moratorium, which was approved by the previous administration, and which included underground tests.

The treaty requires careful consideration. The hearings have been productive. Nothing has been said in the hearings to date which was not known before or which would in any way frighten the American people into a position of doubt as to the reliability of the instrument we have signed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have been listening very carefully. I have been trying to ascertain the point the Senator is trying to make.

I agree with what the Senator has said, but I think the point he is trying to get across is that Senators have no right to stand up and ask questions about the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will read my remarks carefully, he will find there is an area of doubt, but not in the same area. The Senator from Minnesota has raised some very intelligent questions. I know about seismic detection. I know we cannot distinguish between earthquakes and nuclear explosions. I am not arguing that point at all. I am arguing whether there is some doubt as to whether we would have to give up our help with the French, or what the Soviet attitude is toward Red China, or any other country. Once Cuba is recognized as a signatory of this treaty, there is nothing to prevent any other country from giving her atomic information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This is what occurs to me at the time. This is the point I am trying to make. The Senator from Minnesota is making a long recital of things he knows I know, and he knows I agree with him. I am merely trying to raise questions which are in my mind, and I intend to continue raising them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is entitled to do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He would be remiss in his duty if he did not.

All I am saying is that the Senator has indicated certain things. He has indicated that the treaty would not be subject to inspection—which is not true. It is subject to inspection—it is subject to our national inspection system.

The Senator has questioned whether or not the treaty would be abided by. I think the point he is trying to make to the American people is a disservice, namely that the treaty is an open invitation to avoidance or evasion. The Senator says the treaty is not subject to inspection. I say it is subject to our inspection. The Senator's questions tend to obscure rather than illuminate the Senate's consideration of this treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is not subject to the type of inspection that we have been insisting on year after year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For underground tests?

Mr. GOLDWATER. For all tests. We held, in ventures in the past in trying to reach agreements, that we needed onsite inspections.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is talking about onsite inspections for the comprehensive, overall nuclear test ban proposals, which included underground tests. I am not going to let the Senator from Arizona befog or becloud the record or to obscure the central issue. The tests being banned under the treaty are the very areas which the previous administration recommended for the kind of treaty we now have, and the previous comprehensive test ban proposals were not approved. It was in the area of onsite inspection and international control where we had differences. The Senator from Minnesota represents that this treaty is subject to inspection—our inspection—and we can withdraw at any time that we find it is in our national interest to do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will take the trouble in the morning to read the remarks I have made, he will see that I am outlining an area in which I feel that a different type of inspection is needed. I may be mistaken, but the Senator is not talking to the point, so we are not solving it. The point I make is that after reading the draft of the treaty I have a question in my mind as to whether or not we need a better inspection system in that area. I admit that the situation may never develop, but the fact that it could develop worries me. I know we can withdraw. That is the most palatable part of the treaty. I would not want to join in one that was irrevocable.

I further suggest that, in the whole area of underground testing, we can test as much as they and they can test as much as we can. In this we are not stopping a proliferation of weapons. I think we are adding to the proliferation of weapons. But this is neither for nor against the treaty. I have merely raised a question, as have other Members of the Senate. I asked Dean Rusk for a complete briefing—I have not received it yet, but I know I will—as to why, by East Germany's signing the treaty, we would not be in effect recognizing her. I take his word for it. I believe him. But I want to have some legal proof before I say "Yes." I am merely raising questions. I merely wanted to clarify the issue and debate it. I hope the Senator from Minnesota does not suggest that a Senator ought not to have the right or duty to stand up and raise a question. When I have other questions I intend to raise them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The practice of continually raising questions is a good way to indicate a deep interest in the subject; and the Senator from Arizona has a deep interest in it. But these questions have already been raised. The point with respect to recognition of East Germany has been answered. A pamphlet has been published by the Foreign Relations Committee on the legal question involved. Furthermore, the State Department has a memorandum on this particular legal issue. I point out that the West German Republic has many agreements with East Germany, but it does not recognize the East German regime. East Germany has signed certain protocols and agreements relating to prisoners of war to which we are signatories. That does not mean that the East German regime has been recognized.

First the Senator from Arizona announced that he was opposed to the treaty——

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At one time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I said I was opposed to the draft that Dean Rusk showed us 2 or 3 days before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was the same treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; it was not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respectfully differ.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I respectfully differ. I heard it. I was present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to learn that the Senator is not opposed to the treaty. This is encouraging to me, because I felt that eventually he would not be opposed to it. He is sensible, wise, and intelligent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Flattery will get the Senator everything.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to know that the Senator will be on the side of those supporting the treaty. West Germany did not have any difficulty with it, because it signed the treaty. West Germany is not as worried about its relationships with East Germany as we are. The Associated Press indicated a few moments ago that the Republic of West Germany signed the treaty.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator is interested in my becoming enlightened in this field, if he will allow me to ask questions, I may be contented, and he may find me going arm in arm with him——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wonderful.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But not having all the intelligence that the Senator from Minnesota has——

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is going too far.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He is going to hinder me and place hurdles in my road. I merely want to be as well informed on this subject as those who have already made up their minds. I hope the Senator will not undertake to restrain me from asking questions in the future that I regard as important questions to me. I hope the Senator will not deny me that right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will join the Senator in that exercise of interrogation. I read with considerable interest the Senator's speech during the past weekend. I listened to his remarks today. Both speeches indicate to me that a number of questions are being asked.

The public record, as well as the executive record, has answered these questions. But the constant repetition of them does not reassure the people of the United States. What is needed is reassurance from those who have listened to the testimony. All the questions that have been asked are being answered responsively and effectively. The testimony of Secretary Rusk, the testimony of General Taylor, and the testimony of Mr. McCone, as well as the testimony of other witnesses who have appeared before the committee, has been candid, to the point, and responsive to the questions which have been asked by thoughtful Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Arizona. But let us now acknowledge that these questions have been answered.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe I have missed one session of the committee hearings on this treaty. I have heard Dean Rusk, and I have heard General Taylor. The fact that there is still some question in my mind indicates that there are areas in the treaty to be questioned. I do not believe a treaty should be brought before the Senate and voted on merely because it seems to be the politically proper or appropriate thing to do or because the President wants it or does not want it. I believe these issues should be considered carefully. I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. My knowledge in this field is entirely military and technical. I must proceed with some caution in a field in which the Senator from Minnesota is so brilliant; namely, foreign policy and international problems. I hope the Senator will therefore help me in my ignorance. I shall be grateful if he will extend my knowledge in this field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's expression of humility does him well. His knowledge in this field is far beyond his present testimony, and I am more than happy to be his witness.

The RECORD will indicate that the Senator from Arizona attempted to tell the American people that we were trying to establish a new pattern and a new policy by signing an agreement without a provision for inspection; and that apparently we were growing a little weak in terms of our relationships with the Soviet Union because the treaty on these subjects is wide open to violation. All that the Senator from Minnesota says is that such statements plant doubts which should be resolved by testimony, and which have been resolved by testimony.

The inspection that is provided is adequate for the type of treaty we are discussing. On-site, international control inspection was required in connection with a comprehensive treaty that included underground tests. I am sure that my remarks at this point will prove to be very pertinent to this RECORD. I may have more to say later.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to keep the Record straight. I believe that I commented upon the fact that historically we have not been in the habit of making a declaratory type of treaty. That is what I mentioned as being a step in a direction that we have not taken before. I believe that if the Senator from Minnesota will read my speech he will find that to be the case. I am not raising the issue of inspection, because I do not believe that there can be an effective inspection system other than an on-site inspection system. In other words, as it is, if they are going to cheat, they will cheat, and we shall have a hard time catching them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not consider the treaty a declaratory statement. It is a first step in the attempt to bring nuclear weaponry under control. It is a primary, preliminary step. However, I believe it is a very important step in our effort to prevent further proliferation of these weapons. It is not the answer to all problems. It does not represent a major step toward disarmament. It does not reduce our military power. There are many things that it does not do.

As the President says in his message to the Senate:

> This treaty is the first concrete result of 18 years of effort by the United States to impose limits on the nuclear arms race.

Then he goes on to say:

> This treaty is the whole agreement. U.S. negotiators in Moscow were instructed not to make this agreement conditioned upon any other understanding; and they made none.
>
> This treaty advances, though it does not assure, world peace; and it will inhibit, though it does not prohibit, the nuclear arms race.

This is not merely a declaratory statement.

I thank the Senator for his indulgence. I will examine the Senator's speech in more detail. The Senator says, "Having finally renounced our demands for inspection, could we expect to press those demands in future arms control agreements with which we may be faced?" I say that that kind of question is misleading.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it a fair question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not a fair question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. It is not fair because we have not renounced our demands for inspection. Our demands for inspection were in connection with a comprehensive nuclear test treaty. The Senator from Minnesota has said on the floor dozens of times that he has been in favor of this proposal, and encourages it. Furthermore, I have not heard his entire speech. I have heard only a part of it. However, in his speech the Senator asks: "And how in the world can any such clause be meaningful if there is no way to inspect it for possible violations?"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is that a fair question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but the answer is as obvious as the presence of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Why?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are means of inspection; and the Senator knows it. He ought to be telling the American people that there is a means of inspection; namely, the inspection system of the United States, which is managed by the U.S. Air Force, of which the Senator is a renowned and respected member.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish the Senator would read the entire statement at his leisure. If he does so, he will see that I am not referring to the area of inspection that we discussed previously. I am talking about the question that arose as a result of the signing of the treaty with other countries; namely, that it might allow other countries to develop a nuclear power which they now have no opportunity to develop. I wish the Senator would read the entire statement, and not take portions of it out of context. I believe I have raised a fair, legitimate question. If the Senator can answer it, I shall be grateful to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to do so. With respect to inspection, we have not renounced our requirement for inspection in a comprehensive treaty. I believe that the Senator's speech presents a constant attitude of doubt and suspicion. I do not believe it makes a constructive contribution to a thoughtful discussion of the all-important treaty that is before us.

There is a doubt on some points. There is some doubt as to what will be the reaction of the Soviet Union if we were to give nuclear weaponry and nuclear information to France.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has asked for specific information on that point from the State Department, and he will get it. There is doubt as to what we could expect if China were to explode a nuclear device. All these questions have been referred to in testimony, and they have been discussed at length. All that the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that a continuation of the recital of the doubts, the setting up of strawmen, and the occasional knocking down of those strawmen by the one who initially sets them up, does not contribute to what I believe to be a thoughtful consideration of the treaty.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Perhaps I am in error, but when I am engaged in dealing with the Soviet Union, the Communists, I believe I have some ground for being a bit distrustful, and I shall continue to be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every man is distrustful. It is "old hat" to say that we

ought to be distrustful of the Communists.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it wrong to say it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed not; let the Senator say it repeatedly. However, it does not fortify the Senator's argument. No treaty with the Soviet Union will be worth the paper it is written on unless it contains some mutual advantages. Furthermore, as Admiral Radford once said, We develop our system of international inspection as an alternative to trust."

Mr. President, we have poured millions of dollars into the system of international inspection.

We have farflung inspection facilities, and every Member of this body is fully aware of it. I believe the American people ought to be told that the treaty is not merely a declaratory statement, but that it involves a system of inspection. They should be told that we are paying for it, and that we will rely upon our inspection system to make sure that the treaty is observed and that there is no violation of it. If there is a violation, we will be ready to take whatever action is appropriate under the existing circumstances.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Once again, the Senator gets away from the point. I admit all the things the Senator is talking about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so helpful about admitting all these wonderful things.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will allow me to direct his attention to the basic question that arises by the language of the treaty, I have no doubt about our inspection. I think I know as much about it as does the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps more.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have great faith in it. I am aware of its weaknesses, but we are not discussing them today. I am discussing a question I have in my mind, that I stated on the floor of the Senate, but which, except for the last part, the Senator from Minnesota did not hear. The Senator from Minnesota took exception to it. When he studies the question I propounded, if he can enlighten me on the subject, I shall be very happy to be enlightened. He will not find the question on the last page.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Despite all the genteel protestations, when I read again what the Senator from Arizona said, it is quite obvious what the impact or import of the question is. We know that suspicion exists apart from the treaty. I call upon all Senators to give this subject their serious attention. The Senator from Minnesota will give it serious consideration. Inspection is involved. The Senator from Arizona asks:

> How much more would we be risking our lives now in signing a treaty dealing with the mightiest weapons of all but with no inspection beyond sniffing the air, feeling the ground, or scanning the skies

Sniffing the air under the inspection system we have is a little more than talking about hay fever. It is a mighty process. It involves planes and manpower. It involves the highest, most intricate techniques of air inspection and filtration for atomic debris. It means scanning the skies with radar and electronic devices. That is no little picture of looking up at the milky way or the moon. It is a mighty, technical, and effective process.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. So let the Senator from Arizona put the question directly. He said the issue was inspection. That issue is well met in the treaty. It is our inspection system. We are the judge of whether the treaty is being fulfilled. If ever there was a treaty that protected the national sovereignty of the United States of America, this is it. If there were an international inspection system I can imagine the Senator saying, "Are we going to trust those foreigners?" No; we are trusting ourselves, and are trusting the finest inspection apparatus that any country has ever known.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We are getting into a discussion without the Senator's reading my question. He is not giving attention to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to tell me what the question is? I have re-read his statement the second time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Senator has not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would be most happy to have the Senator state the question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I hope the Senator will read the question and give me an intelligent answer, because I think I asked a legitimate question. It has nothing to do with our inspection system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the Senator talking about in his speech? Would he mind delineating his remarks?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It pertains to section 2 of article 1. That language reads:

> Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this article.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This wording, as I said, seems clear:

> A nation that signs this treaty will not cause a nuclear explosion, or test, anywhere in any of the banned environments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then:

> A nation that signs this treaty would pledge not to encourage any such test.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that has been testified to in all the hearings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And:

> A nation that signs this treaty would not participate in any such test.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona is making a good case for the treaty. What is the question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. We will get to it. That clause provides that we will not cause, encourage, or participate in regard to any test the French may make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] placed that question before the State Department. The question will be answered. A vigorous answer will be made available to the American people.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator agrees with me, then, that there is a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota does not agree. The Senator says that the Senator from Arizona is about a week late in catching up with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It takes about that much time to catch up with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon is a fast man.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The same clause provides that the Soviets will not cause, encourage, or participate in regard to any test Red China may carry out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This is where the present inspection system, in my opinion, is not meaningful, and where I have a question. How in the world can any such clause be meaningful if there is no way to inspect for possible violations? There must be a way to inspect for possible violations. We can inspect on the basis of our ability. I think we can say, without violating secrets, that we can inspect the mainland, heartland, of Russia. I do not think we are set up to inspect any disturbances that might be seismic in nature in China.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We can do so every bit as well as we can in Russia.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We cannot discuss that subject on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona and I know that. I do not say we can inspect all seismic events in Russia; but we can do it as well there as we can in China.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We cannot talk about that on the floor of the Senate. That is the question I would like to have answered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the other question? The question is one of inspection. The Senator from Arizona not only raises the point of inspection in that situation, but the entire force of his speech was upon the subject of inspection, planting doubts in the American mind as to whether the treaty provides for inspection.

I say unqualifiedly that the treaty provides for inspection—our inspection. Who else said so? Secretary Rusk, Mr. McCone, and General Taylor. They were witnesses before the committee. Secretary McNamara also testified.

Everyone knows that the treaty provides for inspection. Whether the inspection is as good as it ought to be is a question that can be argued. I am of the opinion that our inspection system can be improved. But let the record be perfectly clear that we do not trust the Soviets, and they do not trust us. We have our inspection system. That is the alternative to trust. To me, the treaty is an enforcible document to protect our

national security. We will rely on our national inspection system. The taxpayers of the United States have put hundreds of millions of dollars into this system and have reached a number of agreements with the friendly powers of the world, with whom there is a tie-in of their inspection systems with our own. Many scores of countries will sign the treaty, all of them interested in seeing that the treaty is abided by.

The argument of the Senator from Arizona has very weak underpinnings. It is primarily an expression of doubt, to which he knows the answer. That is the kind of protest the Senator from Arizona makes. I can question whether today is Monday and tomorrow will be Tuesday. I can raise a question. But there are answers to many of the questions, and the answers have been made. The answer to the Senator's speech is in the record. It was answered by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Defense, and by General Taylor, and it will be answered a thousand times in the weeks ahead, because the question merely raises the simple issue as to whether we have decided to sign a treaty that is open to violation without inspection. That is the import of that question. The Senator from Minnesota says that such a question is a disservice to the treaty, to those who negotiated it, and to Congress. The question is designed to obscure rather than enlighten the debate on this vital question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In closing, I say that the Senator from Minnesota recognizes that there is a question. He has recognized it by saying that a memorandum will be submitted to cover the general question. I did not know that such a memorandum was forthcoming; but I still have the question in my mind, despite what the Senator from Minnesota may think are my intentions. I intend to continue to exercise my freedom in this body by raising the question. I do not care what the Senator from Minnesota thinks my motives may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not contest the Senator's motives. His motives are always good, but his information is what is lacking.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to deliver my daily speech in opposition to the foreign aid bill. I missed a few days; I had to go to Peru, to the inauguration of the new Peruvian president; and that took me away from the Senate for a few days. There have been several other interruptions because of official business.

Today, I propose to raise another point in opposition to the foreign aid bill. I direct attention to the expenditure of American funds in Europe for the defense of Berlin and West Germany, for the continuance of this foreign policy issue is costing the United States billions of dollars. In view of the balance-of-payments problems which confront us, in view of the rehabilitation of Germany by American taxpayers, and in view of the very large defense expenditures we must make, all of which I voted for, and would again, we have not just the right but the duty to question whether these costs are for basic American interests. Our entire foreign aid program to European NATO members, to Greece and Turkey, to Spain and Portugal, to several countries in north Africa and in parts of the Middle East, is designed to strengthen free world defenses against encroachments upon West Germany and West Berlin.

In my opinion, this is a burden of which the United States is carrying an undue share. In my opinion, the time has come to stop foreign aid to NATO. The time has come to stop spending so much money for military purposes in West Germany. The time has come to make perfectly clear to West Germany that she has been economically rehabilitated, is now rich, and should pay a much larger share of the cost of her protection.

Beyond that, there is the question of whether the policies of the German Government are in any way repsonsible for perpetuating any of these conditions that are costing the United States so much money. This question is clearly raised by some of Bonn's complaints about the handling of the test ban treaty and about future negotiations over possible guards against surprise attack.

I am delighted to know that today West Germany is the 61st nation to sign the test ban treaty. I also take note that some very interesting discussions took place between President Adenauer and the U.S. Secretary of State before there was any decision by West Germany to sign the test ban treaty. It is perfectly all right for such conversations to take place; but in my judgment we have maneuvered ourselves into a foreign policy position in which apparently our country hesitates to make any move in Europe until it is first cleared with Adenauer. I suggest to the State Department that it is time first to clear it with the American people, and that we had better discuss some of these problems with the American people before we proceed to discuss them with the heads of foreign states, even friendly states.

So I repeat that I am satisfied this administration does not yet grasp the changing opinion at the precinct level in America in regard to the fleecing of the American taxpayers to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars by continuation of American foreign aid in many areas of the world where our foreign aid should stop, and where our expenditures should be taken over in part by others.

Next week, in a speech which will be longer than the one I am making today, I shall discuss my amendment to the foreing aid bill. In due course the amendment will reach the floor of the Senate; and it will call for an end to all our foreign aid by the end of the fiscal year 1965.

That does not mean we shall not continue foreign aid; but it means that we will discontinue this program of foreign aid. Then we will say to the world that American unilateral foreign aid—for much of our foreign aid for years has been unilateral, and a good deal of it has been forced upon foreign countries—will end. I favor a continuation of foreign aid, when entered into as a result of direct negotiation, on a bilateral basis, between the United States and the foreign government concerned, as regards specific uses, project by project, for which American money is to be appropriated.

Mr. President, some weeks ago I said the proposed expenditure of $4½ billion, as called for in this year's foreign aid authorization bill, should be cut 25 percent. However, that was an understatement; the cut should be greater, but at the least we should cut it 25 percent. In addition, more and more reports which I am receiving from more and more people returning from Europe—responsible citizens of the United States—convince me all the more that this is the year to stop further aid by us to NATO and to some countries bordering on NATO countries. Let West Germany, France, and Great Britain enter with us into an understanding as to how much they will contribute to any continuation of aid to Greece and Turkey. Today, the United States pays for most of it. Some say Greece and Turkey are not important to the defense of West Germany, France, England, The Netherlands, and the rest of the NATO countries. But if the defense of those two countries is important to the rest of the NATO allies, let the rest of the NATO allies help pay to support their economies and their armies, too. Today the NATO countries are more prosperous than ever before. They are the recipients of billions of dollars of American largess. France, has received more than $9 billion; yet we find De Gaulle following an anti-American course of action. We find him taking a nationalistic course of action in regard to nuclear power. As I have said before on this floor, I am opposed to giving him anything for the development of French nuclear power.

Early this afternoon there was some discussion about the memorandum I called for, from this administration, in regard to exactly what is proposes to do about the United States vis-a-vis France in regard to nuclear power, once the test ban treaty is approved. I repeat that if this administration intends to do anything to aid De Gaulle in connection with the development of French nuclear power, while he insists he will not be a party to the treaty, but will continue nuclear testing in the atmosphere, this administration will be guilty of making the treaty a scrap of paper at the very time when it is approved.

Mr. President, not only do we need to consider France and our country's relationships with her; in addition, we had better take a long, hard look at our country's relationships with West Germany.

Although it may seem to many to be extraneous to the test ban treaty, there has nonetheless been injected into its consideration the question of the division of Germany. This issue, raised by the Federal Republic, necessitated a stopover in Bonn by Secretary Rusk, to reassure Chancellor Adenauer that regardless of whether East Germany signs the treaty, the United States does not plan to change its policy toward East Germany.

It is certainly evident that the Federal Republic regards this question as a paramount one for itself, and expects it to be a paramount one for the United States, as well. We are on notice that all our relationships and negotiations with the Soviet Union will be examined in West Germany from the standpoint of whether they tend to give any standing to the Government of East Germany. So it is time for some public discussion in this country of this whole issue.

In fact, I think the time has come for an emancipation proclamation freeing American foreign policy from West German foreign policy. I do not look with approval on the policy of "clearing it with Adenauer." I am perfectly willing to have our country consult with Adenauer; but American foreign policy should be determined on the basis of what is the best interests of the United States, not those of West Germany. Furthermore, West Germany, as well as the United States, has global responsibilities, now that West Germany has reached a position of great wealth and affluence.

It seems to me that whatever they expect their own policy toward East Germany to be, the political leaders of West Germany are wearing political blinders if they think the American people will for long place the issue of nonrecognition of the Communist regime ahead of prospects for a relaxation in tensions between ourselves and the Soviet Union. Someone in Bonn is kidding himself if he thinks the East German question can for long delay a detente between East and West, if other conditions are conducive to a detente.

HOW DOES REJECTION OF EAST GERMAN TIES LEAD TO UNIFICATION?

This leads me to a related matter. It is the question that has been growing in my mind of just what the present nonrecognition policy toward East Germany is supposed to accomplish.

We share, and sympathize with, the ultimate objective of the reunification of Germany.

Let the record be clear. The senior Senator from Oregon wishes to see a reunification of Germany. The division of Germany is an unnatural one; it was never contemplated by the Western Allies at the close of World War II that the occupation zones should become separate countries. We know that we meant for Germany to be occupied temporarily, until the war in the Pacific was concluded, and that then there would be a final settlement and peace treaty. The occupation of the country and of the city of Berlin was supposed to take care of the governing of Germany only until we could come back to it in a permanent treaty.

On several occasions in recent years I have discussed the Potsdam agreement on the floor of the Senate, and pointed out that the historic record of the Potsdam agreement is perfectly clear. The major powers that agreed on the Potsdam agreement entered into a temporary understanding in respect to Germany until they first finished the defeat of Japan. They had a falling out after the defeat of Japan, and so we had left this temporary arrangement that was entered into at Potsdam, and the Big Five have never been able to reach a permanent agreement in regard to what the final solution of the German question was to be.

So I say that although the agreement was supposed to be temporary, it did not turn out that way. The division of Germany became a fact. The government set up by the Communists became just as real is if we recognized it. Defeated and overrun by countries it had attacked, the separation and dismemberment of the country became a German legacy from the Third Reich. Put more bluntly, the division of the country became one of the prices the German people paid for starting a war and losing it.

Memories are pretty short. That is a human frailty. A little recalling will not hurt in regard to this major foreign policy problem. Do not forget that Russia was devastated by the German Army to an extent that some military strategists and military historians say was unequaled in all human history. Germany has not been able to wipe the slate clean of blood in the history of the world. Forget about the Governments of Russia and Poland. Do not forget what is ingrained in the heritage of the people of Russia and Poland. The merciless, brutal, cruel, and devastating atrocities of the German Army have not yet been wiped off the pages of history.

Yet we listen to some these days who apparently are oblivious to the record of Germany and are oblivious to the repeated threat from Germany to the peace of the world.

I wish to see a united Germany, but I wish to see a united Germany under a negotiated settlement that will remove a repetition of that danger. Let us be frank about that, too. There are many reliable authorities who will tell us that that danger has not been removed. They are living in free countries. Of course, if one should go into the Communist orbit, he would find that the possibility of German aggression is a frightening ogre. It beclouds the thinking of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. But we see the difficulty of discussing a subject such as this. So many people will not think in terms of historic perspective. So many people are thinking only of the immediate present, their own skins and their own selfish interests. We are dealing here with a problem that may very well determine the direction of mankind 100 years from now.

I do not mean that retribution must be exacted. The futility of punitive peace treaties should be obvious to anyone who can read history. But what one can reasonably expect in the future is often limited by what has happened in the past.

There is a great solemn responsibility of statesmanship to think in terms of a century or two and not in terms of a day in the present.

So we must think of the German question as a question that involves unfinished business and a question that can be solved only by a negotiated settlement. If there are those who think that the German question can and will be decided by West Germany, on her terms, they never will live so long as to see a united Germany. It is not in the cards. In my judgment, there is no more chance of Poland, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and the rest of the Communist bloc—and it happens to be an ugly reality in this world in which mankind lives—agreeing to a settlement of the German question by West Germany than there is of my flying to the moon.

We have not been very realistic in some of our diplomatic discussions with West Germany. I am inclined to think that we have tended to give too many false impressions and unrealistic false hopes that West Germany will write the ticket of the settlement.

There has grown up around this de facto division a whole set of vested interests and emotions both on the side of the status quo and in opposition to the status quo. I can understand the attitude of the Poles and the Russians and some of Germany's other victims, and their apprehensions at the prospect of a reunified Germany. Those apprehensions cannot be taken lightly, nor can they be ignored in the consideration of how and under what terms unification can take place.

I certainly think Americans believe that Germany should be reunified, just as the Germans do. But we know that can only be achieved by negotiation.

It is unthinkable that it could be achieved by war, for under such circumstances there would not be anything left to reunite. We know, and the government in Bonn knows, too, that if reunification is a practical objective and not just a pious dream, it can only be reached by negotiation, and those negotiations must take place among the Soviet Union, East Germany, West Germany, France, Britain, and the United States. Moreover, the Western Powers, and probably West Germany in particular, must expect to pay a price for reunification.

So I think it is fair for Americans to ask the Bonn Government if the Communist Government is not just as real as it can ever get. And does not rejection of any and all dealings with the East German Government really confirm and harden the division of Germany, and make impossible any change in the status quo? Is Bonn satisfied to keep reunification as a hypothetical objective instead of a practical one? And how long does it think the rest of the world—the rest of the Western World—will respect and share its policy of nonrecognition when that policy has no apparent objective, no apparent end, and no apparent relationship to reality? Worst of all, that policy offers no means whatever of leading to or bringing about reunification of Germany.

In my opinion, both Bonn and Washington are contributing to the permanence of the division of Germany by following this policy. In the minds of some, that is a good thing. But it is not our stated objective, nor is it the stated objective of Bonn. I see not the slightest advance, or hope of advance, toward our stated objective, except by undertaking some contacts with those who must be dealt with in the matter of reunifica-

tion. If Bonn is merely waiting for lightning to strike dead the East German Communists, that may satisfy the people of Germany but it will not satisfy everyone else.

The present rejection policy—and it is political rejection, not an economic one—can only continue so long as there are other issues between East and West so critical and far reaching as to make the reunification issue somewhat secondary. But let any real evidence appear that an easing of other issues is possible, and the nonrecognition question will not stand in the way, so far as this country is concerned.

There is an interesting paradox, a remarkable inconsistency, in the minds of some in connection with West German policy toward East Germany.

I have asked for the facts. I have asked the administration to supply me with all the information available as to the extent of trade between West Germany and East Germany. That will be very interesting material to be used in several connections with respect to the foreign aid debate.

I say to my colleagues, "You should get all ready for those speeches which will be given with respect to the most-favored-nation clause."

The old eagle up there in the ceiling will be flapping his wings once more, trying to fly away under the barrage, when we are told that we must not help people because they may be behind the Iron Curtain.

I should like to find out to what extent West Germany is carrying on trade with peoples behind the Iron Curtain—not only in East Germany, but also elsewhere.

This is one of the great instrumentalities we have for beating communism. I am not critical of trade between East and West Germany. I want to get the facts about it. Well-fed people will not buy communism. People with a decent standard of living will not buy communism. That is why, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Senators find me so often pleading, in the committee and in the Senate, for the export to Latin America of economic freedom. If we can establish a system of economic freedom, that system will take care of communism.

But Bonn cannot expect to enjoy economic contacts with East Germany without others beginning to ask, "Why not political contacts?"

When there is mentioned to West Germany any diplomatic conversations in connection with East Germany, either the Secretary of State of the United States or some other high official is promptly off in a jetplane to Bonn to talk to Adenauer. I am not impressed. I do not think we ought to let West Germany have its cake and eat it, too. I think the time has come for us to raise some very serious questions of great import in connection with American policy toward West Germany.

We have largely deferred to Bonn in the past, where East Germany is concerned. But should it appear that this deference is forestalling better relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the question will be put squarely up to the Federal Republic of whether it really wants reunification; and, if so, what price is it willing to pay for it?

It is to be hoped that the initiative for a change in this dichotomic policy will come from Bonn, for it is a matter of greatest import to the Germans. It cannot be expected that the United States, any more than Russia, can view the division of Germany as a problem that must perpetuate the cold war indefinitely. It can be part of the cold war, but it is not a cold war in itself.

Moreover, had events gone as we expected them to at the close of World War II, there would not have been any Federal Republic, or any Bonn government, to wield the weight it wields today on this issue. Suppose that late in 1945 or in 1946 we had had a peace conference over Germany. The terms would have been worked out among the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and France, with representation of some kind from representatives within the occupation zones. If one were to speculate on what kind of permanent settlement for Germany might have been arranged at that time, one has to conclude that Germany would have paid some unknown price, and a very high one, for a return to complete self-government of a unified country.

I assure Senators there would not have been anything in those terms which would have provided for sharing atomic power, yet who would deny that some in West Germany have designs on making her a nuclear power? Who is short-sighted or foolish enough to think that if Germany presses those designs, Russia is going to stand up and applaud?

Mr. President, that day of reckoning for Germany has been postponed for 18 years. Has it in fact been canceled? Is it to be assumed that the de facto peace settlement for Germany is its permanent division into east and west?

If this is the assumption, then there is not much point in the continued rejection of all political contacts with East Germany.

If it is not the assumption, then the same negotiations among the same parties and with the same understanding that concessions must be made to gain unified self-government have to be undertaken, as would have had to be undertaken in 1945 if the German question had been settled then.

Today, the United States would probably not impose a German settlement on an unwilling Bonn Government. This is an advantage the Federal Republic has today that did not exist in 1945. It is why I believe the initiative should come from there. It is why I express the fervent hope that someone of political responsibility in the councils of the West German Government is giving thought and formulating some opinions as to whether Germany does want to undertake practical steps to unite the country or whether it is willing to accept the status quo as the final settlement of World War II, and hence accept the existence of East Germany.

If the Germans fail to decide this issue for themselves, they run the risk of having it decided for them by others.

We cannot wish off the face of the globe the existence of West Germany, nor of East Germany, Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, nor of any other area directly and immediately affected by whatever the final decision may be in respect to the permanent status of Germany, separated or unified. But I think the time has come when we ought to say to West Germany, "We are going to determine American foreign policy in the best interests of America, and no longer are going to have to clear with Adenauer or his successor."

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. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MORTON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 19, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

George L. Mehren, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice John P. Duncan, Jr., resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. John William Bowen, XXXXXX U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be lieutenant commander in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Phillip N. Griebel

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Dan S. Meginley — James L. Webb
Warren K. Wordsworth — Edward L. Murnane
Robert A. Rich — Carl "J" Angus

The following-named persons to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard H. Hicks — Lafayette J. Harbison
Danny M. Brown — Donald H. Ramsden
Robert T. Morhard

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 19, 1963:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Robert A. Wallace, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. William Harry Moore, executive secretary, South Georgia Methodist Home for the Aging, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our gracious Heavenly Father: We pause in the very beginning of the deliberations of this day to ask Thy guidance and Thy leadership in all that we shall do and say.

We come this morning remembering that Thou hast led us throughout all the days of the life of this Nation and brought us into this good hour.

We pray that Thou wilt give us Thy grace to keep and sustain us. Bless this Nation of ours. May it be a nation of honest industry, sound learning, and pure religion. We pray Thy blessing upon Thy servant, the President of the United States, and all of those who are in authority over us and under Thee.

Bless these men and women into whose hands has been placed the responsibility of government. May they be men of wisdom and of understanding, and in these days through which we pass preserve our liberties, keep our unity, save us from violence and discord and disharmony, and out of these hours may we move into the land of promise and peace that Thou hast promised to us, Thy children.

Bless this Nation of ours, each home, from the smallest hamlet to the greatest city. May Thy name be honored and hallowed in every home, and may Thy spirit live within our hearts.

These things we ask in Thy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 15, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7043. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to 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. 3872) entitled "An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes."

FREE WORLD AND RUSSIAN SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, latest figures on free world and Russian shipping to Cuba show that our allies' ships are continuing to outnumber Russian ships by a substantial margin. The Congress should be aware of these figures, as well as the American people. Most recent reports from the Maritime Administration and Naval Intelligence show the following:

Shipping to Cuba

	Free world	*Russian*
January	12	35
February	19	34
March	28	32
April	37	27
May	44	38
June	43	31
July (incomplete)	28	23

From these figures can be seen that free world shipping is not on the wane, but rather on the continual upswing. It would seem that these free world countries who yearly expect U.S. foreign aid and who yearly, I might add, receive this aid, would lend an ear to the U.S. requests for an effective ban on Cuban trade. A case in point is Greece. In fiscal year 1962, the United States provided $82.2 million in foreign aid for Greece. Of that amount, $64.1 million were outright grants, and yet Greek ships have made 63 calls on Cuba's ports since the beginning of 1963 in spite of a royal decree issued banning shipping to Cuba by Greek shippers. It is strange that the Greek Government cannot enforce its own decree.

I cannot understand why the United States continues to supply aid to countries who will not support our position of ridding communism from the Western Hemisphere. I would hope that we shall bear this in mind when considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 this week.

Again I call on the United States to take steps to ban trade with Cuba in line with the proposals that I have outlined in my bill, H.R. 7687, which provides that no article shall be transported in interstate or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows any of the vessels under the flag of that country to be used in trade or commerce with Cuba.

Until we effectively cut off trade with Cuba by the free world nations, that Communist cancer shall continue to spread its infection, posing a threat to not only the United States, but to freedom of the whole Western Hemisphere as well.

USE OF CHILDREN IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in this week's issue of Newsweek there appears a picture of 8 or 10 frightened children, one reportedly only 2 years of age, sitting in the dusty driveway of a Brooklyn construction site attempting to block the entrance of a large dump truck.

While I deplore such action by anyone, this was a most shameful and despicable spectacle.

If their cause is just why would they resort to such cowardly tactics? The subjection of innocent children to such abuse and danger is unpardonable and defies all understanding. Those who would resort to such practices and the cause they represent deserve no consideration. They are the most depraved of humans with a calloused and warped mind. Their barbaric and inhuman tactics are dramatic proof of their unpreparedness for the rights they are demanding.

Of even more tragic concern is the report that a group of so-called ministers have promoted the involvement of children and brought them into the picture by design. In fact, the Sunday Washington Star reports a top secret plan, labeled "Camp Freedom," to mobilize 2,000 children for a demonstration. Such action defies the teachings of the Scripture, which they presumably uphold, when Christ said:

He that would offend one of these little ones it is better that a millstone were placed around his neck and he were drowned in the depths of the sea.

Those promoting such schemes deserve neither the title of clergymen nor Christian.

Although the control of such actions is not properly a Federal function, I urge State and local governments to enact strong measures prohibiting such practices with severe penalties for parents or other adults promoting such activities. This Nation of civilized people cannot condone these barbaric and sadist exhibitions. Even the most avid do-gooders and do-righters should join me in this plea.

THE GESELL REPORT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, broader implications of the recent Gesell report continue to arise. The report's possible deleterious effect on duly constituted municipal authority is discussed in a recent resolution by the Georgia Municipal Association's board of directors. I offer it as further food for thought to my colleagues in the Congress:

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed a Committee on Equal Opportunity in the armed services; and

Whereas this Committee in its report to the President has recommended certain actions, to be enforced through the Military Establishment, the objective of which is to force compliance with Executive policy upon business establishments and other facilities in proximity to military bases, including among other things, recommended use of off-limits powers, the replacement of local transportation facilities with military transportation, and even possible closing of bases; and

Whereas at least one of the Committee recommendations has been placed in effect; and

Whereas this action is of direct and vital concern to municipal officials; and

Whereas the scope of the action recommended exceeds the normal and traditional function of military command in its relationship to civil authority, and seeks to reach objectives not peculiar to the military, but common to all Americans and thereby seeks to compel an overall civil policy through use of the Military Establishment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Georgia Municipal Association, That we vigorously oppose such use of the military command to transcend the functions and responsibilities of duly constituted local authority in matters of concern to the entire citizenry.

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested and pleased by the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], in respect to prayer in our public schools and in the relationship of Almighty God to our Nation. A discharge petition is on the desk awaiting signatures of Members. The numbers are increasing every week. This is the only way we are going to get this matter on the floor of the House.

I want to read one paragraph from one of the finest statements I have ever heard of, by the Rev. Walter G. J. Hards, Th. D., rector of St. David's Episcopal Church of Baltimore, Md.

The Supreme Court has spoken. We must obey. But I heartily concur with the statement released by the archbishop of Baltimore in which he said that the Supreme Court's decision was "another regrettable step on a journey which the Supreme Court should never have commenced." The question is, Where will this journey end?

My colleagues, we can end this journey by bringing a constitutional amendment to the floor of this House. I am afraid the only way we can do it is by way of the discharge petition which I dislike, but which course I feel I must take because I cannot sit idly by and wait year after year after year for legislation through the regular process to correct this tragic decision by the Supreme Court.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS COMPARED TO SALARIES OF FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, AND MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I made public to the House certain findings that my office made with respect to salaries of Federal, State, local, and municipal officials who are making in excess of $22,500 a year which is the present congressional salary. At that time I indicated to the House, there were some reports from some States that had not yet come in as of that time, but I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the balance of findings from those States to complete the report of those officials—Federal, State, local, and otherwise who are making in excess of what Members of Congress are making today. I am sure my colleagues will find this information very interesting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a few more questions about this bill.

As I understand it, this would set up a parking lot for employees of the Supreme Court across the street from the present Supreme Court Building. My question is, Why a special parking lot for members of the Supreme Court to protect them against the rapists and other lawless elements in the area of the Supreme Court Building, to the exclusion of employees and particularly women employees in other Federal offices on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in the District? Can the gentleman tell me why we should indulge in this legislation which is in the nature of special privilege legislation?

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for the purpose of answering his question, I have some further information which may have a bearing on this subject. This particular lot is presently used by the Supreme Court employees. There are some 45 cars presently parked there.

If this particular construction is approved, there will be room for some 60 to 65 cars in the lot. The Court has some 200 employees. There is presently room to park some 56 cars in a garage in the basement of the Supreme Court Building. At the present time we have 1,200 parking spaces for automobiles of Members and for the House Office Building employees, and we will have a total of over 3,000 parking spaces when the Rayburn House Office Building and other planned improvements are completed, for Members and House employees. So when the parking program for the House is completed, we will be providing a substantial number of the parking spaces for our employees and for ourselves. This will be comparable to what will be provided for the Supreme Court personnel or the Supreme Court employees by this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman this question: Why is it not possible to use the block or two blocks that were cleared over here on Independence Avenue? Why is it not possible to use that as a parking space for members of the Supreme Court as well as other employees on Capitol Hill?

Mr. McFALL. Is the gentleman referring to the land which is just immediately east of the Old House Office Building?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly the tract.

Mr. McFALL. I perhaps am not qualified to answer this question, because I am not a member of the House Building Committee. I understand that there is a plan for the use of this property for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that there was some plan in view of the fact that the Government bought and tore down the business establishments that were paying taxes to the District of Columbia. I would hope that there was some plan to use it. Again I say that I cannot understand why this huge lot cannot be used to save the taxpayers $1,500, or whatever the amount is that is being paid, apparently out of funds appropriated to the Supreme Court, to pay for the parking that is now going on in the lot which you seek to buy. I cannot understand why this big lot is vacant with no parking when you say that parking needs are acute on Capitol Hill.

Mr. McFALL. I am informed that there are plans for permanent building construction on that property for the use of the Library of Congress. We have had before us in the Public Works Committee a bill for construction of such a building which would include a memorial to James Madison. We have not, however, seen fit to pass out this legislation,

although there are plans for some permanent construction on that building site. Therefore, within a few years it is expected that there will be a building constructed there. So if plans in the future can be made for parking for Supreme Court people, this is the only available space that would be permanent for them. There might be some temporary use made of this land to which you refer. However, it would not be permanent, and this parking lot will be a permanent facility.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman's committee has not come out with another building to fill that space in view of the busted condition of the United States Treasury. I think it is high time to stop some of this building in the District of Columbia.

Moreover, I do not understand why all of the buildings now under construction and nearing completion have been built in the District of Columbia. I thought this was a vulnerable area and the Government was to be decentralized. Does the gentleman, being on the Committee on Public Works, remember the stories we heard a few years ago about how we must relocate some of this Government in other places because of being highly vulnerable to enemy attack?

Mr. McFALL. I am not completely informed on whether it is better to centralize or decentralize, but it is my understanding that these plans for decentralization of buildings around the District of Columbia area were changed because it cost more money for the Government to decentralize than it would to build in the area of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I regret that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a member of the House of Representatives Building Commission, is not on the floor so I could ask him the question as to why the property already vacant is not being used for the purpose intended under this bill.

In view of the fact that I cannot get an answer that seems to me acceptable I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4786) for the relief of the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of the sponsors of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO RECEIVE COMPENSATION UNDER SECTION 401

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6396) to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 208 of the Federal Employees Pay Act Amendments of 1954 (title II of the Act of September 1, 1954; 68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Each employee who—

"(A) is on the rolls on the date of enactment of this subsection,

"(B) is within any class of employees described in subparagraph (1) of subparagraph (2) of section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926); and

"(C) is receiving aggregate compensation at a saved rate by reason of subsection (b) of this section, may elect, in his discretion, by written request to the appropriate authority concerned, to receive basic compensation for his position in accordance with law and premium compensation under such subparagraph (1) or such subparagraph (2), as applicable, in lieu of aggregate compensation at a saved rate by reason of subsection (b) of this section.

"(2) All such elections made by employees prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, and payments of compensation pursuant to such elections, which would have been authorized under paragraph (1) of this subsection if such paragraph had been in effect at the times when such elections and payments were made are hereby authorized and validated to the same extent as if such paragraph had been in effect at such times.".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POSTAL STATIONS

The Clerk called 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 705(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "10 miles" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 miles".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill 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."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That subsections (c) and (d) of section 705 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of a post office within twenty miles of the outer boundary or limits of a village, town, or city having one thousand five hundred or more inhabitants and in which the principal office is located. This authority may not be used by the Postmaster General as a basis for discontinuing an established post office.

"'(d) The Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of a post office at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, at defense or other strategic installations, and at airports'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill 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."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING MINERAL RIGHTS TO CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4479) 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the State of California, at the fair market value as determined by impartial appraisals, all right, title, and interest in and to the coal and other minerals heretofore reserved to the United States in the real property described in section 2 of this Act, subject to any valid existing rights.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act, located in the State of California, is more particularly described as follows: Northeast quarter and east half northwest quarter, section 29, township 20 south, range 3 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, State of California.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That, upon application therefor by the State of California within one year from the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the State of California, upon payment of the sum of (1) the fair market value as of the effective date of this Act as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and (2) the administrative costs of the conveyance as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, all right, title, and interest in and to the coal and other minerals heretofore reserved to the United States in the real property described in section 2 of this Act, subject to any valid existing rights."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITIES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6118) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of

public lands for the development and expansion of communities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am curious to know who established 5,760 acres as necessary for a townsite? How did this occur in the first place? I do not believe I have any objection to the bill, but I am curious to know who could possibly have set up this size acreage for purposes of a townsite, if that is what the bill provides.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this minimum acreage limitation pertains to community expansion and was provided for in the statehood bill as enacted. There are two categories in the selection of lands for the State domain in Alaska. One is the general program whereby the State may select lands up to 103 million acres. There must be a minimum area of 5,760 acres with respect to each selection. Otherwise the State might select areas too small which would cause surveying problems. The other category has reference to community expansion and involves up to 400,000 acres within the national forests and another 400,000 acres from the open Federal domain. I do not think it was intended to make that minimum acreage apply to these community expansion selections. It is not good land management to have a little community select a much larger area within a forest than necessary to meet its expansion needs.

In other words, this bill is to clarify what was really an ambiguity in the original bill.

Mr. GROSS. I have forgotten who were the authors of the statehood bill that conceived this acreage provision that is now sought to be so drastically reduced?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Senator BARTLETT when he was the delegate from Alaska was one of the authors; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and various members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had something to do with it. But that bill was written and rewritten for about 15 years. I do not know to whom blame could be attached for this ambiguity.

Mr. GROSS. You are now reducing it to 640 acres as the minimum acreage?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The committee fixed 640 acres. I am not as happy with this as I might be. This was the doing of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. I think it would be more flexible if it were even smaller. It may be that they can make further adjustments on the other side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of subsection (g) of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union", approved July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), is amended by striking out "All selections" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except for selections authorized in subsection (a), all selections".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the second sentence of subsection (g) of section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union', approved July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding 'or, in the case of selections under subsection (a) of this section, six hundred and forty acres.'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REINSTATEMENT OF U.S. OIL AND GAS LEASE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1233) to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any decision to the contrary heretofore made by the Secretary of the Interior of the United States or his authorized agents or representatives, United States oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C shall be held not to have terminated by operation of law or otherwise on April 30, 1960, but shall be deemed to be in full force and effect and the term of said lease extended from April 30, 1960, to two years after the effective date of this Act and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to act as to approval upon the assignment of said lease by the last record holder thereof, Jos. R. Neaves, doing business as Neaves Petroleum Developments, to James P. Psaltis, dated April 7, 1960, and filed on April 13, 1960, in the Sacramento, California, land office of the Bureau of Land Management, and to approve said assignment, subject to the payment of accrued lease rentals and tender of a proper drilling bond as hereinafter provided, if the said James P. Psaltis be qualified to hold said lease under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.): *Provided,* That within thirty days after the receipt of written notice from the Secretary of the Interior of the amount of rental then accrued to the United States under said lease and unpaid, which notice shall be given by the Secretary within thirty days after approval of said assignment, the said James P. Psaltis, his heirs, successors or assigns, shall tender payment of said amount of rental together with a proper drilling bond in the amount required by the regulations then in effect.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4842) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751–1772) is amended by—

1. in section 1760, deleting the word "month" from the second sentence, and inserting in place thereof "months" and inserting after "January" the following: ", February or March"; and

2. in section 1761a, inserting after the first sentence the following: "The directors may also appoint a general manager.", and inserting after "except that the treasurer shall be the general manager of the corporation" the following: "unless a separate general manager has been appointed".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 11 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1760) is amended by striking out 'during the month of the following January' and inserting in lieu thereof 'during the following January, February, or March'.

"SEC. 2. Section 13 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761a) is amended by striking out ', except that the treasurer shall be the general manager of the corporation' in the fourth sentence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECT IN DETROIT, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 772) to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are authorized and directed to consent to the transfer by the city of Detroit, from its low-rent housing project numbered Michigan 1–11 to its Elmwood Park numbered 1 urban renewal project, Michigan R–40, of all real property, except the administration building and appurtenant land, acquired by the city for the low-rent housing project, on the condition that the sum of $1,246,987.31, plus interest thereon from September 9, 1960, to the date of payment at the rate specified in contract numbered C–102 between the city and the Public Housing Administration, will be paid by the city to the Public Housing Administration to be applied to the extent thereof against the city's obligations in connection with the low-rent housing project, and that the amount of these payments will be included in the gross project cost of the Elmwood Park numbered 1 urban renewal project.

SEC. 2. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are hereby authorized to modify

any contracts heretofore entered into with the city of Detroit to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF FHA SECTION 207 MORTGAGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5048) to amend section 207 of the National Housing Act to eliminate the provision presently limiting mortgages thereunder to the cost of the physical improvements involved.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 207(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all that follows the first colon and precedes "to mortgages on housing in Alaska", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENTS LOCATED ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1136) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army be authorized and directed to pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of any such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Red Rock Reservoir project on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Iowa on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose; and that the Secretary of the Army be authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Red Rock Reservoir project.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL PART OF NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3804) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (46 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the Act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with *"Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "funds" and insert in lieu thereof "funds:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1139), to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the Act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with *"Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds".

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1139 and substitute the language of H.R. 3804, as passed.

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1139) entitled "An Act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes", do pass with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the second paragraph under the heading 'FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION' in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the Act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with *'Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment' down through 'without exchange of funds:' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3804) was laid on the table.

FAIR VALUE FOR IMPROVEMENTS ON RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5160) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army be authorized and directed to pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were totally situated or partially situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kansas, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose: *Provided,* That in no case shall the owner of such improvements receive dual compensation for any part of said improvements as a result of this legislation or otherwise: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Army be authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the committee report for the bill just passed, Consent Calendar No. 166, sufficiently explains H.R. 5160. There are two comments which I want to place on the record at this time, however,

In the first place, there is an error in the committee report. The cost indicated on page 3, paragraph 2, of the bill is in error and probably is in excess by 50 percent of the cost of the bill.

The second point that I want to place on record is that in my statement to the Committee on Public Works, the estimates on probable costs of the bill were those obtained from the Corps of Army Engineers. At least one beneficiary does not believe that his property was fairly evaluated. I would point out, however, that his rights under the bill are clearly protected, as jurisdiction is conferred on the U.S. District Court of Kansas to hear a condemnation proceedings on any property that is included in the provisions of this bill.

MODIFYING THE FOUR RIVER BASINS PROJECT, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7221) to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the Tarpon Springs feature of such project for any work done by such interests on such feature of the project after July 1, 1963, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized: *Provided,* That such credit shall not exceed the Federal share of this feature of the project, presently estimated at $1,255,300.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, insert "the Tarpon Springs feature of" before the words "such project".

Page 1, line 8, insert "feature of the" before the word "project".

Page 1, line 9, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That such credit shall not exceed the Federal share of this feature of the project, presently estimated at $1,255,300."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7221, a bill which I introduced to modify the flood control project for the Four River Basins, Fla., which was authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 and which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the Tarpon Springs or Lake Tarpon feature of the project for work done by local interests after July 1, 1963, for such work as is in accordance with the project as authorized and in an amount not to exceed the Federal share of $1,255,300.

This bill has been favorably reported on by the Secretary of the Army and unanimously reported out by the Public Works Committee of the House upon proper presentation to the effect that many millions of dollars of property damage occurred in recent years in the Lake Tarpon area, including residential and citrus developments, due to the flooding of the lake. There is no surface outlet for tributary inflow. Flood waters are removed only by evaporation or through a natural subsurface connection to the Gulf of Mexico. I personally visited the area during the serious flood conditions in the last few years and can attest to the tremendous damage that resulted. Water stood in the homes of many of the residents and a serious threat this year, indicating that such conditions might reoccur, triggered my introduction of this bill, which would permit the local authorities to go ahead with construction and to be reimbursed through credits toward local contributions as the total Four River Basins project progresses.

It has been generally agreed that one of the most serious flood damage areas contained in the Four River Basins project is the Lake Tarpon area. I am proud of having participated in efforts to get the serious flood condition alleviated before the House Public Works Committee on which I serve, and as a result of a survey and other resolutions I introduced, this total Four River Basins project was successfully included in the Flood Control Act of 1962.

The project is to be constructed at an estimated cost of $2,044,200, of which $1,255,300 is Federal cost for engineering and construction, and $788,900 is local cost for rights-of-way and the required contribution.

The local interests, including the Board of County Commissioners of Pinellas County and the Southwest Florida Water Management District, a State agency set up for assessing and collecting taxes and administering the total project, have approved the acceleration of the Lake Tarpon phase of the project in this manner.

Likewise, the local district has collected sufficient funds to go ahead with the project and has expressed a willingness to do so upon the passage of this necessary legislation.

A copy of the pertinent parts of the letter of transmittal and approval of the Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance, is hereby included:

Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to H.R. 7221, 88th Congress, a bill to modify the flood-control project for Four River Basins, Fla.

This bill would modify the flood-control project for Four River Basins, Fla., to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contributions to the project for any work done by them on the project after July 1, 1963, provided the work is approved as being in accordance with the project as authorized.

The Four River Basins, Fla., consists of the drainage areas of four main streams in central and southwest peninsular Florida which rise at or within the Green Swamp region, and certain intervening streams on the west coast of Florida. The four rivers are the Hillsborough, Oklawaha, Withlacoochee, and Peace. The city of Tampa is located on the Hillsborough River.

The project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180, 1183) provides for improvements of southwest Florida, drained by Hillsborough, Oklawaha, Withlacoochee, Peace, Anclote, and Pithlachascotee Rivers, and Lake Tarpon for flood control, major drainage, and other purposes. The estimated Federal cost for the project is $57,760,000. The authorization is subject to a requirement that local interests construct and maintain associated lateral drainage facilities, furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, make all bridge, road, and utility relocations, except railroad bridges and approaches, hold and save the United States free from damages, preserve outlet waterways needed for the proposed work, maintain and operate the completed works, and contribute 17 percent of the construction cost of the project.

In the vicinity of Lake Tarpon, residential and citrus developments have suffered frequent damage caused by high water. As there is no surface outlet for tributary inflow, floodwaters are removed only by evaporation or through a natural subsurface connection to the Gulf of Mexico. This condition will be alleviated when the portion of the authorized project for Tarpon Springs, consisting of one outlet canal from Lake Tarpon south to Old Tarpon Bay, with a control structure and three bridges, is constructed. The local interests are desirous of proceeding with this feature of the project prior to the Federal Government undertaking the project. The total cost of this feature is estimated at $2,044,200, of which $1,255,300 is Federal cost for engineering and construction, and $788,900 is local cost for rights-of-way and the required contribution.

In view of the desires of the local interests to proceed with the Tarpon Springs feature of the project, it is suggested that H.R. 7221 be amended so as to modify the project only insofar as it relates to the Tarpon Springs portion thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZED CAPITAL STOCK OF INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7405) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 19. The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to vote for an increase of $1,000,000,000 in the authorized capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Bank, as recommended in the report, dated November 6, 1962, to the Board of Governors of the Bank by the Bank's Executive Directors."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7405 would add a new section to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act authorizing the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for a $1 billion increase

in the Bank's capital stock. This increase is needed in order to allow for the admission of new members to the Bank and to permit special increases in the capital subscription of the present members when this is appropriate. The United States will not—I repeat, will not—subscribe to any portion of this increase.

The Secretary of the Treasury urged favorable congressional action on this legislation and emphasized that the provisions of the bill involve no increase in our subscription to the capital stock of the Bank or authorization or appropriation of funds by the United States.

The bill was reported out of committee unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean it does not cost anything at this time, but may later?

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir; not at any time. This is merely a permissive bill to permit our delegates to vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

INCREASED U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7406) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (73 Stat. 299; 22 U.S.C. 283–2831), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 13. The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized (1) to vote (A) for increases in the authorized capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the agreement, and (B) for an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations under article IV, section 3, of the agreement, all as recommended by the Executive Directors in a report dated March 18, 1963, to the Board of Governors of the Bank; (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the $1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank; and (3) to vote for an amendment to article VIII, section 3, of the agreement to provide that the Board of Governors may, upon certain conditions, increase by one the number of Executive Directors."

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for payment of the increased United States subscription to the capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, $411,760,000.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for payment of the increased United States subscription to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, $50,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank. It amends the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote for increases in the callable capital stock of the Bank, and, if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to 41,176 additional shares of stock having a par value of $10,000 each and to consent to an increase of $50 million in the quota of the United States in the Bank's Fund for Special Operations.

The Inter-American Development Bank came into being in 1959, meeting the long-held aspirations of the Latin American countries to join with the United States in a financial institution designed to accelerate the economic development of the Latin America Republics by providing capital, extending technical assistance, and encouraging private investment in development projects. It was modeled after the World Bank and finances the foreign exchange cost of worthwhile and soundly financed projects when financing cannot be obtained elsewhere under conditions considered reasonable by the Bank.

The aggregate resources of the Bank subscribed by its members amount to the equivalent of $959,476,000. This amount consists of $813,160,000 in ordinary capital resources and $146,316,000 in the Fund for Special Operations. The ordinary capital stock subscriptions consist of a paid-in portion of $381,580,000 and a callable portion of $431,580,000. The paid-in portion of each member's subscription was made available to the Bank in three installments in 1960, 1961, and 1962. All members have met their obligations to the Bank prior to the final date for payment of the subscriptions. Cuba did not become a member.

After utilizing its paid-in capital, the Bank must obtain additional funds for its loans from the sale of its bonds to investors. The uncalled capital forms a guarantee fund to back the Bank's bonds. The current U.S. subscription to the Bank's capital is $350 million of which $150 million has been paid in and $200 million is callable.

The Bank's Fund for Special Operations was established completely separate from the Bank's ordinary capital resources by contributions from the members totaling the equivalent of $146,316,000, to make loans on terms and conditions appropriate for dealing with special circumstances arising in particular countries or with respect to specific projects. Such loans may be repayable, in whole or in part, in the currency of the borrowing country. This Fund was established in recognition of the fact that some Latin American countries, from time to time, are not in a position to service additional loans repayable entirely in hard currency, yet may be in need of financing for meritorious development projects. Loans from the Fund are also made for projects which are not directly productive but which are important to the basic development of a country. The United States contributed $100 million to this fund and the Latin American countries contributed $46 million. Half of each contribution was paid in gold and dollars and half in the national currency of the member.

In addition, and completely separate from the Bank's own resources, the United States has entrusted to the Bank the administration of the $394 million Social Progress Trust Fund, created for the purpose of assisting the social development of Latin America. This Fund is not involved in any way in the proposed legislation.

In its 2½ years of existence, the Bank has established a remarkable record. It has made 102 loans from its own resources for an aggregate value of $412 million of which 69 loans for $295 million were financed out of the Bank's ordinary capital resources, drawing upon the paid-in capital subscriptions, as well as the resources derived from the Bank's borrowings. These loans can be grouped in the following larger categories: (a) 14 development loans for relending to private enterprise, $85.2 million; (b) 28 direct private enterprise loans, $60.8 million; (c) 18 loans to governments and government entities for roads, and so forth, $16.6 million; (d) 9 water supply and sewerage loans for $37.4 million.

During the same period, the Bank's Board of Directors authorized 33 operations from the Fund for Special Operations, totaling $116.9 million. These loans may be grouped in the same categories as follows: (a) 10 development loans for relending to private enterprise, $50.8 million; (b) 1 direct private enterprise loan for $700,000; (c) 20 loans to governments and government entities, $50.5 million; (d) 2 water supply and sewerage loans, $14.4 million.

The Bank has borrowed in the private capital market two issues, one in Italy for $24.2 million convertible lire, and a $75 million issue in the United States. The U.S. issue was rated by the leading rating services as AAA, the highest classification possible.

The need for an increase in the Bank's resources arose from the task which under its charter the Bank has to perform within the context of an expanded program of inter-American economic cooperation. The agreement establishing the Bank contemplated that such an increase would be sought after the first 3 years of operations and after the original subscription had been paid. The proposal involves three major acts. First, the authorized capital of the Bank would be increased by $1 billion, entirely in the form of callable capital available to back up the Bank's obligations. Second, the resources of the Fund for Special Operations would be increased by $73 million. Third, the authorized ordinary capital would be further increased by $300 million to provide for the possible future admission of new members to the Bank. The proposed $1 billion increase in the callable capital would be subscribed by all existing members in the same proportion as

their present subscription bears to the authorized capital of the Bank. The U.S. share of the increase would thus be $411.8 million for which appropriations would be sought in two equal installments in 1964 and 1965. Authority for this increase is being requested at this time in order to provide the Bank with assurance regarding its ability to raise additional funds in the private capital market. The Secretary of the Treasury told the committee that it is highly unlikely that any of this increase in the U.S. subscription would be paid out as actual cash expenditure of the Treasury.

The proposed increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations represents a 50 percent increase of the existing resources of the Fund. The U.S. share of the increase would be $50 million, while the Latin American members will contribute $23 million.

The $300 million additional increase in the authorized capital would not involve subscriptions by the United States or other existing members of the Bank, and therefore no authorizing of appropriations of funds by the United States will be required.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, in a special report to the President and Congress has endorsed this proposal, and Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, appeared before the committee urging passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Development Bank was established as the first tangible symbol of inter-American economic cooperation. It has well fulfilled the expectation of this House when it authorized U.S. membership in this Bank by playing a significant and important role in shaping and stimulating Latin America's own efforts toward a realization of the goals of the Alliance for Progress. It has been well administered and prudently managed and worthy of the continued support of the United States in its efforts. Your committee voted unanimously to favorably report this bill and I urge the approval by the House of this legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This would increase our contingent liability by nearly $500 million; $41 million, I believe.

Mr. PATMAN. Approximately, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Will we put up 50 percent of that in gold?

Mr. PATMAN. No; dollars—if we should be called upon to put up anything.

Mr. GROSS. But is there not a requirement that 50 percent be in gold?

Mr. PATMAN. No, we do not put up anything.

Mr. GROSS. Since this is officially a contingent liability, if we are called upon to back up this contingent liability would we not then be compelled to put in gold?

Mr. PATMAN. No gold at any time. Dollars would be required. Any amount that is required to be paid by the United States may be paid in dollars.

Mr. GROSS. What average interest does this Inter-American Bank charge?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not an excessive rate, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of, not that it would not be excessive, but there would be practically no interest, three-fourths of 1 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. I am informed it is 5 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Do they not have a soft loan window?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, as well as a hard loan window. The amount is small in comparison to the other, and the rate charged on these loans is 2½ percent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to urge support of this bill. I would also like to point out that in the operation of the Bank, since its inception, the funds of the United States have been provided through the appropriation process and not directly from the Treasury through backdoor spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PAYMENTS FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS DYING FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5250) to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$112" and inserting in lieu thereof "$120".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the effective date of the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963, or on January 1, 1964, whichever first occurs.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Public Law 881, 84th Congress, effective January 1, 1957, dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to widows, children, and parents based on the service-connected deaths of their husbands, fathers, and children, respectively. Specific monthly rates are provided for children and parents. However, the widow is paid at the monthly rate of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of her deceased husband. This is now set forth in chapter 13, title 38, United States Code. This bill would increase to $120 the $112 factor of the widows' rate.

The increase provided herein coupled with those in H.R. 5555—Uniformed Services Pay Act—and now in conference between the two Houses, would equal approximately a 10-percent increase.

The estimated cost of the bill is $11,779,000 the first year affecting 122,700 widows. The cost will remain the same for the following 4 years.

The bill is recommended by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The bill will increase payments by $8 monthly of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows of veterans who died as the result of service-connected disabilities. At the present time, widows so situated are paid under a formula of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic service pay of the deceased husband. H.R. 5250 would increase the $112 factor to $120. The widows affected by this bill have not received an increase in monthly benefits since January 1, 1957, when Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress became effective. Should the military pay bill be enacted into law the modest increase provided by that bill together with the $8 monthly increase provided by H.R. 5250 will provide an approximate 10-percent increase to these service-connected widows. This increase would be approximately the same as that recently authorized for parents and children by Public Law 88–21.

The Veterans' Administration has estimated the bill will affect approximately 122,700 widows at a first-year cost of $11,779,000. I recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN OF VETERANS PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED FROM WARTIME SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 221) to amend chapter 35 of

title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new sentence after the first sentence thereof: "Such term also includes the child of a person who has a total disability permanent in nature resulting from a service-connected disability arising out of service as described in the first sentence hereof, or who died while a disability so evaluated was in existence."

(b) Section 1701(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(10) The term 'total disability permanent in nature' means any disability rated total for the purposes of disability compensation which is based upon an impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the life of the disabled person."

(c) Section 1701(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "death" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "disability or death".

SEC. 2. Section 1711 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) If any child pursuing a program of education, or of specialized restorative training, under this chapter ceases to be an 'eligible person' because the parent from whom eligibility is derived is found to no longer have a 'total disability permanent in nature', as defined in section 1701(a)(10) of this title, then such child (if he has sufficient remaining entitlement) may, nevertheless, be afforded educational assistance under this chapter until the end of a quarter or semester for which enrolled if the educational institution in which he is enrolled is operated on a quarter or semester system, or if the educational institution is not so operated until the end of the course, or until nine weeks have expired, whichever first occurs."

SEC. 3. Section 1712(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"*(3)* if the Administrator first finds that the parent from whom eligibility is derived has a service-connected total disability permanent in nature, or if the death of the parent from whom eligibility is derived occurs, after the eligible person's eighteenth birthday but before his twenty-third birthday, then (unless paragraph (4) applies) such period shall end five years after, whichever date first occurs (A) the date on which the Administrator first finds that the parent from whom eligibility is derived has a service-connected total disability permanent in nature, or (B) the date of death of the parent from whom eligibility is derived;".

SEC. 4. Section 1762(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following clause before the period at the end thereof: "whether eligibility is based upon the death or upon the total permanent disability of the parent".

SEC. 5. In the case of any individual who is an "*eligible* person" within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act, and who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, provides educational assistance for the children of persons who died from service-connected disability during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; or a death resulting directly from armed conflict; or from an injury or disease received while engaging in extrahazardous service including service under conditions simulating war. This law provides education not to exceed 36 calendar months generally between the ages of 18 to 23 with an educational assistance allowance of $110 per month if, of course, his pursuit is on a full-time basis, $80 per month for a three-quarter time basis, and $50 per month if pursuit is on a half-time basis. This chapter originated as Public Law 634 of the 84th Congress.

Under the provisions of H.R. 221, 88th Congress, educational benefits heretofore granted to war orphans would be extended to children of living veterans who have a service-connected total disability permanent in nature. Any disability rated total for the purposes of disability compensation which is based on impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the life of the veteran would meet the requirements of this bill.

In recent testimony before this committee, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs testified:

War orphans' educational assistance has proved to be a most worthwhile benefit. However, at present, this assistance only becomes available when the veteran dies. In many cases we must recognize that a permanently and totally disabled veteran has problems in providing for the education of his children which are comparable to those his widow would face if he died. We recommend that this situation be corrected and that the educational assistance be made available to him by the enactment of this legislation.

The subject bill would accomplish this worthwhile objective and was introduced at the request of the Disabled American Veterans which has long had this objective as one of its key proposals to the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that this bill would cost $3,300,000 the first year and would involve a cost of $26,200,000 the following 4 years affecting a monthly average of 2,000 trainees the first year and 4,600 in the fifth year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this piece of legislation. The War Orphans Educational Assistance Act has proved to be of tremendous advantage to the children of servicemen who were killed in wartime action, or died as a result of service-connected disabilities. However, we have a group of children in this country whose parents, particularly the fathers, are suffering from 100 percent service-connected disabilities. This bill will extend to those children the same rights that we are presently extending under the existing act.

The War Orphans Educational Assistance Act contains a provision which, in effect, sets forth the intent of Congress that this educational program is established for the purpose of providing opportunities for education to children whose education would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of a death of a parent from a service-connected disability and for the purpose of aiding such children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of such parent. In other words, the Congress recognized the obligation of the Federal Government to provide educational assistance in those instances in which Federal Government military service was responsible for the death of the family breadwinner. We are confronted with the same situation, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the totally disabled service-connected veteran. Because of service-connected disabilities, he, too, is unable to pursue gainful employment in many cases, and consequently unable to earn the necessary money to provide educational assistance for his children. It is my carefully considered opinion that the Federal Government has the same obligation to the children of the totally disabled veteran as it does the children of deceased veterans, when military service has been the factor responsible for both situations.

I think it is a good piece of legislation and I ask that it be passed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the chairman certain questions about this legislation. First of all, am I correct in stating that this is a departure from present law where benefits are available only to children of veterans who have died from a service-connected disability, or killed in service action or activity. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Second, does this law cover both natural and adopted children?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The definition of a child, as I am sure the gentleman well knows, stems from the basic definition of "child" in all the veterans laws and includes a legally adopted child. Also it would broaden the definition of "child" to a degree in that if a young man were in service at age 18, his entitlement would begin at the time he was discharged from the service, so there is a little broader definition of "child" in this legislation.

Mr. DOLE. With reference to the definition of the word "child," in other words, a man or a veteran can adopt a child after he has been rated 100 percent disabled and that child is entitled to the benefits of this act. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If he is a legally adopted child, yes.

Mr. DOLE. Whether he is adopted before or after the rating?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If a veteran becomes legally 100 percent totally disabled and adopts a child legally, the child will be covered.

Mr. DOLE. Is there any limit on the number of children?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is no limitation of the number of children.

Mr. DOLE. And these can be natural born or adopted either before or after the disability rating is given?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman's analysis is correct that the benefits would apply to an adopted child, but all veterans' benefits would apply to an adopted child. However, what the gentleman fails to take into consideration in his questioning is the fact that all adoption proceedings are under the control and jurisdiction of competent orphans' courts in our various States, and one of the primary responsibilities of every court is to assure that the parents are in a position to financially support the child. The fact that a father would be permanently and totally disabled and rated by the Veterans' Administration as such, I am satisfied would be sufficient grounds so that almost every orphans' court in the United States would turn down any adoption petition in that case. Therefore, while the theory that the gentleman may have and which he proposes is one which could possibly exist, in actual fact I think it could not.

Mr. DOLE. Let me inform the gentleman that I am in sympathy with veterans, having spent 39 months in Army hospitals, and having served as service officer for the American Legion and VFW for many years in my hometown, but in fairness I wish to express the opinion that legislative history is needed with reference to this particular measure.

I have other questions. What about the veteran who is 100 percent disabled, has been for years and has already educated his children? Is there anything which would reimburse this veteran in this act?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. DOLE. Is there any reason why he should not be reimbursed?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not think the committee considered that question at all, actually.

Mr. DOLE. There are people in this country, fortunately, who do not wait for the Government to come up with a program, and there are possibilities of cases where a 100 percent disabled veteran through scrimping and saving and with his wife and children working, may have educated his child or children. Perhaps this should be considered, because educating his children may have deprived this veteran of what little savings he had. It could be the future basis of additional legislation.

The item which really concerns me is the possibility some veterans group may come in next year and ask that these benefits be made available to children of 90, 80, 70, or 60 percent disabled veterans? The cost would become prohibitive.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir. There has been no mention to me by any group, in any way, form, or fashion, of any such provision, and I can tell the gentleman if I am still chairman of the committee, I would not expect something of that nature to receive very serious consideration.

Mr. DOLE. As far as the veterans groups are concerned, does the chairman know whether the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans are all in favor of this legislation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Every veterans group is in favor of this legislation. I have received the following telegram from the legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TEAGUE: VFW strongly urges favorable House consideration of H.R. 221, which will help thousands of veterans who were struck down on the battlefield many years ago and are still suffering from total disability which is permanent. These veterans have been unable to accumulate savings to provide higher education for their children, and vitally need this assistance.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Mr. DOLE. I might point out, too, when compensation raises are requested one argument used on behalf of those seriously disabled is, "They have families to educate, have children and this should be considered in the amount of the compensation received. This is a justifiable consideration, but now we would be educating this child at a cost of $110 per month for a maximum of 36 months. Will this be considered in later compensation actions by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I should certainly think so.

Mr. DOLE. Again is it very clear this act would not be extended the next time, in the gentleman's opinion, to provide benefits to children of veterans who are 90-percent disabled or 80-percent disabled or something less than 100 percent?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir; in my opinion it would not.

Mr. DOLE. And there is no limit to the number of children. There are 100-percent-disabled veterans who have resources of their own and do not need help from the Government. Is there any exception made in this bill as to the children of those veterans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. DOLE. I am wondering if, for the record, we might have the reason for the departure from the original intent of veterans' legislation which was to compensate the veteran, if alive, and not his family. What is the basic justification for this departure?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think our studies in the committee certainly show that the veteran in most need in our country is the 100-percent-disabled veteran, who has no income because of having lost an arm or a leg or something of that kind. Of all the veterans in our country the 100-percent-disabled, permanently and totally disabled and unemployable veteran is the most deserving and the most needy veteran in our country today. That was the thinking back of the legislation.

Mr. DOLE. Is it not true that some thinking back of the compensation paid to the 100-percent-disabled veteran was and is that he should be adequately compensated so he might properly educate his children? Was not this a consideration in the past?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. DOLE. When they were considering how much the 100-percent-disabled veteran should receive, which I understand is $250, unless there are statutory awards, plus the possibility of a $200 monthly allowance for an aid and attendant—was there consideration of the veteran with a family and proper education and maintenance of his children?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the gentleman well knows that a 100-percent-disabled veteran with children receives certain allowances for those children under the present law. When those children become eligible for this educational assistance he loses that allowance paid to him because of the children.

Mr. DOLE. Another item for the RECORD is whether this act would apply to everyone rated 100 percent by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, it does not apply to everyone who is rated 100 percent by the Veterans' Administration. For example, today when a man goes into a hospital, the Administrator may give him a 100-percent rating for a temporary period. It does not cover him. It does not cover a man with TB or psychoneurosis, unless he has reached a point where a decision is made by a rating board that he is permanently and totally disabled. But the rating that is given by the Administrator for those other diseases would not be covered in this instance until permanency is established.

Mr. DOLE. With specific reference to mental cases—let us say the veteran's child is 24 or 25 by the time the 100-percent rating is held to be permanent. As far as this veteran is concerned, what happens to his child? Is he denied the fruits of this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. We have a provision in the bill which covers the child if the total disability of the parent occurs before the child reaches age 23. If the child has reached age 23 when total disability of the parent occurs he is not eligible.

Mr. DOLE. This should be considered by whomever might make the determination: If the children of this 100-percent-rated veteran, because of mental disability, is not rated until his child, or children, pass the age of 23, then some allowance should be made for them. It is certainly not the fault of the veteran he is not rated as 100 percent because of his mental illness earlier.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I agree with the gentleman but point out that there

must be some fixed age beyond which a child of a veteran is not considered a child for educational purposes. Otherwise we might be sending persons 50 or 60 years of age to college.

Mr. DOLE. Does this cover the officer who may be rated 100 percent by the VA but receives retirement pay, as he has a right to claim under the law, does it cover his children?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It covers only the children of ex-servicemen rated 100-percent disabled by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. DOLE. The question which I propound is this: Do the children of a veteran having the option of taking disability retirement pay or veteran compensation, and many will take the retirement pay—three-fourths of their base pay—rather than the disability compensation allowed by the Veterans' Administration, receive benefits under provisions of this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It applies only to the men that the VA finds have 100-percent disability.

Mr. DOLE. If a man is rated 100-percent disabled, does it make any difference if he elects to take retirement or VA pay. The 100-percent disability is the key, is it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. He has his choice. He can take either one.

Mr. DOLE. Is there any provision whereby the veteran can go back from retirement pay to disability compensation to qualify under this act? I can see some great benefits from payment for a period of 36 months at $110 a month. If a veteran has six children or one, he would not benefit from this law if he was receiving retired pay.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that my committee does not have jurisdiction over retired officers.

Mr. DOLE. Just to make it clear, and the gentleman mentioned it before, is it true that the man must be unemployable and rated 100-percent disabled before he is entitled to the benefits of this act?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. He must be rated a 100-percent disability. Unemployability might or might not enter into the rating.

Mr. DOLE. And if he should become employable during the course of the educational program, then are the educational benefits terminated?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The benefits would expire at the end of the next semester or quarter, according to the kind of school term the child was following at that time.

Mr. DOLE. What does the gentleman anticipate the total cost of this program will be?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Veterans' Administration estimates it for 5 years—and it is in the report—as $29,500,000. They estimate a total of 2,000 children in 1964 and up to a total of about 4,600 in 1968.

Mr. DOLE. In conclusion, would the gentleman agree there might be some merit to a law that would reimburse the veteran who has at least started his child in school or who perhaps has not completed the education of one, or more, of his children, or does the gentleman think this is not meritorious at this time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I certainly do, and if the gentleman will introduce legislation along that line, I will guarantee the gentleman a hearing before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as soon as possible.

Mr. DOLE. Further with regard to the retired officer or enlisted man, there might be a few dollars difference between the retirement pay and VA compensation. After the veteran has made an election—it was a 5-year period during which he could elect retired pay or VA compensation, it seems to me if he is unemployable and 100 percent disabled, though he does not take VA compensation, but takes, in lieu thereof, retirement pay, that his children should be entitled to the same benefits.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not believe that legislation would come to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I think it would go to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DOLE. It is my desire to point out to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I certainly felt it necessary to raise these questions. I did so to make some legislative history. I can forsee some very serious questions. Certainly, we have an obligation to the 100-percent-disabled veteran and a responsibility to make certain no veteran is discriminated against. This bothers me, because I know 80-percent-disabled veterans and 90-percent-disabled veterans who, in my judgment, seem to be more disabled than those adjudicated to be 100 percent disabled. On one day the rating board might find the extent of his disablement to be 90 percent and tomorrow might find it to be 80 percent. It is a situation similar to the tax assessor. He might value your property at one figure one day and at another figure another day. This is just one of the things which bothers me about this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I understand the gentleman's questions and I understand his philosophy on veterans' benefits. I just wish the gentleman were on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 221, to provide educational assistance to children of veterans permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability.

It is estimated that there are approximately 89,000 veterans who have been rendered 100 percent disabled because of wartime service-connected disabilities. These men have made great and burdensome sacrifices for our country. Because of their disabilities they continue to sacrifice each day of their lives.

To my mind it is not right to penalize their children for the sacrifices made by their fathers who have exchanged their capabilities for our freedom. It is not right to penalize the veteran himself.

H.R. 221 will serve to assist many of these families by permitting a greater level of education for the children than might be otherwise available. In helping the child, we help the veteran and repay, in a small measure, the sacrifices he has made and is continuing to make.

In this light, I urge the support of the Members of the House for H.R. 221.

In supporting this legislation and heralding its passage, I want to pay tribute to the efforts of Mr. Kenneth Taft, of Lakewood, N.Y., past commander, Department of New York, Disabled American Veterans, who has long been an advocate of this legislation and has done an effective job in working for its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 221, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENTING TO EXTENSION AND RENEWAL OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H.J. Res. 220) consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Texas, the 16th day of February 1935 by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and which prior to August 27, 1935, was presented to and approved by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, and which so approved by the six States last above-named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter was consented to by the Congress in Public Resolution Numbered 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935, for a period of two years, and thereafter was extended by the representatives of the compacting States and consented to by the Congress for successive periods, without interruption, the last ex-

tension being for the period from September 1, 1959, to September 1, 1963, consented to by Congress by Public Law Numbered 143, Eighty-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1959. The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, duly executed by representatives of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

"AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"WHEREAS, on the 16th day of February, 1935, in the city of Dallas, Texas, there was executed 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"'*Article I*

"'This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oilproducing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"'*Article II*

"'The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"'*Article III*

"'Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if the laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"'(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"'(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

"'(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"'(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"'(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"'(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"'The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

"'*Article IV*

"'Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"'*Article V*

"'It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"'*Article VI*

"'Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a Commission hereby constituted and designated as THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION, the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"'The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"'No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"'*Article VII*

"'No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"'*Article VIII*

"'This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon sixty (60) days notice, withdraw herefrom.

"'The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory states.

"'This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similiarly deposited, certified, and ratified.'

"WHEREAS, the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1963; and,

"WHEREAS, it is desired to renew and extend the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967:

"Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the compact entitled 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' executed in the city of Dallas, Texas, on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, its present date of expiration, to September 1, 1967. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in article I of the original compact.

"The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"EXECUTED by the several undersigned States, at their several State capitols, through their proper officials on the dates as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State legislatures.

"THE STATE OF ALABAMA
"By JOHN PATTERSON, Governor
"Attest: BETTYE FRINK
"Dated: 9–4–62
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ALASKA
"By WILLIAM A. EGAN, Governor
"Dated: 9–21–62
"Attest: HUGH J. WADE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARIZONA
"By PAUL J. FANNIN, Governor
"Dated: 11–1–61
"Attest: WESLEY BOLIN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARKANSAS
"By ORVAL E. FAUBUS, Governor
"Dated: 8–15–62
"Attest: NANCY J. HALL
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF COLORADO
"By STEVE MCNICHOLS, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: GEORGE J. BAKER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF FLORIDA
"By FARRIS BRYANT, Governor
"Dated: 5–28–62
"Attest: TOM ADAMS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
"By OTTO KERNER, Governor
"Dated: 12–12–61
"Attest: CHARLES F. CARPENTIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF INDIANA
"By MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: CHARLES O. HENDRICKS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KANSAS
"By JOHN ANDERSON, Jr., Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: PAUL R. SHANAHAN
"Secretary of State
"LEONE M. POWERS
"Assistant Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KENTUCKY
"By BERT COMBS, Governor
"Dated: 11–30–61
"Attest: HENRY H. CARTER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF LOUISIANA
"By JIMMIE H. DAVIS, Governor
"Dated: 6–12–62
"Attest: WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MARYLAND
"By J. MILLARD TAWES, Governor
"Dated: 11-20-62
"Attest: LLOYD L. SIMPKINS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
"By JOHN B. SWAINSON, Governor
"Dated: 7-6-62
"Attest: JAMES M. HARE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
"By ROSS R. BARNETT, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: HEBER LADNER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MONTANA
"By DONALD G. NUTTER, Governor
"Dated: 1-18-62
"Attest: FRANK MURRAY
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEBRASKA
"By FRANK B. MORRISON, Governor
"Dated: 1-24-62
"Attest: FRANK MARSH
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEVADA
"By GRANT SAWYER, Governor
"Dated: 4-25-62
"Attest: JOHN KOONTZ
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
"By E. L. MECHEM, Governor
"Dated: 10-23-61
"Attest: BETTY FIORINA
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW YORK
"By NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, Governor
"Dated: 9-22-62
"Attest: CAROLINE K. SIMON
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
"By WILLIAM L. GUY, Governor
"Dated: 3-2-62
"Attest: BEN MEIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OHIO
"By MICHAEL V. DI SALLE, Governor
"Dated: 10-9-62
"Attest: TED W. BROWN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
"By J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, Governor
"Dated: 10-20-61
"Attest: WILLIAM N. CHRISTIAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA
"By DAVID L. LAWRENCE, Governor
"Dated: 2-6-62
"Attest: E. JAMES TRIMARCHI, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
"By ARCHIE GUBBRUD, Governor
"Dated: 3-26-62
"Attest: ESSIE WIEDENMAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
"By BUFORD ELLINGTON, Governor
"Dated: 9-10-62
"Attest: JOE C. CARR
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TEXAS
"By PRICE DANIEL, Governor
"Dated: 10-16-61
"Attest: P. FRANK LAKE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF UTAH
"By GEORGE D. CLYDE, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: LAMONT F. TORONTO
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
"By ALBERT D. ROSELLINI, Governor
"Dated: 10-25-62
"Attest: VICTOR A. MEYERS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
"By W. W. BARRON, Governor
"Dated: 10-10-62
"Attest: JOE F. BURDETT
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WYOMING
"By JACK R. GAGE, Governor
"Dated: 10-3-62
"Attest: ROBERT OUTSEN
"Deputy Secretary of State
"(SEAL)".

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall continue to make an annual report to Congress, as provided in section 2 of Public Law 185, Eighty-fourth Congress, for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas as to whether or not the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purposes as set out in article V of such compact.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one question of the chairman. I support this legislation. In the hearings there was some talk of the President's Committee on the Study of Petroleum. There is some reference in this report to the import situation. On August 6 on the floor of the House many Members made speeches about how the imports affected these various States, including Arkansas and Kansas. We are concerned because we have had a decline in oil activity.

Does the Interstate Oil Compact Commission have authority to make recommendations in reference to imports?

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that the Interstate Oil Compact Comission, of course, has the right and authority to make any recommendations it wishes.

Insofar as authority to do anything about the import situation—it does not have any authority.

Mr. DOLE. There might be an area where that might be of some help. There are 33 States at this time involved, I believe. The only other question is this:

There is no cost in this program at all to the Federal Government, is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOLE. This is paid for by the States?

Mr. HARRIS. This gives the States the authority under this compact to discuss certain matters in the oil industry affecting conservation problems. The expense is borne solely by the Commission through the activities of the States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This in no way expands or affects the Tidelands Oil Act, does it?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. GROSS. There is no relation whatever to it?

Mr. HARRIS. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. GROSS. This would have nothing to do with this gimmick that is being used by the Mexican Government in collaboration with the State Department of wheeling about 35,000 barrels of oil in bond out of Brownsville, across the bridge at Matamoros and through the customs and received back in the United States, making it free oil?

This would not cure that situation?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not too familiar with the type of operation the gentleman has explained. I believe he has reference to the overland transportation?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, precisely so.

Mr. HARRIS. Of the product itself. This would have nothing to do with that whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the consent of the Congress to the extension and renewal for a period of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was entered into originally in 1935 by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas. The Congress first gave consent to such compact by House Joint Resolution 407, approved August 27, 1935—Public Resolution 64, 74th Congress.

Since 1935 the compact has been renewed and extended eight times with the consent of the Congress and, unless again renewed, will expire on September 1, 1963.

When the compact was originally consented to by the Congress in 1935, it was hoped that the several oil-producing States, acting together under the compact, would be able to effect conservation of this important natural resource, prevent its waste, and give aid to the petroleum industry in its effort to achieve a relatively stable situation. During the 28 years that this compact has been in force, that hope has been fulfilled in substan-

tial and ever-increasing degree. Thirty States are now members of the compact.

A compact such as the one under consideration is in complete harmony with the spirit of our form of government. It preserves the rights of each separate State while enabling the several States, as parties to the compact, to work together on a sound program which all of them will accept and endorse.

This compact, in article V, expressly states that nothing in it authorizes the signatory States to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, to create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation.

Section 2 of the resolution consenting to the renewal in 1955, provided that the Attorney General shall report to the Congress whether the activities of the States under the compact have been consistent with the purpose set out in article V. The same language is contained in section 2 of the present resolution.

Section 3 of the resolution merely repeats the usual reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the compact which was contained in seven of the resolutions consenting to, and the renewal of, the compact. Inadvertently, this provision was omitted from the renewal legislation in 1955. The language of section 3 in the House resolution differs with that of Senate Joint Resolution 33, in that the reference to section 1 is expressed in Arabic numeral in the Senate version—as it was in the extension approved in 1951—whereas the language of the House resolution refers to the first section—as it was in the extension approved 4 years ago—in 1959.

The extension has the approval of the Departments of Justice, Interior, State, and Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Federal Power Commission. No one in the committee hearings has expressed opposition to the proposed extension.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 33, which is an identical bill to the one just passed extending the interstate oil compact, with the exception of language in the reservation section of section 3, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Texas, the 16th day of February 1935 by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and which prior to August 27, 1935, was presented to and approved by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, and which so approved by the six States last above-named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter was consented to by the Congress in Public Resolution Numbered 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935, for a period of two years, and thereafter was extended by the representatives of the compacting States and consented to by the Congress for successive periods, without interruption, the last extension being for the period from September 1, 1959, to September 1, 1963, consented to by Congress by Public Law Numbered 143, Eighty-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1959. The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, duly executed by representatives of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

"AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"WHEREAS, on the 16th day of February, 1935, in the city of Dallas, Texas, there was executed 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

" 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

" '*Article I*

" 'This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that state, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

" '*Article II*

" 'The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

" '*Article III*

" 'Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if the laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

" '(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

" '(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

" '(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

" '(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

" '(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

" '(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

" 'The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

" '*Article IV*

" 'Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

" '*Article V*

" 'It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the states joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

" '*Article VI*

" 'Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION, the duty of which said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

" 'The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several states within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said states, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

" 'No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

" '*Article VII*

" 'No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

" '*Article VIII*

" 'This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein, may, upon sixty days' notice, withdraw herefrom.

" 'The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"'This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in Article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.'

"WHEREAS, the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1963; and,

"WHEREAS, it is desired to renew and extend the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967:

"Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the Compact entitled

"'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' executed in the City of Dallas, Texas, on the 16th day of February, 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, its present date of expiration, to September 1, 1967. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in Article I of the original Compact.

"The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"EXECUTED by the several undersigned States, at their several State capitols, through their proper officials on the dates as shown, as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State Legislatures.

"THE STATE OF ALABAMA
"By JOHN PATTERSON, Governor
"Dated: 9-4-62
"Attest: BETTYE FRINK
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ALASKA
"By WILLIAM A. EGAN, Governor
"Dated: 9-21-62
"Attest: HUGH J. WADE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARIZONA
"By PAUL J. FANNIN, Governor
"Dated: 11-1-61
"Attest: WESLEY BOLIN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARKANSAS
"By ORVAL E. FAUBUS, Governor
"Dated: 8-15-62
"Attest: NANCY J. HALL
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF COLORADO
"By STEVE MCNICHOLS, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: GEORGE J. BAKER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF FLORIDA
"By FARRIS BRYANT, Governor
"Dated: 5-28-62
"Attest: TOM ADAMS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
"By OTTO KERNER, Governor
"Dated: 12-12-61
"Attest: CHARLES F. CARPENTIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF INDIANA
"By MATTHEW E. WELSH, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: CHARLES O. HENDRICKS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KANSAS
"By JOHN ANDERSON, Jr., Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: PAUL R. SHANAHAN
"Secretary of State
"LEONE M. POWERS
"Assistant Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KENTUCKY
"By BERT COMBS, Governor
"Dated: 11-30-61
"Attest: HENRY H. CARTER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF LOUISIANA
"By JIMMIE H. DAVIS, Governor
"Dated: 6-12-62
"Attest: WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MARYLAND
"By J. MILLARD TAWES, Governor
"Dated: 11-20-62
"Attest: LLOYD L. SIMPKINS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
"By JOHN B. SWAINSON, Governor
"Dated: 7-6-62
"Attest: JAMES M. HARE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
"By ROSS R. BARNETT, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: HEBER LADNER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MONTANA
"By DONALD G. NUTTER, Governor
"Dated: 1-18-62
"Attest: FRANK MURRAY
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEBRASKA
"By FRANK B. MORRISON, Governor
"Dated: 1-24-62
"Attest: FRANK MARSH
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEVADA
"By GRANT SAWYER, Governor
"Dated: 4-25-62
"Attest: JOHN KOONTZ
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
"By E. L. MECHEM, Governor
"Dated: 10-23-61
"Attest: BETTY FIORINA
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW YORK
"By NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, Governor
"Dated: 9-22-62
"Attest: CAROLINE K. SIMON
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
"By WILLIAM L. GUY, Governor
"Dated: 3-2-62
"Attest: BEN MEIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OHIO
"By MICHAEL V. DI SALLE, Governor
"Dated: 10-9-62
"Attest: TED W. BROWN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
"By J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, Governor
"Dated: 10-20-61
"Attest: WILLIAM N. CHRISTIAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA
"By DAVID L. LAWRENCE, Governor
"Dated: 2-6-62
"Attest: E. JAMES TRIMARCHI, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
"By ARCHIE GUBBRUD, Governor
"Dated: 3-26-62
"Attest: ESSIE WIEDENMAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
"By BUFORD ELLINGTON, Governor
"Dated: 9-10-62
"Attest: JOE C. CARR
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TEXAS
"By PRICE DANIEL, Governor
"Dated: 10-16-61
"Attest: P. FRANK LAKE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF UTAH
"By GEORGE D. CLYDE, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: LAMONT F. TORONTO
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
"By ALBERT D. ROSELLINI, Governor
"Dated: 10-25-62
"Attest: VICTOR A. MEYERS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
"By W. W. BARRON, Governor
"Dated: 10-10-62
"Attest: JOE F. BURDETT
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WYOMING
"By JACK R. GAGE, Governor
"Dated: 10-3-62
"Attest: ROBERT OUTSEN
"Deputy Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall continue to make an annual report to Congress, as provided in section 2 of Public Law 185, Eighty-fourth Congress, for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas as to whether or not the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of section 1 is hereby expressly reserved.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 33 and insert the provisions of House Joint Resolution 220 as just passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 220) was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act consenting to an extension of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD preceding the vote on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. NO. 688)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) section 2(c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out '$1,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000,000,000'.

"(b) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out '$7,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000,000,000'.

"SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
JAMES HARVEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
MAURINE NEUBERGER,
TOM MCINTYRE,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
JOHN G. TOWER,
J. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXPLANATION

The bill as passed by the House and the bill as amended and passed by the Senate have certain features in common:

Both versions of the bill would extend the charter of the Bank to June 30, 1968.

Both versions would raise by $2 billion the total amount of loans, insurance, and guarantees the Bank is authorized to have outstanding at any one time.

Both versions would raise (within the overall limit for loans, guarantees, and insurance) the amount of export credit insurance and guarantees, which the Bank may have outstanding against a 25 percent reserve, from a present maximum of $1 billion to a new maximum of $2 billion.

In addition, the House and Senate versions of the bill are similar in that both would provide for a $2 billion increase in the funds available to the Bank—to match the $2 billion increase being made in its lending authority—but the two versions are dissimilar as to the methods which would be used to finance the $2 billion of additional funds. As passed by the House, the bill would authorize to be appropriated the $2 billion of increased financing. As passed by the Senate, the bill would authorize the Bank to obtain the additional funds under its present method of financing, which is to borrow the funds as needed from the Treasury.

The conference agreement adopts those provisions of the bill which are identical in both the House and Senate versions. More specifically, the agreement provides that—

(a) the life of the Bank be extended to June 30, 1968;

(b) the aggregate amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance which the Bank may have outstanding at any one time be increased by $2 billion; and

(c) the aggregate amount of export credit insurance and guarantees which the Bank may have outstanding against a 25 percent reserve be increased from the present maximum of $1 billion to a maximum of $2 billion.

The conferees further agreed, however, that no additional funds are to be provided at this time for financing the Bank's operations. The principal disagreement between the House and the Senate—indeed substantially the whole of the disagreement—is over the method by which the additional funds for the Bank are to be provided. The agreement of the conferees does not resolve this dispute one way or the other, either in favor of the appropriations method or the Treasury financing method. On the contrary, the agreement postpones a resolution of the issue until such time as the Bank is in greater need of additional funds.

Such a postponement of the issue is made possible by the fact that the Bank has available for its loan, guarantee, and insurance operations certain funds other than those made available by its authority to borrow from the Treasury. These additional funds, as of June 30, 1963, consisted of (a) approximately $810 million of surplus; and (b) approximately $520 million which have been borrowed, in effect, from private banks through sales of "participation certificates" in certain of the Bank's assets.

By reason of these funds derived from sources other than Treasury borrowing, it is anticipated that the Bank now has sufficient funds available to it to meet its anticipated needs for a reasonable period of time.

Finally, the bill as passed by the Senate contains a provision not in the House bill which would require that the Bank make a report to Congress only once a year, rather than on a semiannual basis as required by present law. The conference agreement omitted this provision of the Senate bill, upon the belief that the more frequent reporting to Congress is appropriate.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
JAMES HARVEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have agreed unanimously on the conference report, and I hope the House will accept it. The Senate has already accepted it—last Thursday.

There were two differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. One of these concerns the method by which the Export-Import Bank is to be financed, and has been the source of the dispute and the long deadlock.

The charter of the Export-Import Bank, which was last renewed for a period of 5 years, expired on June 30 of this year. In anticipation of this expiration date, the Bank asked that its charter be renewed for another 5 years and that both its lending and borrowing authority be increased sufficiently to provide for an expanding rate of operations over the next 5 years.

At the present time, the Bank is authorized to have loans, guarantees and insurance outstanding at any one time up to an aggregate amount of $7 billion. On the other side of the coin, the Bank is also authorized to have total liabilities to the Treasury in the amount of $7 billion, $6 billion of which may be in the form of loans from the Treasury and $1 billion in the form of capital stock, which capital stock is already outstanding.

The proposal was to increase both the Bank's lending authority and its borrowing authority by $2 billion to permit the Bank to play a greatly enlarged role in promoting exports over the next 5 years.

Both the House and the Senate agreed to this expansion of the Bank's lending and borrowing operations but the disagreement has been over how the additional $2 billion of financing for the Bank is to be provided. The Senate bill would have expanded the Bank's authorization to borrow, thus continuing the Bank's financing on the same method that has been in use since the Bank was founded 29 years ago. The House bill, on the other hand, would require that the $2 billion of additional funds be appropriated but without fiscal year limitation.

After nine meetings of the conferees, it was clear that neither side would yield. Accordingly, the compromise which has been reached is one to expand by $2 billion the Bank's lending authority but to make no expansion of any kind in the Bank's financing. In other words, the controversy has not been resolved; it has simply been put off until another day.

Even so it is apparent that the Bank will have adequate financing under present law for a reasonable period of time—18 months, 2 years, perhaps longer. The

committee report accompanying the House bill gives a balance sheet for the Bank as of December 31 setting out its exact financial condition as of that time. As this report shows, the Bank had liabilities of $3,776,768,000, all of which were liabilities to the Treasury except $285 million, which had been borrowed in effect from certain private banks. It is thus apparent that the Bank has quite substantial unused borrowing authority under present law. What it will not have under this compromise agreement is the elbow room it was asking for to expand its export promotion activities and also have provisions for meeting large emergency situations such as it has met in the past.

For example, during the Suez crisis the Bank lent the British Government one-half billion dollars to finance exports from the United States during the extraordinary demands on the British treasury. These funds have been repaid, incidentally.

Similarly, last June when there was a run on the Canadian dollar and a crisis in the Canadian balance of payments, the Bank lent the Canadian Goverment a quarter of a billion dollars. As it happened, the mere existence of this credit helped to solve Canada's problem, and no funds were ever actually disbursed.

It also appears that under existing law the Bank is authorized to issue securities in the private capital market, and to borrow from private sources. Last year it borrowed, in effect, $300 million from some of the private banks, using the device of the so-called participation certificates to effectuate the loan.

This device of setting up a pool of Government assets and then selling the banks a share in the pool is one invented early in the Eisenhower administration to raise funds on the RFC assets, the Commodity Credit assets, and others. The principal appeal of this device is that it is a way of raising funds without having the debt reflected in the national debt and thus escaping the debt limitation. The Export-Import Bank's borrowings in this manner seem to have involved, in addition, the payment of an excessive interest rate. The Comptroller General's audit report on the Bank's operations last year concludes that the Bank paid at least one-quarter of a percent more for the private funds than it would have paid on funds borrowed from the Treasury, pointing out that over the 10-year life of the loan the unnecessary cost to the taxpayers will be $3.9 million. If the Bank should borrow $2 billion at an interest rate of one-quarter of a percent higher than necessary, the cost to the taxpayers will be $5 million a year.

It is my own belief that the excessive interest charges which the Bank has paid on these borrowings from the private banks are higher than need be, and that the Bank could negotiate a rate much closer to that it would have to pay the Treasury. Unless this is true, I would personally be very disappointed to see the Bank engage in any more of this kind of private financing.

A second difference between the House bill and the Senate bill concerns the frequency of the Bank's reports to Congress. Under existing law, the Bank must report every 6 months and the Senate bill would have changed that to permit the Bank to make a report only once a year. Under the conference agreement, the present requirement for a report every 6 months would be continued. It is my belief that a report at least every 6 months is entirely justified and indeed I anticipate that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will have the officials of the Bank before it each 6 months to review these reports and make sure that we are fully informed as to what the Bank is doing.

It will now be well, I believe, for me to take some of the Members' time to review the history of this legislation. It is now obvious that these jurisdictional disputes are going to arise again and again, and lead to other prolonged deadlocks, not only with reference to the Export-Import Bank but each and every time we consider renewing or extending any of the other legislation involving Federal lending or banking operations. This will be true for a variety of veterans and housing programs, as well as for all others. The proposals that have been made from time to time over the years, such as that contained in the resolution of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], to place all Federal loan and banking operations under jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees, having been rejected, the champions of this proposal have given clear warning that they now intend to fight on each individual bill. Manifestly, we are caught up in an issue about which there is a great deal more emotion than substance and in a debate in which there is a great deal more misunderstanding than understanding.

Treasury financing is, of course, known in the dialectic of the rightwing radicals as "back-door financing or back-door spending." And the members of this cult seem firmly to believe that stopping this so-called back-door financing will lead to a reduction in Federal spending and help lay the groundwork for repeal of the Federal income tax. The reasoning behind all this is in no way clear and, in truth, I have been unable to find any reason why putting the Federal lending and banking operations under the Appropriations Committees would lead to any reduction in Federal spending whatever. Nevertheless, this erroneous belief is widely held and held by people who are very militant about having their way about things.

Now what are the facts as they apply to the Export-Import Bank?

The Bank was organized in 1934, almost 30 years ago. In 1945 its legislation was rewritten in several respects to make it accord with the Government Corporations Control Act which was enacted in that year.

Like all other Government corporations subject to the Government Corporations Control Act, the Bank may have a life of no more than 5 years. Until the present time, however, the Bank has operated without interruption since 1934. Over the span of its life, the Bank has been a profitable operation for the Treasury. It has paid dividends to the Treasury on its stock; and on its borrowed funds it has paid the Treasury a higher rate of interest than the Treasury's cost of borrowing the funds.

Since 1945, the life of the Bank has been renewed regularly each 5 years, and on these occasions both its lending authority and its borrowing authority have been expanded. During President Eisenhower's administration, Secretary Humphrey took a special interest in the Bank and, as a result, its charter was renewed more than a year before it was to expire—in 1957. Then in 1958 both its lending and borrowing authority were increased by $2 billion at Secretary Humphrey's request.

President Kennedy has asked Congress to expand both the Bank's lending and borrowing authority by another $2 billion. He made a particular point of this request in his budget message to Congress last January 17. The Bank plays a key role in the administration's program to promote a large-scale increase in our exports in order to help bring our international payments into balance. This is a most serious matter and any legislation which will help solve this problem should be handled expeditiously. The House Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on the administration's bill last February. We heard testimony from the members of the Bank's advisory committee, a prominent group of bankers, industrialists, and others. In addition, we heard other leaders of the banking community, the foreign policy associations, the American Farm Bureau, the AFL–CIO, the American Cotton Shippers Association, the National Small Business Association, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the National Cotton Council of America, plus a number of prominent representatives of business and finance in the international field. All witnesses uniformly endorsed the administration's bill.

When the committee met to consider reporting the bill, however, the minority members offered an amendment to change the method by which the Bank has traditionally been financed, to shift jurisdiction to the Appropriations Committee. The amendment was rejected on a straight party line vote. Thereafter, on March 11 the committee unanimously reported the bill but with all minority members of the committee submitting a minority report calling for a shift from the traditional method of Treasury financing to one of appropriations.

These two methods of financing make little, if any, difference to anything external but the Congress itself.

Under the Government Corporations Control Act, the Bank must:

First. Submit an annual budget to Congress and, accordingly, the anticipated expenditures of the Bank for the year ahead are in the President's budget.

Second. Any funds which the Bank takes from the Treasury are reflected in the Treasury's debt and are therefore included in the amount which is subject to the debt limitation.

Third. Funds are withdrawn from the Treasury only when needed. In fact, the Treasury handles the disbursements, just as it does in the case of appropriated funds. The only difference is that in the

case of appropriated funds there is no I O U or promise to repay given the Treasury.

Fourth. Administrative expenses must be approved in advance by Congress on an annual basis.

Fifth. Finally, the Bank's operations must be audited annually by the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General must make an annual report to Congress indicating whether or not the Bank's funds have been handled and accounted for properly and whether or not it has engaged in any operations not according to law.

Sixth. The Bank's charter to operate must not be extended for a period of more than 5 years. Congress can of course grant a charter for less than 5 years, and it can grant borrowing authority on an annual basis or even on a monthly basis if it so chooses.

Indeed, these are the controls and safeguards which the Government Corporations Control Act places over all of the Government banking and lending operations with a few exceptions, the most notable exception being the Federal Reserve banks. In the case of the Federal Reserve bank, there is no budget, no limitation on administrative expenses, and no audit.

The Federal Reserve Banks do not of course borrow funds from the Treasury, but they borrow gold from the Treasury. Then they issue money on this gold, and use the money to acquire interest bearing Government securities. The interest payments on these securities give the banks a very comfortable income, which they spend in whatever amounts they please, returning to the Treasury whatever amounts happen to be left over.

Since the Export-Import Bank is under the Government Corporations Control Act, we might ask what possible difference can it make whether the bank is financed by the appropriations method or the promise to repay method.

The Treasury borrowing method runs afoul of the doctrine of what we might call "the House must act first." This doctrine draws upon the language of article I, section 9, of the Constitution and also upon the language of article I, section 7, of the Constitution. Article I, section 9, states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Manifestly, this section was meant to give Congress control over the purse strings. It means, obviously, that no President, Secretary of the Treasury, or any other official is to take money from the Treasury except in amounts and for purposes specified in law. The proponents of the House primacy hold that in this section of the Constitution the framers are not only establishing principles but defining the precise meaning of words, with a view to requiring that legislation use the word "appropriations." Under the Rules of the House, bills using this term are automatically referred to the Appropriations Committee of the House.

The second step in the logic of this doctrine rests upon article I, section 7, of the Constitution, which declares:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Reasoning by analogy, the proponents of the doctrine conclude that raising revenue and expending public funds are one and the same, or at least natural counterparts and, consequently, the section of the Constitution requiring the House to act first on revenue bills applies equally to appropriations bills.

This doctrine has now been pretty well established and accepted by the Senate. In recent years the Senate has not attempted to originate measures which are under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees. The contest now, however, is to place legislation pertaining to the Federal banking and loan operations under the appropriations process where these will also come under the House's prerogative to act first. The Banking and Currency Committee of the House has not adopted the theory that the Senate may not initiate such measures and can act only upon such measures as the House may have passed first.

The Treasury financing procedure also runs afoul of the newer doctrine now developing which holds that the Senate may not properly amend an appropriations measure, although it may accept or reject outright an appropriations bill which the House has sent over. The House of Lords, it is sometimes said, has no right to amend appropriations measures approved by the House of Commons.

After our committee reported the Eximbank bill authorizing an additional $2 billion of borrowing authority for the Bank, and before the bill had received a rule, several soundings or polls were made of the House membership. These indicated considerable doubt whether action on the bill could be successfully completed in the House unless a change were made in the method of financing the $2 billion of additional funds for the Bank. It was clear that many Members of the House felt very deeply about this matter.

Accordingly, I promised the Rules Committee that when the bill was given a rule and brought up for action in the House I would offer an amendment to change the method of financing the $2 billion additional funds, which amendment was offered and accepted by the House.

The Senate, on the other hand, amended the bill to put the $2 billion of additional financing back into the Treasury borrowing category. Thus we have had a long and very costly dispute between the House and the Senate. There have been two debates and rollcalls in the House and one in the Senate, which would not have occurred except for the dispute. The House appointed 7 conferees, the Senate 9 conferees, or a total of 16 Members of Congress. The conferees have had a total of nine meetings, stretching over a period since the latter part of June, up to and through last Wednesday. If these meetings have involved no more than an average of 1 hour per meeting for each of the 16 conferees, then they have cost a total of 144 man-hours. In truth, some of the meetings lasted for several hours, and a great many years have been spent in preparations for the meetings.

Some of our friends in the House have thought, I know, that all the House conferees needed to do was to stand firm, and the Senate would yield. The Senate conferees have not been able to see the matter that way, thinking perhaps that all they needed to do was stand firm and the House would yield. It has been a very long and difficult deadlock.

I am not sure what the result of all this has been except that the Bank has been out of operation for a month and a half and a great deal of export business has been lost to American concerns. Business Week magazine of August 10 reported that $85 million in export business was lost during the month of July, as a result of the Bank's being out of operation, and during the month of August the loss might run as high as $145 million.

The House position, I must be frank to say, did not receive much outside support during these long negotiations. True, we had letters of support from some of the rightwing organizations, but a great many business firms and banks sent letters and telegrams taking the position that the Treasury financing method is more efficient and results in better bookkeeping.

I think we recognize, however, that in the affairs of Government the most efficient way of doing things is not necessarily the best way of doing things, particularly if the most efficient way involves a method that is misunderstood and disquieting to substantial numbers of people. While Members of Congress know that the phrase back-door spending has in fact none of the meanings the phrase implies, this phrase is very sacred in the cult of rightwing radicalism. In many parts of the country the Birchers and sons of Birchers are having almost nightly hootenannies to sing dirges about the evils of back-door financing.

The rightwing radical groups were activated against the Eximbank bill, furthermore, almost as soon as our committee reported it. I might cite, for example, the April 1, 1963, issue of the National Economic Council letter. The National Economic Council was founded by the late Merwin K. Hart, an oldtime American Firster, and in recent years chapter leader of the John Birch Society in New York. Its nine other officers still living are, I am assured, not only members of the John Birch Society but members of that society's committee of endorsers.

The National Economic Council's letter of April 1 lists six steps in what it calls its "campaign to cutback the concentration of power in the Federal Executive." Plank No. 4 is:

Stop every attempt to use backdoor financing.

This letter goes on to describe the Export-Import Bank bill as a test case which must be won at all costs, and urges its readership to help by writing letters to the Members of the Senate and the House. I quote:

On backdoor spending, the planners have picked a clever test case. Backdoor spending is permitting Federal agencies to write up their own I O U's and cash them at the Treasury—a highly unsound practice. The

administration proposes to finance the Export-Import Bank by backdoor financing. This means that for many years the Bank would get its money without having to get appropriations from Congress or show the amount of its spending in the budget.

Why make a test of the Export-Import Bank? Because the Bank is popular, relatively conservative, far better managed than most foreign aid agencies. But you can be sure—if this bill passes—that half a dozen other and worse bills will quickly be introduced using backdoor financing, that is, I O U's which the Treasury will then list among its assets.

This test case must not be won by the spenders. You can help by writing your Senators and Representative asking them that under no circumstances to allow backdoor funds to the Export-Import Bank or any other purpose.

The merits of the Eximbank are, of course, not involved in the dispute. The Bank is simply an innocent victim of a jurisdictional dispute within the Congress, and a doctrinal dispute within one of the major political parties.

Several Members of the House who insist on converting all banking and lending functions to the appropriations method have expressed the view that since the executive branch has a single agency—the Bureau of the Budget—to control the President's budget submissions, the Congress should have a single agency in the Appropriations Committee. This is, I think, an expression of a deep-felt need to meet a very real problem. But the exact proposal being made really does not come to grips with the problem and may misconceive the problem.

If the problem were only to keep the House Appropriations Committee informed of proposed budget expenditures, then manifestly that Committee its already informed. On the other hand, if the proposal is to create a central control over the aggregate expenditures of the Federal Government, which is the real problem, then the proposal to centralize all expenditure measures in the Appropriations Committee does not even begin to solve the problem. In order to provide the Appropriations Committee with such control, not only would the Senate have to give up the practice of amending expenditure bills, but the House would have to do likewise, and I seriously doubt if this solution would be acceptable to either body. At the present time, of course, the Appropriations Committee has many subcommittees acting simultaneously; and at any given moment appropriation bills are at various stages of completion in the House, in the Senate Appropriations Committee, in the Senate, and again in the House.

Furthermore, the question whether we have a surplus or deficit in the budget, and to what extent we have a surplus or deficit, also depends upon what the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee may be doing. It is a most serious problem and on about which thoughtful business groups such as the Committee for Economic Development—CED—have been gravely concerned. For example, I would like to quote from the testimony last year of a CED executive who is also a vice president in charge of the finance committee of the Ford Motor Co., as follows:

I would emphasize a matter that concerns us greatly. These hearings are probably the last moment at which Congress will consider the budget as a whole. Whether or not the budget target proposed by the administration is the correct one, there is no reliable machinery in the Congress that will make the overall results conform either to the administration's target or to some other target consciously chosen by the Congress.

The various taxing and appropriating committees of the Congress are already going their separate ways, making the unrelated decisions that will finally determine the budget. We will not even know the net results of all this until a month after Congress goes home. To carry out the purposeful budget policy on which there is growing agreement, more effective machinery in the Congress is needed.

This is a matter which should be of most serious concern to all of us. Congress must, I think, find more effective machinery for handling its expenditure legislation if it is to retain the functions assigned to it under the Constitution.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Comparative statement of financial condition, Dec. 31, 1962

[In thousands]

Assets:		
Cash:		
In banks, in transit, and on hand	$2,554	
With U.S. Treasury	878	
		$3,432
Loans receivable:		
Outstanding loans and undisbursed authorizations [1] [2]	5,333,490	
Less:		
Undisbursed letters of credit	98,308	
Other undisbursed authorizations	1,513,968	
Net loans receivable [3]		3,721,214
Accrued interest on loans	52,823	
Less: Amount due others [3]	2,024	
		50,799
Other assets		1,323
Total assets		3,776,768
Liabilities:		
Investment of the U.S. Government:		
Notes payable to U.S. Treasury [4]	$1,680,100	
Capital stock held by U.S. Treasury [5]	1,000,000	
Dividend payable [5]	0	
Retained income reserve [5]	804,495	
Total investment		3,484,595
Other liabilities:		
Participation certificates payable [3]	285,000	
Funds retained as loan security	5,872	
Trust and deposit liabilities	705	
Employees accrued annual leave	278	
Accounts payable	251	
Reservation for contingent labor claims	60	
Deferred and undistributed credits	7	
		292,173
Contingent liabilities for gross guarantees and insurance outstanding: [2]		
Guarantees to agent banks	33,741	
Medium-term guarantees	333,443	
Short-term guarantees	0	
Consignment insurance	1,534	
FCIA medium-term insurance	11,374	
FCIA short-term insurance	$462,693	
Total	842,785	
Tota , liabilities and investment		$3,776,768

[1] There are protracted loan defaults aggregating $24,700,000 ($14,000,000 principal plus $10,700,000 interest) involving 3 loans in Cuba and 4 to Bolivia. On these loans, the total outstanding principal is $70,100,000. Of the Bank's $200,000,000 of loans to mainland China, all but $29,000,000 has been repaid. Currently, the Republic of China has resumed payment on $2,600,000. In addition, there are other delinquencies which in the opinion of the Board, are attributable to routine delays or transitory exchange difficulties. The delinquencies total $11,200,000, of which $8,100,000 is principal and $3,100,000 is interest.

[2] The form of this statement differs from that published in June 1962. The change in the presentation was made on the recommendation of the General Accounting Office.

[3] In May 1962, the Bank sold guaranteed 10-year participations in the amount of $300,000,000 in a portfolio of its loans, which consists of selected loans from which collections of principal and interest are to be used for payment of principal and interest on the participation certificates. Participation certificates outstanding at Dec. 31, 1962, amounted to $285,000,000. (Loans designated in a memorandum record as in this fund on Dec. 31, 1962, totaled $648,000,000.)

[4] The Bank's authority to borrow from the U.S. Treasury is limited in the aggregate amount outstanding at any one time to $6,000,000,000. There is an overall ceiling of $7,000,000,000 currently limiting the Bank's loan and guarantee operations. Effective Sept. 26, 1961, Public Law 87-311 authorized the Bank to maintain reserves of a minimum of 25 percent on not to exceed $1,000,000,000 of outstanding insurance and guarantees on short- and medium-term paper. Reserves so calculated, which at Dec. 31, 1962, totaled $220,000,000 are added to outstanding loans and undisbursed loan authorizations as a charge against the Bank's $7,000,000,000 lending authority. At Dec. 31 1962, unused lending authority totaled $1,400,000,000.

The Congress limited the Bank's loan and guarantee activity for fiscal year 1963 to $1,295,000,000 of which not more than $750,000,000 was to be available for project lending. The Bank's operations, calculated in accordance with the above, were within these limitations.

[5] Capital stock of $1,000,000,000 is held by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Bank declared a dividend of $35,000,000 (3.5 percent) on June 29, 1962, and accordingly on July 2, 1962, paid that sum to the U.S. Treasury. All of the Bank's accumulated income of $804,500,000, after payment of dividends, has been reserved for possible future losses.

NOTE.—Figures in footnotes have been rounded to nearest tenths of a billion dollars to simplify presentation.

Source: Export-Import Bank.

[From Business Week magazine, Aug. 10, 1963]

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FEELS CONGRESS' PINCH—A FIGHT BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE OVER WHO SHOULD CONTROL THE PURSE HAS THE 29-YEAR-OLD BANK STOPPED COLD—IT ALSO IS COSTING U.S. EXPORTERS A HUGE CHUNK OF BUSINESS

The Export-Import Bank this week was in its second month as a technically nonexistent institution, and U.S. exporters were confronted with lost sales that may total $230 million by the end of August.

Behind the squeeze on both the Bank's operations and the exporters is a stubborn fight in Congress over who should control the Bank's purse. In the House, a bloc of Republicans and Southern Democrats feel that the Bank should get its funds from Congress through annual appropriations. But the Senate has voted to allow the Bank to continue to borrow its moneys directly from the Treasury, the so-called backdoor method of financing. So far, there is no sign that this deadlock will be resolved.

Since its founding in 1934, the life of the Bank, along with its borrowing authority, has been extended for consecutive 5-year terms by Congress. The last such term expired June 30. In July, the bank was in a technical state of liquidation, unable to make new loans or grant new credit guarantees. As a result, an estimated $85 million

in export business was lost—some permanently, some temporarily—because the Bank could not give the necessary credit guarantees. This month, the loss is expected to run to some $145 million.

LARGE AND SMALL

Perhaps the hardest hit by the curtailment of the Bank's functions is the jet aircraft industry. Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president of Douglas Aircraft Co., has warned Congress that sales of U.S. jet transports abroad depend heavily on backing from the Bank. Douglas is trying to sell its proposed DC-9 short-range jet in competition with Britain's BAC-111, on which earlier delivery dates have been promised. If the Export-Import Bank cannot give credits and guarantees for sales abroad, some of Douglas' 6,000 work force probably "will have to suffer," Douglas stated.

The Boeing Co., which is selling its 707 jet abroad and has foreign airline orders on its books for its short- to medium-range 727 for delivery next year, will feel the pinch even faster than Douglas. While the Export-Import Bank is forced to mark time, French and British Government export institutions are expanding their credit guarantees.

Smaller companies are suffering too. "I don't know what they're fighting about * * * I do know they are simply finishing off our export business," says Louis Schriber, president of Schriber Machinery Co., Dayton, Ohio. "We've got a printing machine going to a good Mexican customer. It's blocked on the border."

UNEXPECTED BLOW

The wrangle that stopped the Bank cold started on February 25 when Congress received the request for a 5-year extension of the Bank's life, with $2 billion more in authorized lending power and $2 billion more authorization to back up export guarantees and insurance.

At hearings in both the House and Senate, praise was heaped on the Bank as "one of the Government's finest institutions * * * it pays its own way." Then the ax fell. The House passed a bill extending the Bank's life—but with a year-by-year appropriations approval rider attached. The Senate, feeling the shaky, year-by-year financing arrangements would turn foreign buyers to expanding credits offered by the West Germans, French, and British, voted to continue the present arrangement.

A DIVIDEND

Backers of the Bank say it has repaid on schedule, and with interest, all it has borrowed from the Treasury and has piled up an extra reserve of $825 million from its own earnings. In addition, the Bank this June declared a $50 million dividend, which goes to the Treasury as an unplanned extra. This is the highest dividend in the Bank's history, up from $35 million last year and $22.5 million the year before.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank bill, merits the support of the Members of this House. Here are five good reasons why this is the case:

First. The life of the Bank is extended 5 years to June 30, 1968.

Second. The Bank's overall lending, guarantee, and insurance authorization is increased by $2 billion from a total of $7 billion to a new total of $9 billion.

Third. The Bank's export credit insurance and guarantee authorization is increased by $1 billion from the present maximum of $1 billion to a new maximum of $2 billion, chargeable against the overall statutory lending, guarantees, and insurance limitation on a 25-percent reserve basis.

Fourth. The position of the House in opposition to increased authorization for back-door spending is preserved—there is not even one penny of additionally authorized back-door spending in this conference report.

Fifth. A reduction of $2 billion is made in the Federal funds obligational authority requested by the President in his budget message of January 17, 1963.

The first three of these points for support of this conference report stem from the provisions included in the text of the report. Points four and five above mentioned stem from omission from the conference report of a provision in the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill which would have given the Export-Import Bank access to $2 billion of additional Federal funds. In the House-passed version of the bill this added $2 billion of Federal funds would have been provided through the appropriation process. In the Senate-passed version, the $2 billion of additional Federal funds would have been provided through back-door financing. The method by which this $2 billion of additional Federal funds was to be provided was the crux of the long drawn-out controversy between the House and Senate conferees. The controversy was resolved by omitting from the conference report, any provision for added Federal funds for the Bank. Thus, no new back-door spending has been authorized and requested budget obligational authority has been reduced by $2 billion.

To those unfamiliar with the broad charter and operations of the Bank it might seem that the conference agreement means little. It could be argued that while lending authority was increased by $2 billion, no provision was made for a corresponding increase of $2 billion in access to Federal funds and therefore the $2 billion lending increase is an empty gesture. Such is not the case.

The Bank has capital stock of $1 billion, $6 billion of Treasury borrowing authority and surplus of $810 million as of June 30, 1963. That is a total of $7.810 billion of available funds from these sources. However, section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act, which is the control section, places an overall limit on the amount of loans, guarantees and insurance which the Bank may have outstanding at any one time. Presently that limit is $7 billion. Therefore, even though the Bank has available resources of $7.810 billion as above detailed to make loans, it could only make $7 billion of loans because of the limitation in section 7 of the present law. The conference report in increasing the section 7 control limit of the act from $7 to $9 billion would therefore permit the Bank to utilize its capital stock, Treasury borrowing authority, and surplus in the full amount of $7.810 billion.

In addition to the above-listed sources of usable funds the Bank may also borrow funds in the private market, limited only by the overall control limit in section 7 of the act. Borrowing of $1.2 billion funds in the private market plus $800 million of the now fully usable surplus would give the Bank $2 billion of funds to support the $2 billion increase in lending authority for the Bank provided by the conference report.

The ability of the Bank to borrow in the private market is more than a theoretical right. The Bank has demonstrated that it can do so. In May of 1962 the Bank sold $300 million of 10-year serial, 4¼-percent participating certificates in the private market. In May 1963 the Bank sold an additional $250 million of 4-percent participation certificates with a 7-year serial maturity in the private market. As of June 30, 1963, a total of $520 million of these participating certificates remained outstanding.

There has been some criticism of the Bank for sale of these participation certificates which in effect is borrowing from the private market. I think the criticism is ill-founded. As a matter of fact I believe the management of the Bank should be commended, rather than criticized, for the start it has made in financing its borrowing operations from the private investment market rather than from the Federal Treasury. I hope the Bank will expand its operations of borrowing in the private investment market even to the point where it obtains virtually all of its borrowed funds in the private market. Its Federal borrowing authority could be placed on a virtual standby basis. This is what has been done by the Federal National Mortgage Association in its secondary market operations for the purchase of home mortgages of our own citizens.

Critics of the Bank borrowing funds in the private market contend the interest cost to the Bank is higher by about one-fourth. I believe that is true and that one-fourth of 1 percent is a fair estimate of the added interest cost. But the Bank is in a unique position to cover this added cost and still maintain its customary spread between the cost of funds borrowed and return on funds loaned. Most of the loans of the Bank are for undertakings in foreign countries where the Bank's interest charge of 5¾ or 6 percent is indeed a bargain rate. Many of the Bank's loans are in countries where the going rate of interest even on short-term prime-business loans is 10, 12, or 15 percent. A quarter of 1 percent added on to the Bank's interest charge for foreign financing would still leave the Bank a much sought after source of bargain credit financing.

Let me direct your attention to what could be achieved if a top level policy decision was made to place the Bank's Treasury borrowing authority on a standby basis as support for borrowing from the private market. As of June 30, 1963, the Bank owed the U.S. Treasury $1,476,200,000. All of that money—almost $1½ billion could be repaid to the Treasury with funds borrowed by the Bank in the private market and there is not even any question as to the ability of the Bank to do so. The repayment would result in a reduction of the Federal cash deficit of almost $1½ billion and afford almost $1½ billion leeway in

the Federal debt ceiling. I sincerely hope such a top level policy decision will be made with respect to financing of the Bank's borrowing operations.

I think the committee of conference was right in not giving the Bank access to any additional Federal funds. With the authority in the amended act, the Bank can substantially expand its operations. As of June 30, 1963, the Bank had $3.816 billion of outstanding loans receivable, $1.561 billion of undisbursed commitments and $816 million of gross guarantees and insurance. That totals $6.2 billion and represents gross financial assistance being rendered by the Bank as of that date. Under the act as amended by the conference report the Bank could have outstanding $8.5 billion of loans and commitments plus $2 billion of gross guarantees and insurance or total gross financial assistance that could be outstanding at any time of $10.5 billion. The amended act therefor will permit an expansion of $4.3 billion of gross financial assistance the Bank may provide at any one time or approximately 69 percent more than the $6.2 billion of gross financial assistance being rendered by the Bank as of June 30, 1963.

This $10.5 billion of gross financial assistance which the Bank could have outstanding at any one time under the amended act could be financed within the $9 billion limitation on loans, guarantees, and insurance provided in the section 7 control provision of the amended act in the following manner:

First, reserve of $500 million for guarantees and insurance, provided on a 25-percent reserve basis of $2 billion outstanding guarantees and insurance; second, borrowed funds of $6.7 billion of which $6 billion could be from the Federal Treasury and $700 million from the private market, or all of it from the private market; third, capital stock of $1 billion; and fourth, surplus of $800 million.

As a matter of record in the operations of the Bank, some commitments are never drawn down but are canceled and there is a substantial lag between the time commitments are made and the time when disbursements are made thereunder. Also with respect to exporter guarantees and insurance, funds are not paid out unless there is an actual loss and premium income under the program is designed to meet such losses. Further, payments and prepayments and interest income on loans previously made provide the Bank with a continuing source of usable funds. What this all adds up to, is, that from an operating point of view the Bank normally makes greater use of its lending guarantees and insurance authorization than is required of its borrowing and other financing authority.

Throughout this long drawn out controversy the position of the House has been clear. On May 1, 1963 the House passed the bill extending the life of the Export-Import Bank and giving it additional authority. The Senate saw fit to modify one of those provisions and thereby provoke the prolonged controversy over the back-door spending issue. The Senate under legislative rules thereby assumed full responsibility for the stalemate. It, in no sense, has been a controversy over the Bank. It has been a controversy over the policy issue of back-door spending. The House clearly expressed itself on the issue by its 110 to 0 vote on July 9 instructing the conference managers on the part of the House "to insist upon the appropriation method of financing provided in the bill as passed by the House" for the proposed $2 billion increase of Federal funds for the Bank. By a subsequent rollcall vote of 379 to 11 on July 30 the House reaffirmed its position that the "House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate."

As the Senate did not pass its amended bill until June 24—just 6 days before the life of the Bank expired it was obvious a "crisis" over the Bank's operations was in the making. A resolution temporarily extending the life of the Bank for 1 month was cleared with the minority. The minority pledged its full support to the temporary extending resolution and expected it to be acted upon June 26. For reasons best known to the majority leadership, the resolution was not presented although we were given to understand that the Bank itself "saw no harm in a short lapse in its authority to make new commitments."

Early in the conferences it became apparent a stalemate had been reached which could continue for an extended period of time. Minority members of the conference pointed out that according to projected operations in the fiscal 1964 budget the Bank could continue operations for a year without any new authority for additional Federal funds. Later, when figures became available as to the position of the Bank as of July 1, 1963, it was apparent the Bank could continue operations for 2 years or more out of authorizations then in the law. As of July 1, 1963, the Bank had unused lending authority of $1.364 billion, actually more than $1.312 billion available as of July 1, 1961—2 years before.

It seemed to the minority members of the conference the dispute could be resolved, temporarily at least, by dropping from the bill the controversial provision with respect to $2 billion additional Federal funds and how such funds would be provided. Majority members of the conference rejected this proposal until the day before the final conference. Then we were informed, the President of the Bank had met with them, and assured them the Bank had access to ample funds to continue operations for a considerable period of time, and that the controversial provision could be dropped from the bill. A conference agreement was then reached quickly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It provides the Bank with desirable new authority. It does not breach the policy position the House has taken in opposition to new back-door spending authorizations. This conference report should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 5 minutes yielded to me by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

All I want to do is express gratification that the conferees stood firm in support of the position of the House against the back-door financing provision of the Export-Import Bank bill.

After all, this position was taken on a record vote of 379 to 11. Certainly there are a majority of the Members of the House who strongly believe that it is in the public interest that no money be drawn from the Treasury except by an appropriation, and because we take this stand in the interest of better congressional control over expenditures does not indicate we are members of a lunatic fringe as some like to infer. The Constitution calls for control over Federal expenditures to be under the jurisdiction of the legislative branch. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, intend to continue to oppose back-door spending at the risk of being called a financial conservative or other names by liberal free spenders and those who differ from my thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the future if and when additional capital of the Bank is being sought such funds will be requested through the appropriations procedure. Then the House and Senate can avoid disagreement.

I think the conferees have arrived at a satisfactory agreement and I commend their report to the Memebrs of the House. It should have unanimous support.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the need to continue the operations of the Export-Import Bank is so urgent that I am sure the pending conference report has the support of an overwhelming majority of the House. The Bank's charter expired on June 30 and since then it has been unable to issue loans or guarantees. There is now a backlog of over 100 applications for aid awaiting favorable action on this conference report which would renew the charter of the Bank for 5 years and increase its authority to finance exports through loans and guarantees.

The Bank plays a vital role in our export drive and any decline in sales of American goods to other nations will not only have a serious effect upon the prosperity of American business but will daily worsen our balance-of-payments position and put a further strain on our dwindling supply of gold.

The conference committee was completely deadlocked on the single question of how additional borrowing authority for the Bank was to be financed. The House version would have required appropriations, while the Senate bill would have continued the existing authority for direct Treasury borrowing. Disagreement on this point has held the bill in conference since early July. Recently the conferees were informed by Bank officials that other resources were available to carry the Bank for a reasonable period. In view of this and because of the urgent need for immediate action, the conference committee set this issue

aside by eliminating the provision to increase borrowing authority and unanimously agreed on the present conference report.

The Export-Import Bank is not widely known to the public but it has been performing a vital public service since 1934. All those who are familiar with it and do business with it support it vigorously. The function of the Bank is to encourage American exports by supplementing private financing through loans and guarantees. In its nearly three decades of experience it has directly aided $9 billion of American sales abroad and its indirect benefits go far beyond that. It has done this not only without cost to the American taxpayer but, in fact, has earned substantial dividends. Altogether the Bank has paid $456 million in interest to the Treasury and an additional $356 million in dividends on capital stock held by the Treasury. Above these amounts it has placed in reserve $810 million in undivided profits which guarantees that its future operations will be solvent.

Its real importance, however, is the economic benefit it provides for our country. This is particularly true now in view of the adverse balance of payments which has resulted in an ominous drain of American gold into foreign hands. The entire operation of the Export-Import Bank combats this dangerous trend. With rare and minor exceptions, every dollar the Bank lends or guarantees is spent right here in this country. The sales abroad which this makes possible result in a flow of dollars back to the United States and to that extent helps our balance of payments and protects our gold supply. Last year alone, this flow of repayments amounted to $700 million.

The Export-Import Bank helps to relieve our balance-of-payments problem in the best possible way—by financing American production. This means jobs and profits for our people here at home. There is no question of the ability of American goods to compete with foreign products. Our skills and the tremendous productivity of the American private enterprise system are more than a match for any country in the world. Most other nations provide aid of one kind or another for financing their sales and the Export-Import Bank enables American goods to compete on equal terms of financing.

We all know from our daily lives and business transactions that the terms and availability of financing are essential factors in the market. Without the aid of the Export-Import Bank many American producers would be seriously handicapped in selling abroad. This, in turn, would mean reduced sales, fewer jobs, smaller profits, and less national income. Our farms and factories would be hurt just as much as if they had lost sales here at home.

Mr. Speaker, let me take just one example of the importance of the Export-Import Bank to our domestic welfare. Mr. Robert S. Weil, of Montgomery, Ala., testified before our committee in behalf of the American Cotton Shippers Association. He pointed out that even with severely reduced acreage, we are producing 14 million bales of cotton a year. Our domestic mills consume only a little over 8 million bales, leaving an annual surplus of 6 million bales for export. Last year, exports of cotton amounted to $600 million. Unfortunately, our share of the free world market is less now than it was in the thirties. If we could regain that share Mr. Weil estimated that our cotton exports would be at least $400 million higher and this one factor would take care of about one-fifth of our balance-of-payments deficit.

He further pointed out the benefits right here at home of cotton exports. A high and prosperous level of cotton production is important not only to farm income but to many allied industries, such as seed, fertilizer, machinery, railroads, trucking, gins, bagging and ties, insurance, banking, warehousing, and the whole range of consumer products for which those dependent on cotton represent a market.

The Export-Import Bank is important to this whole complex of economic interests which are tied into cotton. Altogether it has financed $1.3 billion of cotton exports. At the end of June, just before its charter expired, the Bank extended a $6 million cotton credit for sales to one country and it now has another application for $3 million of aid awaiting approval of this conference report.

The flow of these commodities abroad also nourishes and sustains our great port cities. Any loss of cotton exports would seriously harm our southern ports which handle this trade. These ports are invaluable national assets in both peace and war and any economic adversity they suffer would soon be felt throughout the Nation. What I have said about cotton, of course, applies equally well to the many other southern export products, such as lumber and construction materials, naval stores, machinery, and so forth. It is equally true of the products of every section of our country.

Mr. Speaker, there are few Government enterprises which have such widespread basic support as the Export-Import Bank. It is important not only to help solve our gold problem but, by the same token, it is important to employment, profits, and production here at home. I urge all Members to support this conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, and the House conferees for maintaining the House position in this important legislation. As one who has participated in numerous conferences with the other body, I know how difficult it is to reach an agreement that fully carries out the sentiments of the House. On this particular bill, however, I feel the conferees have done an outstanding job. There is no back-door financing in the measure. Although included in the Senate bill, provisions for back-door spending were knocked out in conference. It is important that the back-door financing was eliminated. And it was important that the legislation be approved promptly. The Export-Import Bank is one of the Government's finest agencies. It has helped to stimulate foreign trade and it has a fine record. As a matter of fact, it is making money. Because of the Bank's excellent financial condition, it does not now require additional funds. And I am sure that when the Bank does need additional funds, it will be able to obtain them promptly through the normal and orderly appropriations process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZED FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BORROWING AUTHORITY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 664)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter

proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That subsection (a) of section 2 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2501b) is amended by striking out "and the sum of $21,000,000 for the fiscal year 1959 and for each fiscal year thereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the sum of $21,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1959 through 1963, inclusive, and the sum of $39,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964 and for each fiscal year thereafter', and in the proviso in such subsection (a) by striking out 'and subsequent fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and for each subsequent fiscal year through and including fiscal year 1963'.

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City', approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), is amended by striking '$75,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$175,000,000'.

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1968' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1973'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

BASIL L. WHITENER,
JOHN DOWDY,
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
FRANK J. HORTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT

The House bill (H.R. 6177) increased the total amount authorized to be appropriated by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia from $32,000,000 per fiscal year to $45,000,000 per fiscal year.

Title I of the Senate amendment substituted for the fixed amount of the Federal payment to the District of Columbia authorized in existing law an amount which would have been determined by a formula based roughly upon the amount the Federal Government would pay to the District of Columbia if it were a private business in the District of Columbia subject to usual taxation. It was estimated that this formula would have resulted in the authorized Federal contribution for the fiscal year 1964 being fixed at approximately $53,000,000, with this amount increasing for succeeding fiscal years to $67,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

The proposed conference substitute retains the concept of a fixed authorization as contained in present law and in the House bill. However, the conference substitute increases the total of such authorization for each future fiscal year (beginning with fiscal 1964) from the $45,000,000 contained in the House bill to $50,000,000.

BORROWING AUTHORITY

The House bill (H.R. 6177) contained no provisions relating to the District of Columbia borrowing authority. However, House bill H.R. 4277, as passed by the House, increased the amount which the District of Columbia is authorized to borrow from the Treasury from the $75,000,000 contained in existing law to $150,000,000 and extended the cutoff date on such loans from June 30, 1968, to June 30, 1972.

Title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 6177 would have substituted for the fixed amount of the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia contained in existing law an amount of borrowing authority based upon a formula keyed to the formula for the authorized Federal payment contained in title I of the Senate amendment. It was estimated that the formula contained in title II of the Senate amendment would result in the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia being increased in fiscal 1964 to $225,000,000, with this amount increasing to $275,000,000 by fiscal 1969. Title II of the Senate amendment did not contain any cutoff date for loans to the District of Columbia under such borrowing authority.

The proposed conference substitute retains the concept of a fixed amount of borrowing authority as contained in existing law and in H.R. 4277 as passed by the House. The proposed conference substitute would increase the borrowing authority for the District of Columbia from the $75,000,000 contained in existing law to $175,000,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the $150,000,000 authorized to be borrowed by H.R. 4277 and a decrease of some $50,000,000 below the amount initially authorized to be borrowed by the proposed Senate amendment.

In addition, the proposed conference substitute would provide a cutoff date of June 30, 1973, for loans to the District of Columbia under this borrowing authority. This is a 5-year extension of the cutoff date of June 30, 1968, contained in existing law. The Senate amendment would have completely removed from the law any cutoff date limitation for these loans.

TITLE

The proposed conference substitute would accept the Senate amendment to the title of the bill as more accurately reflecting the substance of the legislation.

BASIL L. WHITENER,
JOHN DOWDY,
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
FRANK HORTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, which the Clerk has just read, adequately explains the action taken by the conferees. I will, therefore, forgo detailed discussion of the report.

The net effect of the action taken by the conferees is to raise the amount of the Federal payment to the District of Columbia from $32 million per fiscal year to $50 million per fiscal year. When H.R. 6177 was approved by the House, this figure was set at $45 million. The Senate, however, adopted a formula which would yield approximately $53 million for fiscal year 1964, according to estimates. It will thus be seen that the conference report reduces that estimated figure by $3 million and avoids the use of the formula contained in the Senate proposal.

By separate bill, H.R. 4277, the House had increased the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia from the $75 million presently authorized to $150 million. This bill also extended the cutoff date for such loans to June 30, 1972.

The Senate amendment would have substituted for the fixed amount of borrowing authority a formula which it was estimated would authorize borrowing to the extent of $225 million for fiscal year 1964, and a continuing estimated increase for later fiscal years. The Senate amendment had no cutoff date for loans under the borrowing authority.

The conferees agreed upon a fixed amount of borrowing authority and set June 30, 1973, as the cutoff date for loans to the District of Columbia under this borrowing authority. Thus it will be seen that $175 million fixed amount of borrowing authority approved in the conference report is $50 million less than the estimated amount under the proposed formula.

While some of us may feel the action taken by the conferees was in excess of the real needs of the District of Columbia, I would point out that both the Federal payment and the exercise of the borrowing authority will still be subject to the scrutiny of the appropriations committees of the House and Senate. Since there will be this annual review of fiscal affairs in the District of Columbia government by these committees of the Congress, I see no real cause for apprehension as to the results which will follow the enactment of this legislation.

I hope that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House conferees and the House in agreeing to raise the Federal payment to the District of Columbia to $50 million and the borrowing authority to $175 million is encouraging in light of the extremely difficult financial situation confronting our Nation's Capital City today. It is also encouraging as a further step in recognizing the Federal Government's unique responsibility as the District's principal property owner—a responsibility it has all too often been negligent in meeting fairly.

This is an encouraging step, Mr. Speaker, but let me remind our colleagues that it is just that—only a step. What is needed is the adoption of a formula, such as contained in H.R. 4592 and H.R. 4594; a formula which would put the Federal Government and the District on a continuing, businesslike basis.

This formula has been attacked as being vague and of depriving Congress of its legitimate powers. Neither, in fact, is the case. The formula, rather, is a simple, equitable procedure whereby the Federal Government would be authorized to appropriate each year an amount equivalent to that which it would pay to the District if it were a private business, subject to real property, personal property, business income, and related taxes.

This formula would allow and encourage planning which is essential to the solution of many pressing local problems. It would not, however, diminish in any way the authority or responsibility of this body.

In the first place, Congress could at any time review, alter, or abolish the formula. Second, we are only talking about authorization. Appropriations would continue to be made on an annual basis, and only to the level that that vigilant committee finds completely justified.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the House conferees on the conference bill they have reported to the House. With this new level of financing authority further progress can be made in the District of Columbia. But the long-term planning which is vital to long-term, constructive solutions will only become possible when the more realistic approach of the formula is adopted.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the House District Committee has worked long hours, days, and weeks on the District revenue bill; and I am happy that the House has accepted the conference report of a $50 million Federal payment and a $175 million borrowing authority for the Nation's Capital. The members of the subcommittee who held extensive hearings on this subject should be congratulated and thanked personally by the business people of the District of Columbia.

I have never known the House of Representatives to increase the Federal payment more than $7 million in 1 year; however, we have been successful on this occasion in having the House approve an $18 million increase in the Federal payment for the District of Columbia. After reading some of the news editorials of the local Washington papers, the average person would think that the Congress has done nothing for the District of Columbia, while in actual fact we have prevented a tax increase by our action in increasing the Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

I do not belong to the class that seems to be of the opinion that money can cure all the ills in the District of Columbia. I am certain that there are numerous places in the District government where expenses can be reduced. It is my sincere hope that the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees for the District of Columbia will give thorough consideration to every request and every item presented by the District officials, as we cannot afford to increase the Federal payment and taxes every year. The present cost of operating the District government is much more than that of the average State with a population twice the size of the District of Columbia population.

The following is a statement which will give all interested parties some information as to how the different agencies in the District of Columbia have been treated and especially the school system:

The attached exhibits have been prepared in the belief that they may be of some significance in connection with the financial plight of the District of Columbia, with its soaring cost of city government operation.

Exhibit No. 1 consists of statistics from the 13 U.S. cities, of which the District of Columbia is one, with populations between 500,000 and 1 million. These figures, quoted from "Compendium of City Government Finances," editions of 1951 and 1961, published by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, show the population changes for each city over the decade from 1950 through 1960 and also the change in the number of city government employees per thousand population, over the same period of time. It will be observed that the District of Columbia leads all these cities substantially not only in the number of city government employees per thousand population but also in the increase in this number over this 10-year period. Hence, the often-advanced argument that the District of Columbia differs from any other city of comparable size in the number of governmental responsibilities which it must assume—functions many of which are discharged by the various State governments elsewhere—and, therefore, must employ more people to discharge these responsibilities, falls completely flat in view of this latter fact. Since the number of these extra responsibilities has not increased during the past decade, there appears no logical reason for the number of city government employees per thousand population to have increased so disproportionately.

Exhibit No. 2 pinpoints this problem in the District of Columbia in considerably more detail, as it shows the increase in the number of District government employees in the various grades, from fiscal years 1955 through 1963. The tremendous percentage increases in positions from grade 6 upward will be noted, as contrasted with the relatively small increases in positions from grade 5 downward. This clearly indicates a tendency to add more and more to the number of administrative personnel in the District of Columbia government, far out of proportion to the much smaller increase in the number of lower salaried, clerical personnel.

Exhibit No. 3 shows the cost of this situation, in the District of Columbia alone, for fiscal years 1954 through 1963, and also in comparison with the other 12 U.S. cities of comparable size. In the latter instance, it will be observed that again the District of Columbia leads all these cities by a considerable margin.

The seriousness of this situation is revealed by the fact that the expenditure for personal services constitutes some two-thirds of the entire operating expense of the District of Columbia government—and has reached the figure of $176,132,000 in the budget estimate for fiscal 1964.

Exhibit No. 4 shows the total appropriations to the District of Columbia government, and the Federal contribution, both authorized and actually appropriated, for fiscal years 1955 through 1963.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

City	Population, 1950	Population, 1960	Percent change in population	Number of city government employees per thousand population, 1950	Number of city government employees per thousand population, 1960	Number change
Milwaukee	637,392	741,324	+16.3	10.3	12.4	+2.1
Baltimore	949,708	939,024	−1.1	27.0	27.0	
Pittsburgh	676,806	604,332	−10.7	9.6	10.9	+1.3
Boston	801,344	697,197	−13.0	27.4	30.9	+2.5
Cincinnati	503,998	502,550	−0.28	11.25	13.56	+2.31
Cleveland	914,808	876,050	−4.2	12.59	12.39	−0.2
Buffalo	580,132	532,759	−8.1	15.56	17.34	+1.78
San Francisco	775,357	740,316	−4.5	25.54	29.93	+4.39
Houston	596,163	938,219	+57.3	6.3	9.1	+2.8
St. Louis	856,796	750,026	−12.4	9.3	12.5	+3.2
Minneapolis	521,718	482,872	−7.4	16.7	19.1	+2.4
New Orleans	570,445	627,525	+10.0	11.3	11.7	+0.4
Washington	802,178	763,956	−4.7	24.9	34.5	+9.6

EXHIBIT NO. 2

Authorized permanent classified positions, 1955 and 1963

Grade level	1955	1963	Numerical change	Percent change
1	511	24	−487	−102.9
2	463	584	+121	+26.1
3	1,239	1,367	+128	+10.3
4	877	1,641	+764	+87.1
5	1,602	1,258	−344	−27.3
6	503	1,249	+746	+148.3
7	730	1,507	+777	+106.4
8	116	373	+257	+221.5
9	354	925	+571	+161.3
10	29	142	+113	+389.6
11	213	515	+302	+141.6
12	190	303	+113	+59.4
13	103	194	+91	+88.3
14	55	163	+108	+196.3
15	38	104	+66	+173.6
16	12	29	+17	+141.6
17	5	8	+3	+60.0
18	0	3	+3	

Source: District of Columbia Personnel Office.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

District of Columbia government employment statistics, fiscal years 1954–63

	Number of authorized permanent positions	Total gross payroll
Fiscal year:		
1954	19,818	$82,575,105
1955	20,686	89,673,840
1956	21,181	97,094,671
1957	21,995	102,558,852
1958	23,127	[1] 116,688,138
1959	23,794	[1] 124,672,939
1960	24,479	[1] 134,610,294
1961	25,363	143,611,577
1962	26,229	149,014,318
1963	27,253	156,985,278
Numerical increase	7,435	74,410,173
Percent increase	37.5	90.1

[1] Calendar year figures.

EXHIBIT No. 3—Continued

SALARY INCREASES AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PERSONNEL SINCE 1954

	Percent
Classified personnel	30.5
Police and firemen	40.4
Teachers	46.4
Wage board personnel	36.5

Sources: District of Columbia Personnel Office; District of Columbia Budget Office.

[In thousands of dollars]

City	Expenditure for personal services, fiscal 1951	Expenditure for personal services, fiscal 1961	Increase
Milwaukee	28,097	53,829	25,732
Baltimore	58,322	128,426	70,104
Pittsburgh	23,758	37,113	13,355
Boston	75,131	105,215	30,084
Cincinnati	22,843	48,762	25,919
Cleveland	55,012	75,254	20,242
Buffalo	31,649	55,434	23,785
San Francisco	51,811	97,916	46,105
Houston	13,531	37,853	24,322
St. Louis	33,968	57,576	23,608
Minneapolis	21,048	30,958	9,910
New Orleans	18,997	36,231	17,234
District of Columbia	65,387	146,488	81,101

Source: "Compendium of City Government Finances" (1951 and 1961 editions) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

EXHIBIT No. 4

Total appropriations and Federal contribution (authorized and appropriated), fiscal years 1955 through 1963

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total appropriation	Federal contribution authorized	Federal contribution appropriated
1955	172.0	20	20
1956	179.2	20	18
1957	200.5	23	20
1958	203.3	23	20
1959	218.8	32	25
1960	242.8	32	25
1961	288.1	32	25
1962	271.3	32	30
1963	289.0	32	30

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

BOOTLEGGING PRAYER

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include excerpts from a commencement address that I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial entitled "Bootlegging Prayer," written by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, which in my opinion points up the opposition of the American people to the Supreme Court decisions banning prayer and Bible reading in public schools. This editorial, which under a unanimous consent request will appear in the daily RECORD today, sets forth the results of surveys made by the two great news services, United Press International, and the Associated Press, indicating widespread refusal to go along with the Court.

It has also been refreshing to read in the press and to have reported over radio and television, where many States and innumerable school districts are indicating their opposition to these recent rulings by informing their teachers that they are not prohibited from Bible reading and from having prayer in their classrooms.

I think Mr. Hearst has propounded an intriguing question, which I hope all Members of Congress will ponder in their hearts, when he asks, "How has it arrived at what it is only fair to call an establishment—the establishment of atheism, as a favored 'church'—if you'll pardon the expression?"

Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to use the theme, "In God We Trust" in two commencement addresses, one delivered at Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Mo., on June 3, and the other at the Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, on August 2, in which I discussed the direction in which we are headed unless Congress takes some action in nullifying the action of the Supreme Court, which indicates that the philosophy of the present majority of the Court considers all references to God in the public schools as violating the first amendment to the Constitution, more usually referred to as the first article of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, to those who would defend the action of the Court, I would only say, read the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in the school prayer case, and you too, may join in the fear expressed by Mr. Hearst.

Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith excerpts from the addresses referred to above, in which I predict what we may expect in the not too distant future, unless this Congress takes some action to reverse the trend:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

For the moment lay aside any prejudice you may have against politicians, for after all there are many definitions as to what constitutes a politician. Too often, I think, we are inclined to accept the synonym which most accurately describes the particular politician we have in mind at the moment, whether it be grafter, demagog, or statesman. Actually, the politician is, more often than not, one who does not hold public office. The definition I like best is that a politician is an individual who is experienced in, or versed in the science of politics, which I prefer to describe as the art or science of government. And, in this concept I feel that rather than having too many, we have too few practicing politicians, both in and out of government. The more people we have who are interested in good government, and who really understand how our Government functions, the better our Government will be. That, my friends, is one of the challenges I issue here today—a call to all good citizens to become more interested in politics.

Now, I want to speak to you about the religious foundation upon which this great Government of ours was founded. I want to discuss with you one of the most unfortunate controversies that exists in our national life today. A controversy, about which in my opinion, there is entirely too much misunderstanding. I am referring to the great debate which has been raging over the question of the separation of church and state.

Certainly, I concur in the necessity for the separation of church and state, and will defend to the end the right of freedom of worship, upon which the very foundation of this Nation is based. But the danger which I fear most is the activities of those sinister forces that would abolish and deny the necessity of maintaining religion as the cornerstone upon which the strength of this Nation stands. Separation of church and states does not mean abolishment of the concept of religion as exemplified in our national motto, "In God We Trust," which is based on the many references to the Deity in whom our Founding Fathers put their trust when they were writing the Declaration of Independence.

Despite any impressions to the contrary, which you may have, Congress as a body and through its individual members, has long recognized the need for Divine guidance and strength, and on many occasions throughout the years, has evidenced this belief through positive legislative action. A most recent evidence of this expression of recognition, not only of faith but of dependence upon the Almighty, was the unanimous adoption of a resolution directing the placing over the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives the inscription, "In God We Trust". This followed closely upon the announcement of the Supreme Court's decision in the now famous school prayer case. It was my privilege to handle this resolution on the floor and to make the motion for its adoption. I know I was not alone in the feeling that by this one gesture we were telling the world, including members of the Supreme Court, that we recognized that the strength of this Nation rests upon the deep and abiding faith that God has been the protector of this Nation since its birth.

During the comparatively brief time that I have been privileged to serve in the Congress of the United States, I have had the satisfaction of supporting legislation that has provided for the inclusion of our national motto, "In God We Trust," on all of the paper currency which is now being printed by our Government. (For almost 100 years this motto has appeared on the metallic coins.) During this same period that I have been in Congress, the pledge of allegiance to the flag was officially changed by congressional action to include the words, "Under God." We are all familiar with the words of "The Star Spangled-Banner," our national anthem as designated by Congress, with its references to the Deity. Every day, when the House and Senate convene, we are reminded of our dependence upon Him, through the prayers of the Chaplains. And, I might add, at the opening of each day's session of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Justices stand while an official of the Court solemnly, and I hope prayerfully, invokes the protection of the Almighty when he intones, "God save the United States and this honorable Court."

Since early in 1955, in conformity with a House concurrent resolution, adopted by both Houses of Congress, there has been a room in the Capitol, designated and set aside as a prayer room. It is not a large room, and is neither designed nor used for religious assemblies or other public uses. In its appropriate, yet simple appointments, its only

purpose is to provide a quiet place to which individual Members of Congress may withdraw a while to seek divine strength and guidance, both in public affairs and in their own personal concerns.

Why am I mentioning these things, and why have I referred to the several instances wherein we daily recognize the confidence, the reverence, and the faith we have in our Divine Creator? Simply to impress upon you that if the leaders of our country, since the day of the landing of the Pilgrims upon Plymouth Rock, have found it necessary to place their trust in God, and to seek his help in solving the important problems, with which they are faced—certainly we who have not had the experience and who may lack the strength and the ability to meet the temptations and the challenges with which we are faced, can find the answers through prayer and communion with Him who has invited us to share our burdens with Him. I think it is significant that when our brave astronauts were in outer space they recognized their dependence upon God. As Major Cooper spoke to a joint session of Congress a short time ago, I know I experienced the same reverent feeling that millions of other people did as they listened to this young man repeat the prayer that he gave while in his 17th orbit.

Formally, what we have learned at Southeast Missouri State College gives us wise and enduring guideposts for the future—a solid basis upon which to build. But, in a deeper sense, our education began with birth and covers a far wider spectrum than is suggested by the school curriculum. We have been learning from infancy, through our parents, our neighborhood, our school, our environment, our friends, that we are interdependent. There is no such thing as standing alone. Not one of us can be isolated from the rest of mankind.

Up to now it may be said that you have been given the equipment, the apparatus, not to fail. We would hope that you have mastered that equipment. You are on the launching pad, and it is time for you to take off. The countdown has begun. From now on, you are, in a sense on your own.

You have the responsibility not only of doing for others what has been done for you but you must, as others have done before you, improve on the heritage. Truly you have reached the point where you must accept greater responsibilities, and begin to make a real contribution to society.

Your task may very well be the hardest since the dawn of time. But it also means prospects and hopes beyond the wildest dreams of man.

For the world we are living in today is a world of revolution.

It is a ferment in which it is given to us mightily to shape the future.

To neglect or ignore or bypass this opportunity may develop into the greatest tragedy and therefore the greatest crime in all history.

I repeat: The world we are living in today is a world of revolution. More than one-half of the human race has acquired new political status within the past few years and we have witnessed the breakdown of old and established social, political, and economic patterns. Revolutionary ideas are at work in the minds of men. The uncertainty of this hour of unprecedented world crises has filled men's hearts with frustration and wherever we go the same questions are being asked, "Is there an answer? What are we to do? Is the growing tension in world affairs approaching the point of explosion, that maddening moment of insanity when someone will issue the command and the button will be pushed which will annihilate civilization as we know it?"

Dr. Robert Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, commented when he resigned his position more than a decade ago, "I do not want to waste my time teaching the younger generation; the world may not last long enough." At approximately the same time, Winston Churchill said, "This generation may well live to see the end of what we now call civilization." Multitudes of voices have blended with theirs in saying, "Where shall we turn? What shall we do? There must be an answer."

In this hour of confusion and doubt, we might well learn a lesson from the past. One of our greatest leaders, Abraham Lincoln said, "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that all about me seemed insufficient unto the day."

Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon and former president of the United Nations, recognized as one of the world's leading statesmen, recently said: "It is perfectly clear that we can save nobody and nothing if we are not first sure of ourselves. Only those who stay close to Christ can help others who are far away. Only those who prefer Him above everything else, even to the call of the needy world, can be used of Him to meet the need of the world. Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than to arouse responsible Christians from their lethargy and slumber to both the infinite dangers and the infinite possibilities of the moment. At the heart of the whole matter is faith in Jesus Christ. Do we believe in Him as passionately as others believe in their own ideas and systems? If we do, then we are to do better than they, for we worship a person; they worship an idea. We worship life and strength and victory; they worship negation and hatred. Christ can do without us—He may be doing so already in the vast spaces of Asia and Africa. And if we fail Him, it cannot be that He failed. We will have only proven that we are unprofitable servants."

Are you part of the problem or part of the solution that faces civilization during its most critical hour? Edmund Burke, the great British statesman, said, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing." The great leaders of the world, whether leading a cause for God or for evil, have concentrated and continue to concentrate on the youth of the nations. Men like Hitler, Mussolini, Khrushchev and Castro have sought and are seeking to instill their corrupt ideas into the minds and hearts of the collegiate world. J. Edgar Hoover has said: "It may well be that the battlefield for the minds of men will be staged in the classrooms of the Nation. Communist strategists, realizing this, have made the conquest of youth one of their most urgent goals. They seek to channel the vast energies of this growing giant toward their culture of world atheism. But America's heritage of freedom of speech and religion, which is passed on from generation to generation by such agencies as our educational institutions, stands as a major barrier to this objective. Our colleges and universities can help our young men and women to better understand our history. They can also help raise their aspirations to fulfill our destiny in the family of free nations within the ideals of wisdom, temperance, courage and justice. We must present a united front of spiritual and moral integrity against the forces of communism."

Of the first 119 universities in America, 104 were established as Christian institutions—Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Rutgers, Dartmouth, and scores of others. Jesus Christ was their center and circumference—basic to their philosophy of education. Such statements as "This institution was founded for the express purpose of training men to perpetuate the Christian faith," were common.

Yet, today one can spend 4 years and more on the average American university or college campus and never hear a positive statement in the classroom concerning Jesus Christ, the church, the Bible, and Christianity. Abraham Lincoln said: "The philosophy of the classroom in one generation becomes the philosophy of government in the next generation." Prof. E. Merle Root, authority on subversive activities in American universities has stated: "The battle for freedom is being lost in the classrooms of America. The intellectual left dominates the American colleges today."

Real freedom had its beginnings through Christ who emphasized the inherent worth of the individual. The innate dignity of man commands respect only in areas where Christ is not outlawed in the nations of the world today. The words of Christ still bear the flame of moral force, of right, decency, and truth. That dynamic philosophy which sparked this Nation's freedom is a precious heritage which must not be lost to our young men and women.

Former President Schurman of Cornell has stated, "No man is an uneducated man who has a knowledge of the Bible, and no man is truly educated who is ignorant of it." I thank God for our Christian colleges where the Bible is daily a part of the curriculum, and I fervently pray that the time may never come when we do not have Christian men and women who are willing to make the sacrifice by dedicating their lives to teaching in institutions where they have the opportunity of influencing the lives of their students by living exemplary lives themselves.

Another interesting and provocative quote from Dr. Charles Malik, "And, if you think that the hurt feelings of the world are going to be smoothed and placated through diplomacy or classical music or education or culture or humanism or philanthropy or technical assistance or just being nice and reserved and inoffensive, or through the assurance that there is not going to be any nuclear war, then I am afraid you know neither yourself nor the world—Jesus Christ is the only answer. I am personally sobered by His [Christ's] warning, 'Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven'."

Napoleon is believed to have said the following: "Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and myself founded empires; but upon what? Force. Jesus founded his empire on love; and at this hour millions would die for Him. I myself have inspired multitudes with such affection that they would die for me. But my presence was necessary. Now that I am at St. Helena, where are my friends? I am forgotten, soon to return to the earth, and become food for worms. What an abyss between my misery and the eternal kingdom of Christ, who is proclaimed, loved, adored, and which is extending all the earth. Is this death? I tell you, the death of Christ is the death of a God. I tell you, Jesus Christ is God."

The most revolutionary person in all history was Jesus Christ. He alone is the answer to a world in crisis. A new revolution is called for—a spiritual revolution.

This means a revolution not only in that part of the world ruled by communism. Indeed, it means a spiritual revolution in our own midst and an agonizing reevaluation of our spiritual legacy. The time has come to call a halt to a trend in our political and our judicial atmosphere which suggests a distressing deemphasis on the divine influence in our lives. Our Government, the Government of the United States, has a spiritual foundation or it has no foundation at all. The battle line between the greatest threat that faces us, and our future, is

clearly drawn. We are confronted in this year of our Lord 1963 by a Communist dominion that rules one-third of the population of the earth. This ideology that denies God holds sway over 26 percent of the earth's surface—or more than one-fourth of this planet.

It is a threat of enormous proportions and of terrifying potentiality.

Against it our Western World must present as nearly as possible a heroic and solidified and consolidated Christian impact.

Therefore, when the U.S. Supreme Court—with no doubt the best judicial intentions—prohibits a simple prayer in the public schools of one of our States and therefore the Nation, I hold that this is an unwise deemphasis of our religious heritage. Although I am not a lawyer, I would point out that many recognized legal authorities insist that the Court has misconstrued the basic law of the land. It is not my aim or purpose to hold the Supreme Court up to ridicule, for I hold that criticism is not vituperation. I would agree with the statement of Dr. Erwin M. Griswold, dean of the Harvard University Law School, who, in a recent speech criticizing the absolutist position taken by the Supreme Court, stated, "An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task. It is in that spirit that my remarks are offered."

In his address, Dean Griswold stated, "I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that this unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken."

My argument against the Court in this notorious school prayer case, is not that the Court aims to do violence to religion, or that it seeks to undermine our religious foundations. My argument against the Court is that discretion, judgment, wisdom, and just plain commonsense, called for a decision in reverse of the one the Court handed down.

What we got instead was a subtle and complicated interpretation that ignored the facts of life, and, instead, doted on the slenderest of technicalities. It was a decision predicated on nuances of the law, instead of the law itself. It swept aside the massive thinking and the great purposes of the first amendment. It was a decision interested in the niceties of the law; it validated a kind of judicial extremism which—if carried further—promises to dangerously inundate a most important aspect of the American philosophy of life and government. It ran against the tenor, it seems to me, of the whole sweep and flow of American history going back to the Puritan Fathers and beyond.

The prayer which the decision ruled against had no force of compulsion and did no injury to any minority. The very language of the prayer was the very quintessence of religious tolerance. Certainly it was as innocuous a statement as one can imagine. All it said—I quote it whole—is: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

It would seem to be an ideal prayer for children beginning the schoolday.

To outlaw it is a judicial pettiness beyond my comprehension.

It is beyond my comprehension because of its shocking implications.

Does it mean now that in the future, words like "This Nation Under God" are to be expunged because of the use of the word "God," and that no official Government document, coin, postage stamp, public building facade, may use the religious symbols that mean so much to our people?

By this ruling, then, are the chaplains in the Congress put in danger of their posts and is Congress to be denied its traditional morning prayer? One of the Justices—Mr. Douglas—in an opinion concurring with the majority, seemed to find any form of religious recognition or usage by Government prohibited by our Constitution. He found it wrong, as I read his opinion, that we have chaplains in both Houses of Congress and in the armed services. He found wrong compulsory chapel at the service academies. He found religious services wrong in Federal hospitals and prisons. He even found religious proclamations by the President wrong. Mr. Justice Douglas included Bible reading and coin inscriptions—"In God We Trust" out of range of the legally permissible. It calls for some restraint on my part not to let go at Mr. Justice Douglas in a more dramatic and vigorous attack. For what he has given us is an incredible distortion of American history kneaded into a ruling that does violence to our most cherished beliefs. And the same, in my view, holds true in the opinion for the Court written by Mr. Justice Black. What the Court has given the American people is a mass of convolluted thinking and a ruling so confused that one of the Justices, Mr. Clark, who had concurred, took it upon himself, against tradition, to explain afterward in a San Francisco speech what it was the Supreme Court opinion was supposed to have explained.

We may all of us well ask: And what now?

For this the answer rests in the tolerance, the flexibility, the avenues for change inherent in our God-given form of government, including the judicial branch. For the U.S. Supreme Court has again and again changed—sometimes radically—a previously pronounced pontificial judgment. I could go into this in more detail, but that would call for a full-scale speech. For a time I, for one, looked forward in the not too distant future, to a state of contrition in our highest judicial tribunal. I looked forward to a correction by the U.S. Supreme Court of this lofty judicial error—an error that, in my judgment, is one of the grossest in the history of the Court. I cannot believe that this same Court cannot distinguish between so sublime a doctrine as separation of church and state and so simple an expression of faith as a voluntary prayer for schoolchildren.

Any hopes that I might have had that the Supreme Court would recant and possibly find sufficient reason to detour from the absolutist approach taken in the school prayer case, were abandoned with the two most recent decisions of June 17, when the Court held that Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools were unconstitutional. Now, it appears that the Court will soon be called upon to rule on the constitutionality of the phrase, "Under God," inserted in the pledge of allegiance to the flag which was adopted by Congress just a few short years ago. To be consistent, the Court must rule that Congress acted illegally when it adopted this revised version of the pledge of allegiance. The American Civil Liberties Union has already instituted proceedings which would deny any pupil in a public school from reciting this pledge of allegiance. How soon we may expect similar suits to be instituted which would seek to remove chaplains from the House and Senate, and from Federal hospitals and prisons, no one is prepared to say, but if the Court follows the reasoning indicated in Mr. Justice Douglas' concurring opinion in the school prayer case, we may anticipate what the Court's decision may be. I am not deploring the damage which I believe has been done in the three cases which have been decided by the Court as much as I am concerned with the trend. I am discouraged when I read where prominent church and civic leaders have retreated from the vigorous positions they maintained in the past, and apparently have been brainwashed to the extent that they are willing to accept rulings which I contend are contrary to the beliefs of the great majority of Christian people of this Nation who are aware of and who treasure their Christian heritage based on the sincere belief that this Nation came into being, founded upon an unfaltering belief that there was a divine providence who guided our Founding Fathers.

The U.S. Supreme Court should be reverenced as an institution. When our conscience commands it the Court should, under our system, be duly criticized for decisions we may honestly feel are mistaken. I deem the Court's decision in the school prayer case not only a judicial mistake of incalculable damage, but a historical blunder of the meanest magnitude. This has been followed by other decisions and still others pending. All children in our schools should, of course, be given the opportunity and the discipline of acknowledging Almighty God. And, of course, we are all of us devoutly convinced of the principle of separation of church and state. But we know that our Government is a government predicated on divine law and origins and that the motivating influences of the Founding Fathers—almost without exception—were spiritual and religious. To follow in their path, to which we owe so much, the least of the great examples we can follow is that of being influenced—as they were influenced—by the tenets of Jesus Christ.

Ladies and gentlemen, we stand at a critical juncture in world history.

The shape of the future in large part is in our hands.

Either we hold on to the spiritual forces that made us great, or we abandon them and with them abandon our heritage and our freedom.

Our mightiest strength has always been and must always be our religious faith. Every President from George Washington to John F. Kennedy has found refuge, courage, and fortitude in his faith in God as their inaugurals attest. Thomas Jefferson gives me the thought with which I close my message to you today. He said:

"God who gave us life, gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secured when we have removed the conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT COMPETITION

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion on the proposed supersonic transport. The following speech by Mr. William Allen, president of the Boeing Co., states the position of

our largest producer of subsonic jet transports:

OUR COUNTRY'S STAKE IN THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT COMPETITION—BOEING PRESIDENT SAYS, "COOPERATION NEEDED TO FINANCE NATION'S SUPERSONIC PROGRAM"

(Address by William M. Allen, president, the Boeing Co., and chairman, Aerospace Industries Association, National Editorial Association luncheon, Renton, Wash.)

I would like to raise with you a single question which I believe is important. Perhaps it will strike some of you as surprising after seeing our plant full of airplanes for many nations. The question is, simply: Is America's long-held position of world leadership in transport aircraft manufacture in jeopardy for the future?

For some time our U.S. aircraft industry, now the aerospace industry, has been successful in supplying to the airlines of the world the major portion of their equipment. At present our own company occupies the leading role in fulfilling this mission. Many of these airlines are European, or European affiliated. The question I pose is raised in the light of a phenomenon of recent years with which we are all familiar—the industrial resurgence of Europe. In their new period of ascendency, I think it can be fairly said that the Europeans increasingly wish to think of themselves as no longer necessarily secondary to America in aircraft or any other industry. They are making every effort to have it the other way around. They are conscious that their regional economic growth rate has substantially exceeded our own. They are conscious that American industry has been struggling with a problem of high costs, and although their own labor rates are going up, they are endeavoring to maintain and increase their advantage by enlarging their markets and thus cutting their unit costs. This applies in the field of aircraft, where their potential market is the same as the one we serve, namely, the airlines of the world.

A SPIRITED RIVALRY

For years there has been a spirited rivalry between Europe and America in airplane design and manufacture, but in each case of a significant new phase of airline reequipment and expansion the product has either been introduced by U.S. manufacturers or they have been able to ride quickly to the forefront with improvements. The first innovation to greatly widen the market was the twin-engine monoplane transport, introduced by our own company and popularized by the DC-3 in the 1930's. The next was the four-engine monoplane transport derived from our introduction of the four-engine monoplane bomber in 1935, followed by commercial models by Douglas, Lockheed, and Boeing. Again the United States took substantially the world market. The next was the four-engine jet transport which the British introduced, though we had earlier developed its military counterpart. American manufacturers; namely, Boeing, Douglas, and Convair, were able to improve it to a degree which permitted this country to again dominate the market.

Meanwhile the two- and three-engine short-to-medium-range jet market has been considerably split. The French Sud Aviation Co. gained the first position in this market with the twin-engine Caravelle. We have entered it with the three-engine 727. Douglas has undertaken the twin-engine DC-9. The British offer the three-engine De Havilland Trident and the twin-engine BAC 111. An order for the BAC 111 by American Airlines was announced this week. These airplanes are in different size and performance categories but they are in most cases in vigorous competition for the same airline funds. The outcome of the competition is yet to be seen.

Lastly, the British and French have combined to develop a supersonic transport and are at the moment alone in this field, except that the Russians are believed to have an unannounced parallel development. What America can do remains to be seen, and I will have more to say about this later.

The major past successes of the American aircraft industry which I have enumerated, plus several which I have omitted, have been of great value to our country in several ways. They have given America and its industry what is commonly referred to as prestige, though I would prefer to define the role more as that of pace setters in the technological leadership which America has given to the world, with useful ramifications in various directions. These past successes contributed to our national defense, both in the field of equipment development and, more importantly, in helping to build up the facilities and abilities of a vital industry. They have provided American employment, directly and in several layers indirectly, as a factor in our own national economic growth. They have contributed in a very substantial way to our international balance of payments—a contribution which has become critically important in the past few years when this balance has been running so heavily against us. Last year alone, aerospace exports totaled $1.4 billion, and the export of jet transports accounted for about $250 million of this total.

MORE VALUE FOR HIS DOLLAR

How has the American aircraft industry been able to achieve these successes in the past? They have first of all been accomplished on the basis of technical excellence. We have been able to provide the customer with more value for his dollar than our competitors. To state it differently, we have always sought to excel in performance and utility and in the moneymaking capability of the product, and this is a goal which we must never forsake. Also, the airlines of the United States have in the past comprised the largest portion of the total world commercial aircraft market. These airlines have, however, been free to buy from foreign manufacturers, and have done so when they felt that the foreign product better met their needs.

How, then, has the competitive situation been changing? First, it should be noted that the proportion of foreign airlines in the total aircraft market has been increasing, until now in the case of jet transports foreign purchases amount to 48 percent of the total. With the supersonic, they are expected to account for more than 60 percent. More importantly, the competition has become evermore keen in the sense that the Europeans have been striving to narrow the gap of technological leadership which we have held. We still feel that we have a marked technological advantage, but this must be weighed by the customer against a cost disadvantage which stems from the fact the national average of wages and salaries both in France and in Great Britain at present is less than 40 percent of the average paid in the United States. Even allowing for the relatively higher labor productivity in our country due to our tooling and larger production quantities, the cost of labor in these European countries appears to be well below our own. The question is whether we can maintain a technological advantage great enough, in the hard press of competition, to offset an adverse price differential.

Still another factor, and perhaps an even more important one, is that foreign governments have placed themselves in the role of the risk taker in behalf of our competitors through underwriting further technological improvements. It should be recognized that our competition is not from private companies as such, in the sense that American manufacturers are private, but either Government-owned or Government-subsidized manufacturers. Further, most of the foreign airlines which constitute our oversea market are either government-owned, or substantially so; consequently many must buy as directed.

A NEW SITUATION

Now we come to the new situation where two Governments, the British and the French, and incidentally the owners of two of our principal oversea customer airlines, have teamed up to underwrite the development of the supersonic transport. Each has agreed in principle to share the $475 million estimated development cost of the Concorde, toward which they have already committed $70 million. The action poses plainly a serious challenge to this country. This brings me to the crux of the problem, which is the critically expanding financial risk involved in the creation and marketing of new products in the transport aircraft field, and it explains why our own Government, too, has determined that it must become a party to the supersonic transport development if our country is to maintain its position in the aircraft manufacturing field.

To appreciate what has been happening, we must note what we have been doing to the product itself. The first large expansion of passenger air transportation in 1931 employed trimotored airplanes each of which provided on the average, in actual operation, about 3,500 seat-miles of transportation per day. These airplanes cost $75,000 each. In rapid jumps we have been able successively to increase the capability of the product until now, in the form of the 707 or the DC-8, it is delivering 400,000 seat-miles per day, which is 114 times the output of the 1931 trimotor. The jet airplane cost is $6 million, or 80 times the cost of the trimotor. Even though the dollar has been deflated in value by 60 percent during that period, the industry has been able to accomplish such a magnitude of development that today's 600-mile-an-hour luxurious accommodation costs 30 percent less to the airlines per seat-mile capability than did the Ford trimotor or the Boeing model 80-A.

Each step of progress which has made this change possible has been larger than the one before, and the jump to supersonic is by far the largest of all. The development cost has mounted accordingly. The Boeing Co., using all the money it could scrape together at that time, financed in 1935 the prototype of the four-engine airplane which became the Flying Fortress, at a cost of $660,000. In 1952, it designed and built with company funds America's first jet transport at a cost approaching $20 million. Again this took most of the savings that the company had built up from the preceding lean years. That was 30 times the cost of the once "huge" Flying Fortress. A prototype supersonic transport of the type regarded now as most practical is estimated to cost a possible $150 million, which is seven and a half times the cost of the jet transport just 10 years ago, and more than 200 times that of the first Flying Fortress. This does not include many further elements of the development cost in the realm of testing, prototype modification, etc.

Even with the Federal Government carrying the major share of the financial burden of a supersonic transport development program the risk to the manufacturer can be enormous—so great as to be incommensurate with anything previously undertaken. Already Boeing has expended in the neighborhood of $15 million on supersonic transport study, which happens to be the same as the amount originally appropriated by the company, but later increased, for the design and actual construction of the prototype for the 707 jet transport. But the big costs are still ahead in supersonic prototype development.

Let me make clear that we feel it would be highly inadvisable to undertake this step without the construction of a prototype or preferably two competitive prototypes. Even

if the cost of such prototype or prototypes were entirely covered by Government contract, the commitment of necessary facilities and human resources by the manufacturers entering upon the construction project would constitute for them a major investment which would be at risk.

WHEN MANUFACTURER COMMITS HIMSELF

But the really big financial risk comes when the manufacturer commits himself to build production airplanes. When a manufacturer quotes a price to a customer, in order to make the purchase attractive and feasible it has been the practice to quote a price based on the average cost of the customers' airplanes plus those the manufacturer hopes to sell to other customers. Under this practice the manufacturer sells the first airplanes at far below actual cost and then works vigorously to sell enough more so that, as the cost of repeated manufacture comes down, he gains back what he has invested. If the number sold turns out to be much smaller than the hoped for number on which the manufacturer has gambled, or if the costs turn out to be higher than anticipated, the difference is a direct loss. It may not be generally known that it was this combination of lower than anticipated sales and higher production costs rather than initial development cost, which caused the almost back-breaking loss to American manufacturers in connection with the introduction of jet transports. This loss has been quoted by the Aerospace Industries Association as totaling $950 million. In our own case, despite the large number of 707 and 720 aircraft sold, the Boeing Co. is not yet in the black on these projects.

Now we have again entered upon a similar risk in bringing out the short-to-medium-range 727 jet transport regarded by our customers as the very latest technical development in the jet transport field. By committing the 727 program to full-scale production we obligated ourselves to spend several hundred million dollars for engineering, tooling, purchase of materials and salaries and wages. The amount of these expenditures substantially exceeds the revenue that will result from sales of the aircraft now on order.

If past practice is followed the moment we sign our first contract to deliver a new model airplane to an airline, we take this type of risk, because we cannot recover the required investment unless we are successful in making numerous additional sales in competition not only with other American manufacturers but also with the Europeans.

VALID REASON FOR INITIATIVE

When the supersonic transport reaches the stage of being committed to production, the required investment will be several times that which has been necessary for the subsonic jet transport, and it will therefore loom correspondingly larger when compared with prospective returns from early sales. It becomes evident that there is valid reason for the initiative which our Government is taking in developing means to finance the program and that the continued cooperation of Government, the manufacturing industry and the airline industry is required in working out a program that can be practically accomplished within the economic capability of industry and will serve the national interest.

In carrying out this program and undertaking to meet the intensive competition which we will face from abroad we feel it is important, as Federal Aviation Agency administrator N. E. Halaby has recognized, that we retain the advantages of the private enterprise system of contractual responsibility which has proved so effective in our industry in the past. We feel it is likewise important that the airlines be involved early in the process and play a decisive role in determining the character of the program and of the ultimate product. The equipment must from the first be designed to meet the rigorous requirements of competitive and economic airline operation. It must continue our consistent line of progress toward faster service at prices which the public can afford. Not only must the airplane itself be economically sound from an operating standpoint but the program for bringing it into being must be economically feasible for the aircraft manufacturing industry, not involving risks of a magnitude that could result in the crippling of the corporate participants.

Further, we regard it as self-evidently essential, as do our government officials, that we produce an airplane definitely superior to that which will emerge from the joint British-French effort. If we fail to accomplish this, the place of the United States as a supplier of world air transports will indeed be in jeopardy for the future. The market for the supersonic transport has been variously estimated at from 100 to 250 airplanes in first-round orders, including the 30 to 50 which the British and French carriers are expecting to obtain from their own industry. To compete in and continue to serve this market we feel we must build growth potential into the supersonic airplane, with a basic design capable of increased performance in the future as more advanced powerplants become available and operating experience is built up. This has been one of the principles behind our success in the past, a principle which now seems particularly appropriate as we plan to enter upon such a major new step of progress as this one will be, designed to meet the needs of advanced air transportation well into the future. But this aspect of the development, though economical in the longrun, is one which will add to the initial cost as compared with the French-British project, which provides for an airplane limited to a speed of mach 2.2 or 1,450 miles per hour.

I do not wish to leave the impression that the supersonic realm is the only one or principal one in which our aircraft industry's future, depending on the outcome of competition, may be in jeopardy. We are feeling more and more each day the strength of the European competition in other categories, particularly in the short-to-medium-range jet which I have mentioned. This competition we must meet. But the supersonic transport is the big new program in the offing. This market represents a very substantial source of employment for our country in the future, employment which is needed now that the production of subsonic jet transports for the present airline reequipment program is past its peak. Further, it represents an important potential source of future foreign exchange needed in meeting our Nation's balance-of-payments problem. If we find our airlines obtaining their future equipment from Europe, our industry's favorable contribution to the solution of this gold-flow problem could suddenly be reversed. That possibly is real. Already one U.S. airline, mindful of its requirement of providing competitive service in the future, has entered into a provisional contract for a number of the European Concordes, and other lines are considering such action.

WE MUST NOT UNDERESTIMATE

We must not underestimate the capability of the combined British-French team. FAA Administrator Halaby has correctly termed it a "multilateral technical force determined to capture the common world market for air transportation." He has pointed out, after visiting Paris recently, that the European nations are "cooperating to an ever-increasing degree to pool their technical and economic resources to topple the United States from the position of preeminence it has held in transport aviation for the past 30 years."

Mr. Halaby adds that "if we move quickly enough, there is no reason to believe the Concorde, or any other foreign-made aircraft, will preempt the supersonic air transport market."

I agree that our country has the capability of successfully meeting this challenge. But to do so, it is essential that we not underestimate the scope of the problem, and that the public understand the importance of undertaking its solution on a basis economically feasible for the aircraft manufacturing and the airline industry. If private industry is given the opportunity, I believe we can still beat the competition from abroad. This is what we must do.

TO CORRECT THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Washington Post editorialized under the intentionally inflammatory title "Slippery Wetbacks." The editor relied mainly on inaccurate, shopworn clichés and quotations to discredit the bracero program—for supplying necessary supplemental farm labor to permit harvesting of crops without spoilage—and to promote the cruel nomadic migrant family system for supplying such labor. The title is an affront to our true Mexican friends.

The Post also carried a letter to the editor from Mr. GONZALEZ, of Texas, in effect complimenting the editorial. I also wrote a letter to the editor admittedly taking exception to the editorial and even questioning the credentials of the perpetrator of the editorial.

The Post declines to print my letter. I take no exception to such exercise of its prerogative, but I want my colleagues, at least, to know that exception is taken to the gist of the editorial and to the credentials of the editorialist on this subject.

The editorial and my letter to the editor follow:

SLIPPERY WETBACKS

The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor will hold hearings today intended to block a cynical power play involving imported Mexican farm labor. On May 29, the House overruled its own Agriculture Committee and refused to extend again, an emergency measure to allow braceros to enter the United States for harvest work. Originally, Public Law 78 was enacted on the grounds that the Korean war caused a shortage of farmworkers—but that pretext has long since vanished.

The effects of the bracero program have been bad for underpaid and underemployed American migrant labor, and bad for Mexican labor—Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of Texas, who is of Mexican descent, called the bill a shameless piece of legislation. Yet the Senate now has before it the very bill the House has already killed and a vote is expected on Wednesday.

No Senate hearings have been held, and it is the intention of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Migratory Subcommittee, to put on record the facts about the bracero legislation. He deserves strong support. Any back-door attempt to slip the bill

through the Senate and to force the House to reconsider by bargaining on other legislation should get this scorching condemnation it deserves.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

MR. EDITOR: Your July 30 editorial titled "Slippery Wetbacks" proves conclusively that you do not know the difference between a "wetback" (an illegal Mexican entrant) and a "bracero" (a legally admitted, governmentally supervised Mexican national employed in the United States to supplement our domestic supply of desperately needed workers to harvest crops).

This ignorance demonstrates a provincial big city editor's lack of concern for rural America which produces his sustenance, the very food he eats.

Editors who have never been on a row-crop farm, never seen a bracero, have no empathy for the pathetic plight of our migrant farm laborers, and no appreciation of the social or economic problems of farm people should confine their editorializing to other subjects.

The importation of supplemental labor for harvesting field crops to prevent spoilage at peak harvest times has been necessary since the 1870's. Public Law 78 was not an emergency or wartime measure; it simply provided for governmental administration and control of the importation of a necessary supply of reliable farm labor.

My district, "the Salad Bowl of the World," produces at least 1 out of every 3 strawberries grown in the United States; 95 out of every 100 artichokes; 1 out of every 4 heads of lettuce; one-fifth of the broccoli; one-fifth of the celery, etc. The lowest skilled farmworkers earn a minimum of $1 per hour; the average is $1.40 per hour.

Our farmers and employment agencies have tried every suggested means, short of conscription, to obtain a reliable supply of labor. Nevertheless, there is not sufficient row-crop labor to cultivate or harvest our crops. Presently there are 12,000 braceros and 3,000 domestics working in my district. Without the braceros, mature, perishable crops would spoil. Where and how could you possibly obtain 12,000 farmworkers without braceros? If domestics would do the work, where and how could you possibly house their families and educate an influx of 36,000 school children for 3 to 7 months? Who could handle the unemployment, relief, and police problems during the 5 to 9 nonharvest months? Could any community, even a big city? Unwittingly, perhaps, you are advocating chaos for local rural governments, probably bankruptcy for many small farmers, and an exodus of many large farmers to Mexico. Discontinuance of the bracero program will adversely affect more than 1 million skilled workers in numerous allied industries, and many millions of consumers, throughout America.

Public Law 78 prohibits the importation of a single foreign worker if any domestic labor is available. There is double protection for the U.S. citizen in that any domestic who wants to work can "bump" a bracero. You quoted a gentleman from Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ. Farmers in California pay farmworkers 50 percent to 100 percent more than the farmers in the district of Mr. GONZALEZ. If you and Mr. GONZALEZ are sincere about helping the farm laborer, why not advocate betterment of his pay and working conditions in "slave labor" districts. Why penalize progressive, fair farmers by preventing them from harvesting their perishable crops?

You term the bracero program "bad for Mexican labor." Mr. GONZALEZ calls it "slave" labor. If it is so "bad," why would a million Mexican men climb barbed wire fences and swim rivers to earn one-half the wages we pay in California? This is the first time in the history of mankind that slaves behaved in this manner.

You said "underpaid." Row-crop labor skills are among the lowest. I challenge any other industry to show that they pay higher wages for similar skills. Your remarks are easy to perpetrate, but impossible to verify.

You referred to underemployed American migrant labor. There may be unemployment in Kentucky or the big city slums, but none on the farms of California. Anyone who wants a job can have one now at a wage higher than he can earn in any other industry. If you cannot believe this, simply produce such a job seeker on any farm where there is a bracero in California today. Actions should speak more loudly than editorials.

The Congressman's uncanny "Freudian slip" (which you quoted)—"a shameless [sic] piece of legislation"—is typical of one who attempts to use inflammatory language erroneously and unfairly. The legislation is shameless—the most effective, successful, humanitarian solution yet devised for a persistent, difficult social-economic problem. The shameful aspect of this whole matter is that some would attempt to defeat the bracero program by promoting and glamorizing this cruel migrant existence.

To write with accuracy and empathy on this issue, you should live with a migrant farm family. Their existence is a pathetic plight, especially for the innocent children. Living a month here, a month there; from one harvest to the next; in one school and out of another; different teachers, few friends, no stability, no roots, no home. Constant movement from school to school cheats them and their classmates of an education. This nomadic way of life is shameful, abnormal and un-American. Persons who attempt to glamorize and promote the migrant way of existence are perpetuating a cruel delusion upon an already unfortunate segment of our social-economic soicety.

People with pens have higher responsibilities for accuracy and integrity than people who scream in the streets. It seems unfair for an editor (or any Congressman) representing areas where wages are less than $1.40 an hour to criticize or attempt to defeat a successful program which is essential to farmers who pay the highest wages.

Your condemnation of the bracero program which has worked to the satisfaction of those involved—the worker, the employer, the domestic, the customer—and your promotion of a migrant system for providing supplemental farm labor in peak harvest times is a shameful disservice to the industries, countries, and people involved.

I shall leave to the Senate whether that body believes your claim that legislation which it introduces and passes is slipped through a back door by some sort of a power play. I trust you do not approve the tactics already used to prevent the Senate from acting on the merits of this legislation.

I trust I have not been to extravagant in my criticism of your lack of appreciation of this vital problem of the agricultural community. Others share your ignorance and lack of concern—usually because they take advice from demagogues or persons who have never seen a bracero.

Yours very truly,

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. Congressman,
12th District, California.

ADDRESS OF HON. KENNETH GRAY AT 75TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF RETAIL CLERKS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AFL–CIO, CHICAGO

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a speech by the Honorable KENNETH GRAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable KENNETH GRAY, my able colleague from our great State, recently addressed the 75th anniversary convention of the Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, in Chicago.

His comments are worthy of consideration by each of my distinguished colleagues in this House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert Mr. GRAY's address at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH GRAY, CONGRESSMAN FROM ILLINOIS

Thank you very much. My good friend, President Jim, to all of the lovely ladies here on the dias and to all of the officers and all of the members of the Retail Clerks International Association and to my longtime friend, Chuck Lipsen—I have got a story about him after a while if my time doesn't run out—and to all of you friends: Let me say what a great job and wonderful privilege it is to come and to be with you people, yes, you people in the labor movement, who represent the heartbeat of America.

I am filled with mixed emotions today, because when Jim asked me to come, I felt so delighted that I immediately accepted. But after I got here, I found out he cut me down to 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Of course, really, I am not going to talk that long. I learned my lesson in the last campaign. I got engrossed in a subject and talked for 1 hour and 45 minutes. When I finished, a little lady walked up with a boy about 5 or 6 years old and said, "Congressman GRAY, I am just filled with your message."

I felt kind of battered. I thought I had made a pretty good speech, too. So, I leaned over and patted the little boy on the head and said, "And what did you think of that speech, sonny?"

He said, "I got my belly full of it, too." [Laughter.]

I promise I won't talk that long today.

I have been treated royally since coming to Chicago last night; quite a contrast to an incident that happened down in my congressional district. I was campaigning for my fifth term and walked up to an old fellow on the street and said, "I am KEN GRAY and I am running for Congress." He didn't recognize his own Congressman, after having served four terms already.

And he said, "Your name is KEN GRAY?"

He still didn't recognize me as his own Congressman. He said, "You are running for what?"

I said, "I am running for Congress."

He stood there and scratched his head for a minute and said, "I'll sure vote for you because that guy in there now isn't worth a damn." [Laughter.]

I said, "I agree with you and I will appreciate your vote."

And he said, "You'll get it." [Laughter.]

It is a great job to be here to publicly acknowledge one of the greatest leaders in the labor movement, my longtime friend, a man who is held in high regard, yes, as Mr. Labor, in the United States—I am happy to come and join with you again in extending our congratulations for a job well done and to give Jim Suffridge a round of applause. Let's hear it. [Applause.]

As I said earlier, I have worked for a long time with your chairman of the active ballot

club, Chuck Lipsen. Chuck has done a wonderful job and I am glad that I can come and publicly acknowledge his great work.

I think after I conclude my remarks, you will see why it is more important than ever before to give Chuck your support for his fine work in the active ballot club.

I am happy that I can reiterate what Jim told you, that I represent a district that has more RCIA locals than any other congressional district in the entire United States.

We are justly proud of our long-time friends, Mr. McEwing and Jack Falk and Guy Price and all the others who have been doing so much for your clerks' organization in southern Illinois—and glad to come and join with them today in saluting all of you.

This morning I would like to recite some poetry. I will say something that I hope you will be able to take home with you—something that might be helpful for all of us who are working in the labor movement, working, yes, for all of the people in America who want a better way of life.

"I watched them tear the building down,
A gang of men in a busy town;
With a ho heave ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and a side wall fell.
I asked the foreman, 'Are these men as skilled,
As the men you would hire if you had to build?'
He just laughed and said, 'No indeed,
Just common labor is all we need.'
So I thought to myself, as I turned and walked away,
'Which of the roles have I tried to play?
Have I been a builder who works with care,
Measuring life by the rule and square,
Making my deeds to a well made plan,
And patiently doing the best I can,
Or have I been a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the job of tearing down?'"

Therein lies the answer to America. In that poem lies the answer to, yes, the RCIA or any other worthwhile endeavor. You don't have to have a sledge hammer to tear something down. Inaction or not being interested in your communities, your organization and Nation can be just as harmful as taking a sledge hammer and tearing down a building.

On that theme, I wish to relate to you some of my personal experiences as a Member of the Congress.

I would like to impress upon you the great necessity of being more than just a dues-paying member of this organization; yes, in your community being in fact active and being interested in government from the courthouse to the statehouse and to the White House because government is people; and it is like a chain—it is no stronger than its weakest link.

Can you imagine, ladies and gentlemen, living in a time when man through his genius has been able to level mountains, has been able to change the courses of rivers, has been able, yes, to fly masses of steel through the air and around the earth in 80 minutes. But that with all of this genius, we have in America today people hungry; we have people in America today going into the sunset of their lives without adequate medical attention; we have people in America today living in substandard houses—and all of these things through no fault of their own.

I represent an 18-county congressional district in southern Illinois. They are wonderful people. We have God-given natural resources: Two great rivers on each side, an abundance of coal, water, and many other God-given natural resources; but we have had from 25 to 40 percent of our employable force unemployed over the past 15 years. We are making progress; but much more must be done.

Can you imagine a Congress composed of personal representatives just 2 weeks ago voting 209 to 204 to turn down a small (and I say small because $450 million in this economy is small) amount to spend upon putting people back to work? Yet, the Congress of the United States turned down by a vote margin of five votes the Area Redevelopment Act that held out hope and promise for those people who had no hope for so many years.

Why was this bill defeated in the Congress? It was defeated because the special interest groups, the lobbying groups, those who want their cake and want to eat it also, came down to the Congress; and they told my colleagues of the Congress that this bill is a wasteful dissipation of taxpayer funds, that this bill was not needed. I have told you the result, that we lost by five votes.

Can you imagine again a country that is giving $4 billion a year plus to foreign nations that cannot stand and provide, yes, a firm foundation for America through the expenditure of a very small amount for our own unemployed people?

I come here today filled with mixed emotions; happy that I live in America; happy that we have a free labor movement; happy that as clerks you can come here together and, yes, work up a program—a program to move forward; but I say to you, my friends, that this labor movement in America is in greater danger from special interest groups today than at any time I have served in the Congress in five terms.

There will be lights burning bright in the Capitol tonight to try to find ways of turning back the clock for labor; trying to find ways of putting this organization and labor under the antitrust laws.

Isn't it strange that they will not be trying to put an organization like Sears, or some other like that, under the antitrust laws, but that it is the laboring people they are attempting to put under the antitrust laws? [Applause.]

You say that it cannot happen. Well, it did happen 2 weeks ago. As I said, if we turn down those people who cannot help themselves, those people who have been living on relief, who have no hope—if we cannot spend $450 million to help those people and build America economically, then stranger things can happen than an antilabor bill getting through the Congress.

Therefore, this is why I wanted to come; this is why I wanted to tell you that we must all work and pray together in this organization and throughout America if we are going to continue to march down the road of progress and prosperity.

Always remember—from our great theologians we have heard about the beautiful walls that surround the ancient city of Jericho. They were more than 30 feet high, more than 13 feet wide, and some 40 feet apart. But, by the same token, they also tell us that although these walls looked very strong and you could run chariots on the top of them, and also see for great distances, they come tumbling down. They come tumbling down because they did not have a firm foundation.

Therefore, I say to you in all sincerity this morning that unless we maintain a firm foundation in the RCIA, in the labor movement in general, in our progressive legislation to help those who cannot help themselves—yes, in America all—some day the walls will come tumbling down.

This is the challenge that I desire to leave with you today; not as individuals because you have evidenced by your presence here that you are active and you are interested in this organization, but what about those clerks who want all of the benefits but don't want to contribute their time and effort? This is the type of interest, stamina and fortitude that we have, and we in the Congress want and need your active participation and, yes, we need your advice when these bills come before Congress.

When these bills do come before Congress, sit down and write your Congressman a letter. I receive some 300 letters a day but 99 percent come from people who have a personal problem. Of course, I am glad to hear from them but when an important piece of legislation is before the Congress, sometimes we get three, or five, or maybe half a dozen letters.

We had a bill up before the Congress when I first came there in 1955 that changed the lives of millions of young boys throughout America—get this—changed the lives and, yes, the futures of all of these young boys—a military conscription bill affecting the lives of every boy from 17 to 22 in America. I sent out a news release, got on television and radio and asked the people to tell me how they felt about this most important bill. Well, to make a long story short, I received 13 replies. I think there were seven for and six against. However, the point was that I had to stand there and vote the dictates of my own conscience and, of course, as an elected representative, I try to discharge those duties. However, would it not have been better to have had the opinions of two or three or even a dozen? Would not 100 minds be better than one?

If we should have an all-out war, and God forbid, and we find that we do not have enough people to fight that war, then KEN GRAY made a mistake. But it is too late, can't you see, relative to building a firm foundation for legislation. After all, you must start early, work late and continue to work. I would like to close with this poem:

"I once knew a man who built a wall,
A wall unfriendly, grim and tall;
I knew this man could not be bad,
Maybe timid or even sad;
And so I built a tower by this wall so grim
And looked down and smiled on him,
And this noble man's heart was about to break,
And he tore down the wall and built a gate."

Isn't life that simple? Isn't the work of this organization that simple? You can either have a wall or indifference; a wall that is too high to get over and you cannot go under and you certainly cannot go through it. Or you can have a gate that swings open wide, yes, a gate that will say "come into this movement, come in and let's continue to build on that foundation that Samuel Gompers started, let's continue to provide better working conditions, more pay."

I say that you have some great people here as your guests. I understand that the Vice President of the United States delivered a very great message to you and, therefore, if you will take the words of all of these people who are in places of public trust and if you will put those together and continue to build this firm foundation; if you will continue to let those Members of the Congress who represent you know of your feelings; if you will continue to support the Active Ballot Club and, yes, your great President Suffridge and the officers of this great association; if you will continue to work together in your communities, joining hands together, then I have no fear—I have no fear but what we can eradicate, yes, the 5 million plus unemployed in America; I have no fear we can provide job opportunities; I have no fear we can pass progressive legislation for your welfare.

The challenge is yours. I leave this thought with you—that we can turn relief checks in America into paychecks and we can make this a better organization. I

pledge to you as one representative of the Congress of the United States my wholehearted support, as I have in the past, yes, to make the labor movement greater and to make a more stronger organization.

Thank you and God bless you for the opportunity of coming here.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS COMPARED TO SALARIES OF FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, AND MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 18 I had a special order, in which I disclosed the findings of a special study we were making in our office of all those public officials—Federal, State, local, and municipal—who were making salaries in excess of the current congressional salary of $22,500. At that time I indicated that this was a most comprehensive report—one which to the best of my knowledge was the most thorough ever made. Subsequent to making those findings public, we have, of course, the Randall Commission report. In order to make our findings complete, I should like to submit today for the RECORD the additional information which was lacking at the time of our original report on July 18. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the additional information received from the several States, to supplement our report of July 18, to be included and printed in the RECORD:

Additional Government employees earning $22,500 or more

State employees (executive):	
Governor: Florida	$25,000
Administrators:	
Florida: General manager of the citrus commission	25,000
New Jersey:	
Commissioner of institutions and agencies	25,000
Commissioner of education	24,500
Oregon:	
Chancellor of education	30,900
Administrator of mental health	24,240
Washington:	
Supervisor of mental health	25,620
Director of institutions	22,500
Director of highways	22,500
Public university presidents, officers, and department heads:	
Arizona—University of Arizona:	
President	25,000
Arkansas—University of Arkansas:	
President	22,500
Dean of medical center	26,000
Professors in university medical center (13)	23,000
Florida (in all State universities) professors (10)	24,000–25,000
Hawaii—University of Hawaii:	
President	30,000
Vice president, academic affairs	24,000
Massachusetts—University of Massachusetts: President	25,000
Nevada—University of Nevada:	
President	23,000

Additional Government employees earning $22,500 or more—Continued

State employees (executive)—Con.	
Public university presidents, officers, and department heads—Continued	
New Jersey—Rutgers, the State University:	
President	$24,500
Dean of the medical school	27,000
Oregon—University of Oregon:	
President	29,800
Dean of dental school	23,050
Dean of medical school	25,800
Associate dean and medical director	24,000
Chairman, department of pathology	24,000
Professor of surgery	22,500
Chairman, department of otolarynology	23,500
Director, crippled children's division	22,500
Director, primate research center	26,500
Utah—University of Utah:	
President	23,000
State employees (judicial):	
Hawaii—Supreme Court:	
Chief justice	23,625
Associates (4)	23,100
Missouri: Supreme Court commissioners (6)	22,500
County employees (executive):	
Administrators and other officials:	
New Jersey:	
Bergen County:	
Clerk of the board and administrative officer	25,000
Superintendent of Bergen Pines Hospital	30,000
Essex County: Superintendent and medical director	26,250
City employees (executive):	
Mayors:	
Hawaii: Honolulu	22,500
New Jersey: Jersey City	22,000
Other administrators:	
Nevada:	
Las Vegas:	
Convention center manager	35,000
Convention center sales Director	25,000
New Jersey:	
Jersey City: Business administrator	22,500
Newark: Director of Finance	22,500
Superintendents of school districts:	
New Jersey: Ridgewood	24,500

MINORITY VIEWS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the foreign aid bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost is $540.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Minority views of Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 are as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

Four months ago, in its report to the President of the United States, the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World (the Clay Committee) offered this appraisal of our foreign aid program: "We believe that we are indeed attempting too much for too many * * *."

The evidence developed subsequently in the lengthy hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs lends full support to that appraisal. As we will show in this report, the foreign aid program assuredly attempts to do too much for too many—and too soon. Unfortunately, the bill accompanying this report does little if anything to correct this situation. The bill, it must be pointed out, contains a few long overdue constructive amendments adopted by the committee. Unfortunately, many others failed to win the committee's approval. Further, by proposing to authorize foreign aid spending at the current exclusively high rates, it also compounds the problem singled out by the Clay Committee and can only add to the already considerable congressional and public disenchantment with the foreign aid program.

For this reason, we are compelled to oppose this legislation.

WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO TOO MUCH FOR TOO MANY

During the period since World War II, the United States has provided aid to approximately 110 countries and territories. Not all of them have received assistance simultaneously, or for an equal period of time. Five years ago, for instance, while foreign aid appropriations were running at a level comparable to that in fiscal 1963, U.S. military and/or economic assistance went to some 80 countries. Today, an estimated 95 countries and territories are benefiting from our largesse. And in the proposed program for fiscal 1964, the number of prospective recipients of our aid remains about the same.

It is obviously impossible for any country, no matter how rich or strong it may be at the start, to continue assistance indefinitely to most of the countries of the world. The growing size of our national debt and our dwindling gold reserves attest to the drain of our resources resulting from our heavy foreign and domestic commitments. While we admonish the beneficiaries of our largesse and require them, as a condition of our aid, to balance their budgets, to reduce their national debts, and to stop the outflow of gold, we do none of these things ourselves. It is time that America began to practice in her own economy what she preaches to those who receive her aid.

What is equally alarming is the fact that our diffuse aid effort, spread thinly over most of the globe, is not producing and cannot produce the desired results. As some of us have stated repeatedly in the past, we would do much better by sharpening our objectives, concentrating our efforts, and limiting our assistance to those nations whose self-discipline and will to reform provide a reasonable promise of constructive utilization of our help.

In this respect, we have been troubled by continuing evidence of lack of reasonable criteria in the selection of the recipients of our aid. U.S. economic and even military assistance has been provided simultaneously to countries on both sides of troublesome quarrels; to stanch allies, neutrals, and Communist-dominated countries alike; and, in such cases as those of British Guiana, Kenya, Jamaica, and Uganda, even to territories controlled by colonial powers before such territories were given their national independence. It is difficult to believe when one looks at the list of countries benefiting from American aid, that the dispensers of foreign assistance have exercised any appreciable degree of selectivity or prudence in making their decisions.

Apart from the issue of selectivity, it is becoming apparent that the volume of our aid may in certain cases exceed the capacity of the receiving countries to digest it properly. Some foreign aid funds, obligated as long as 5 years ago, still remain to be disbursed. The Executive practice of overobligating funds for particular programs, exposed by a number of the committee's staff studies, still

persists with respect to some projects in Yugoslavia, Korea, Peru, and certain other countries. There is no justification for this practice and the law should be amended to provide for a systematic review of all obligations. Obligated funds against which no program has been developed or initiated within 2 or 3 years, should be deobligated and returned to the Treasury.

We also wish to point out that in some cases, i.e., India and Brazil, the volume of external debt is reaching a level at which the borrowers may find it difficult to meet the annual installments due on U.S. loans. In still other cases, soft loans extended to avoid hard decisions may very well prove to be grants in disguise.

There is perhaps no better measure of the excess in the flow of foreign aid, and of the loss of congressional control over this program, than the growing accumulation of unexpended balances from prior year appropriations. On June 30, 1960, this so-called pipeline, economic and military, amounted to $4.8 billion. As of June 30, 1963, it rose to an estimated $6.8 billion. When the $4.1 billion recommended in this bill is added to this sum, the total which may be available for expenditure in fiscal 1964 reaches the astronomical figure of $10.9 billion. A table showing, country by country, and program by program, the unexpended balances in the foreign economic aid program, follows (pp. 280–290 from hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Foreign Assistance Act of 1963):

AID PIPELINE

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Development loans	1,823,815	2,043,399
Development grants	432,006	371,941
Alliance for Progress	791,843	986,808
Loans	275,960	498,814
Grants	83,087	119,798
Chile reconstruction and rehabilitation	48,796	13,796
IDB trust fund	384,000	354,400
Supporting assistance	661,868	602,324
International organizations	87,372	66,330
Other programs	−40,717	25,341
Total, economic assistance	3,756,187	4,096,143
Africa and Europe	454,719	485,795
Near East and south Asia	1,682,134	1,802,956
Far East	698,842	697,530
Latin America	848,245	1,067,089
Nonregional	72,247	129,991
Adjustment [1]		−87,218
Total	3,756,187	4,096,143
EUROPEAN COUNTRIES		
Berlin: Supporting assistance	905	205
Iceland: Supporting assistance	1,798	298
Poland: Other assistance	1,688	2,468
Spain:		
Development loans	6,000	4,000
Development grants	253	53
Supporting assistance	21,508	10,508
Total, Spain	27,761	14,561
Yugoslavia:		
Development loans	38,493	16,493
Development grants	3,978	1,817
Supporting assistance	941	341
Total, Yugoslavia	43,412	18,651
European technical exchange: Development grants	56	46

[1] Includes estimated receipts and recoveries not distributed by region.

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Summary, Europe:		
Development loans	44,493	20,493
Development grants	4,287	1,916
Supporting assistance	25,152	11,352
Other assistance	1,668	2,468
Total, Europe	75,600	36,229
AFRICAN COUNTRIES		
Algeria:		
Development grants		900
Supporting assistance	232	632
Total, Algeria	232	1,532
Congo (Léopoldville):		
Development grants	4,057	4,476
Supporting assistance		15,095
Total, Congo	4,057	19,571
U.N. Congo: Contributions to international organizations	[2] (10,177)	
Ethiopia:		
Development loans	18,389	8,389
Development grants	7,575	6,833
Supporting assistance	968	268
Total, Ethiopia	26,932	15,490
Ghana:		
Development loans	82,000	82,500
Development grants	2,004	2,534
Total, Ghana	84,004	85,034
Guinea:		
Development loans		2,100
Development grants	2,736	3,470
Supporting assistance	3,865	6,965
Total, Guinea	6,601	12,535
Kenya:		
Development loans		2,200
Development grants	2,332	3,502
Supporting assistance		
Total, Kenya	2,332	5,702
Liberia:		
Development loans	2,876	36,576
Development grants	13,789	13,674
Total, Liberia	16,665	50,250
Libya:		
Development loans	480	80
Development grants	785	1,305
Supporting assistance	6,620	620
Total, Libya	7,885	2,005
Mali:		
Development loans		1,800
Development grants	57	635
Supporting assistance	2,419	1,549
Total, Mali	2,476	3,984
Morocco:		
Development loans	22,500	15,500
Development grants	1,303	1,207
Supporting assistance	36,568	28,068
Total, Morocco	60,371	44,775
Nigeria:		
Development loans	107	23,207
Development grants	25,496	30,096
Total, Nigeria	25,603	53,303
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of: Development grants	2,832	4,264
Sierra Leone: Development grants	1,782	2,481
Somali, Republic:		
Development loans	1,919	5,319
Development grants	10,527	8,127
Supporting assistance	31	
Total, Somali Republic	12,477	13,446

[2] Included in nonregional total.

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Sudan:		
Development loans	2,339	5,739
Development grants	12,863	9,752
Supporting assistance	18	
Total, Sudan	15,220	15,491
Tanganyika:		
Development loans	1,584	10,784
Development grants	2,114	3,479
Supporting assistance	205	
Total, Tanganyika	3,903	14,263
Tunisia:		
Development loans	46,095	58,795
Development grants	9,362	7,049
Supporting assistance	10,697	12,810
Total, Tunisia	66,154	78,654
Uganda:		
Development loans		2,000
Development grants	3,584	2,574
Total, Uganda	3,584	4,574
Zanzibar: Development grants	55	24
Ex-French Metropole (UAM):		
Development loans		
Burundi: Development grants		35
Cameroon:		
Development loans	9,200	9,200
Development grants	506	231
Supporting assistance	4,135	2,235
Total, Cameroon	13,841	11,666
Central African Republic: Development grants	230	391
Chad: Development grants	312	902
Congo (Brazzaville): Development grants	1,182	447
Dahomey: Development grants	872	1,122
Gabon: Development grants	395	461
Ivory Coast:		
Development loans		3,000
Development grants	1,862	2,582
Total, Ivory Coast	1,862	5,582
Malagasy Republic: Development grants	978	808
Mauritania:		
Development grants	7	197
Supporting assistance		4
Total, Mauritania	7	201
Niger:		
Development loans		500
Development grants	1,561	1,734
Total, Niger	1,561	2,234
Rwanda: Development grants		10
Senegal: Development grants	3,050	3,555
Togo:		
Development grants	1,313	1,513
Supporting assistance	300	
Total, Togo	1,613	1,513
Upper Volta: Development grants	1,685	2,050
Programing adjustment: Development loans		−20,500
Regional: Development grants	8,366	11,711
Africa summary:		
Development loans	187,489	247,189
Development grants	125,572	134,131
Supporting assistance	66,058	68,246
Total, Africa	379,119	449,566
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA COUNTRIES		
Afghanistan:		
Development loans		2,400
Development grants	14,668	20,768
Supporting assistance	44,761	39,761
Total, Afghanistan	59,429	62,929

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Ceylon:		
Development loans	3,236	3,136
Development grants	1,594	924
Total, Ceylon	4,830	4,060
Cyprus:		
Development loans		1,900
Development grants	662	1,062
Total, Cyprus	662	2,962
Greece:		
Development loans	41,052	73,552
Development grants	287	87
Supporting assistance	25,392	15,392
Total, Greece	66,731	89,031
India:		
Development loans	720,836	824,336
Development grants	28,918	19,368
Total, India	749,754	843,704
Iran:		
Development loans	18,405	28,405
Development grants	5,877	3,177
Supporting assistance	1,976	1,072
Total, Iran	26,258	32,654
Iraq: Development grants	1,314	1,414
Israel:		
Development loans	53,641	73,641
Development grants	557	57
Supporting assistance		
Total, Israel	54,198	73,698
Jordan:		
Development loans	824	
Development grants	9,753	7,753
Supporting assistance	55	
Total, Jordan	10,632	7,753
Lebanon:		
Development loans	2,890	2,090
Development grants	1,328	478
Total, Lebanon	4,218	2,568
Nepal:		
Development loans	400	
Development grants	5,689	4,989
Total, Nepal	6,089	4,989
Pakistan:		
Development loans	301,984	368,984
Development grants	12,471	13,221
Supporting assistance	40,523	5,523
Total, Pakistan	354,978	387,728
Saudi Arabia: Supporting assistance	242	
Syria:		
Development loans	22,199	19,499
Development grants	114	234
Supporting assistance	9,000	7,517
Total, Syria	31,313	27,250
Turkey:		
Development loans	155,650	145,650
Development grants	7,267	7,317
Supporting assistance	44,404	56,404
Total, Turkey	207,321,	209,371
United Arab Republic:		
Development loans	29,961	58,461
Development grants	4,352	4,152
Supporting assistance	20,000	25,000
Total, United Arab Republic	54,313	87,613
Yemen: Supporting assistance	5,615	4,515
CENTO:		
Development grants	60	110
Supporting assistance	19,122	6,562
Total, CENTO	19,182	6,672
Programing adjustment: Development loans		−65,000

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Regional:		
Development loans		
Development grants	19,290	16,020
Supporting assistance	5,765	3,025
Total, regional	25,055	19,045
Near East and south Asia summary:		
Development loans	1,351,078	1,537,054
Development grants	114,201	101,131
Supporting assistance	216,855	164,771
Total, Near East and south Asia	1,682,134	1,802,956
FAR EAST COUNTRIES		
Burma:		
Development grants	11,248	9,548
Supporting assistance	96	10,096
Total, Burma	11,344	19,644
Cambodia:		
Development grants	15,970	15,970
Supporting assistance	20,699	21,099
Total, Cambodia	36,669	37,069
China:		
Development loans	96,524	117,024
Development grants	10,133	6,133
Supporting assistance	1,674	
Total, China	108,331	123,157
Indonesia:		
Development loans	6,106	16,706
Development grants	25,680	21,880
Supporting assistance	5,487	13,387
Total, Indonesia	37,273	51,973
Japan:		
Development grants	421	
Supporting assistance	124	
Total, Japan	545	
Korea:		
Development loans	44,058	67,058
Development grants	44,458	28,158
Supporting assistance	113,733	97,630
Total, Korea	202,249	192,846
Laos:		
Development grants	261	
Supporting assistance	20,152	38,452
Total, Laos	20,413	38,452
Malaya: Development loans	13,539	5,939
Philippines:		
Development loans	20,959	31,959
Development grants	6,686	4,681
Supporting assistance	752	
Total, Philippines	28,397	36,640
Thailand:		
Development loans	20,472	17,872
Development grants	14,711	11,461
Supporting assistance	17,949	10,249
Total, Thailand	53,132	39,582
Vietnam:		
Development loans	39,097	34,697
Development grants	30,171	18,921
Supporting assistance	102,016	117,416
Total, Vietnam	171,284	171,034
Western Samoa: Supporting assistance	22	
Asian Productivity Organization: Development grants	211	261
SEATO: Development grants	2,194	1,744
Regional:		
Development grants	436	986
Supporting assistance	12,803	5,803
Total, regional	13,239	6,789
Programing adjustment: Development loans		−27,600

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Far East summary:		
Development loans	240,755	263,655
Development grants	162,580	119,743
Supporting assistance	295,507	314,132
Total, Far East	698,842	697,530
LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES		
Argentina: Alliance for Progress	28,378	79,478
Loans	26,000	76,700
Grants	2,378	2,778
Bolivia:		
Alliance for Progress	16,278	27,685
Loans	12,238	20,738
Grants	4,040	6,947
Supporting assistance	18,768	12,168
Total, Bolivia	35,046	39,853
Brazil: Alliance for Progress	13,389	137,094
Loans		109,800
Grants	13,389	27,294
Chile:		
Alliance for Progress	109,889	81,197
Loans	58,897	63,897
Grants	2,196	3,504
Reconstruction and rehabilitation	48,796	13,796
Supporting assistance	948	904
Total, Chile	110,837	82,101
Colombia:		
Alliance for Progress	29,315	75,377
Loans	21,758	68,758
Grants	7,557	6,619
Supporting assistance		
Total, Colombia	29,315	75,377
Costa Rica: Alliance for Progress	8,933	14,033
Loans	6,825	12,425
Grants	2,108	1,608
Dominican Republic:		
Alliance for Progress	910	3,961
Loans		1,900
Grants	910	2,061
Supporting assistance	13,500	25,250
Total, Dominican Republic	14,410	29,211
Ecuador:		
Alliance for Progress	21,478	26,492
Loans	14,378	19,678
Grants	7,100	6,814
Supporting assistance		2,000
Total, Ecuador	21,478	28,492
El Salvador: Alliance for Progress	4,406	12,706
Loans	1,600	9,100
Grants	2,806	3,606
Guatemala:		
Alliance for Progress	15,888	17,855
Loans	11,896	14,096
Grants	3,992	3,759
Haiti:		
Alliance for Progress	829	183
Loans	546	
Grants	283	183
Supporting assistance	5,536	8,323
Total, Haiti	6,365	8,506

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Honduras:		
Alliance for Progress	5,480	5,530
Loans	3,706	2,106
Grants	1,774	3,424
Supporting assistance	785	485
Total, Honduras	6,265	6,015
Mexico: Alliance for Progress	20,827	28,627
Loans	20,000	28,000
Grants	827	627
Nicaragua: Alliance for Progress	11,154	9,454
Loans	9,432	7,332
Grants	1,722	2,122
Panama:		
Alliance for Progress	9,128	18,028
Loans	6,665	15,165
Grants	2,463	2,863
Supporting assistance	9,298	7,298
Total, Panama	18,426	25,326
Paraguay: Alliance for Progress	9,246	5,978
Loans	7,949	3,949
Grants	1,297	2,029
Peru:		
Alliance for Progress	51,050	46,009
Loans	41,990	36,990
Grants	9,060	9,019
Supporting assistance	5,518	4,018
Total, Peru	56,568	50,027
Uruguay: Alliance for Progress	3,110	9,050
Loans	2,810	7,310
Grants	300	1,740
Venezuela:		
Alliance for Progress	25,097	48,424
Loans	24,270	46,270
Grants	827	2,154
Supporting assistance	----------	----------
Total, Venezuela	25,097	48,424
British Guiana: Alliance for Progress, grants	1,372	1,672
British Honduras:		
Alliance for Progress, grants	171	121
Supporting assistance, non-project	45	----------
Total, British Honduras	216	121
Trinidad-Tobago:		
Alliance for Progress, grants	----------	600
Supporting assistance, project	----------	9,092
Total, Trinidad	----------	9,692
East Caribbean:		
Alliance for Progress, grants	2,800	1,200
Supporting assistance	2,004	1,849
Total, East Caribbean	4,084	3,049
Jamaica: Alliance for Progress	970	5,420
Loans	----------	4,500
Grants	970	920
Surinam: Alliance for Progress, grants	218	418
Contributions to PAHO: Alliance for Progress, grants	2,000	1,800
Contributions to OAS: Alliance for Progress, grants	7,701	6,081
IDB Trust Fund: Alliance for Progress	384,000	354,400

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Regional: Alliance for progress	7,826	15,629
Loans	5,000	5,000
Grants	2,826	10,629
ROCAP: Alliance for Progress	----------	8,900
Loans	----------	4,000
Grants	----------	4,900
Programing adjustment: Alliance for Progress, loans	----------	−47,700
Latin America summary:		
Alliance for Progress	791,843	995,702
Loans	275,960	510,014
Grants	83,087	117,492
Chile reconstruction and rehabilitation	48,796	13,796
IDB Trust Fund	384,000	354,400
Supporting assistance	56,402	71,387
Total, Latin America	848,245	1,067,089
NONREGIONAL		
U.N. technical assistance: International organizations	37,480	48,780
Indus waters: International organizations	14,500	----------
U.N. Congo: International organizations	10,177	----------
U.N. Children's Fund: International organizations	13,943	6,000
NATO science: International organizations	103	----------
U.N. Relief and Works Agency: International organizations	7,573	10,200
Atoms for peace:		
Development grants	5,105	2,584
International organizations	650	600
Total, atoms for peace	5,755	3,184
Malaria eradication:		
Development grants	122	22
International organizations	2,500	500
Total, malaria eradication	2,622	522
Community water supply:		
Development grants	220	----------
International organizations	400	250
Total community water supply	620	250
American schools abroad: Other programs	12,514	12,214
Investment incentive: Development grants	931	481
Investment survey: Other assistance	2	400
NATO civilian headquarters: International organizations	46	----------
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration: Other assistance	8	----------
U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees: Other assistance	710	----------
U.S. escapee program: Other assistance	3,238	2,238
Hungarian refugees: Other assistance	30	----------
World refugee airlift: Other assistance	226	----------
Cuban refugee airlift: Other assistance	167	----------
Cuban refugees: Other assistance	2,687	15
Law conference: Supporting assistance	100	50
Office of Inspector General:		
Development loans	----------	----------
Development grants	----------	----------
Supporting assistance	----------	----------
Alliance for Progress	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------
Worldwide school facilities: Development grants	58	64
American national exhibition in Moscow: Other assistance	1	----------

Economic assistance programs administered by AID and other agencies (including military assistance funds used for economic assistance programs)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and function	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1962	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1963
Project Hope:		
Supporting assistance	1,344	472
Alliance for Progress	----------	500
Total, Project Hope	1,344	972
Ocean freight—voluntary relief:		
Development grants	308	1,630
Alliance for Progress	----------	370
Total, ocean freight	308	2,000
Disaster relief: Supporting assistance	63	60
Freight differentials: Supporting assistance	387	287
Foreign scientists: Development grants	654	304
Research:		
Development grants	8,351	9,361
Alliance for Progress	----------	1,100
Total, research	8,351	10,461
Interregional:		
Development grants	9,617	12,563
Supporting assistance	----------	154
Alliance for Progress	----------	2,433
Total, interregional	9,617	15,150
Undistributed: Other assistance	−72,945	−68,945
Administrative expenses, AID: Other assistance	10,920	10,210
Administrative expenses, State: Other assistance	57	201
Organization of American States: International organizations	----------	----------
Unprogramed contingency	----------	74,893
Nonregional summary:		
International organizations	87,372	66,330
Development loans	----------	----------
Development grants	25,366	27,009
Supporting assistance	1,894	1,023
Other assistance	−42,385	31,226
Alliance for Progress	----------	4,403
Total, nonregional	72,247	129,991

The figures in the above table speak for themselves. They lend full support to the conclusion that the $4.1 billion authorization proposed in the bill is excessive. A $2.9 billion authorization recommended by the American Farm Bureau Federation is much more realistic and the bureau should be commended for its soundly conceived presentation.

It is frustrating for the minority to see, year after year, the Committee on Foreign Affairs authorize foreign aid expenditures which are far in excess both of the actual needs of a soundly executed program and of funds eventually appropriated by the Congress. This practice diminishes the credibility of the committee's recommendations and contributes to administrative abuses.

EXCESSIVE VOLUME OF AID ENCOURAGES POOR ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

It is apparent from testimony presented during the hearings on this legislation that the difficulty in handling the large volume of foreign aid leads to many poor administrative practices. In some instances, the committee found that funds hastily obligated for particular projects were subsequently diverted to other uses when the projects did not materialize. This practice circumvents congressional control over the direction of the aid program and should be terminated immediately. All deobligated funds should revert to the Treasury. In some countries, the Agency for International Development (AID) has been unable to provide proper supervision over aid projects.

Instances of poor project management, of funds lying idle, of unnecessary expenditures, abound in the history of the aid program. The legislative framework of the program suffers from the demands imposed upon the overseeing congressional committees by the vastness of this undertaking. The fact that the Inspector General for Foreign Aid to date has no legal authority to review and inspect projects financed out of the Social Progress Trust Fund—through which instrumentality more than $384 million in aid has been obligated in less than 2 years' time—is a case in point.

Another problem that has troubled us relates to AID personnel policies. In spite of personnel freezes, reorganizations, and other administrative reforms, the number and the cost of personnel involved in the administration of foreign aid continue to mount. As of June 30, 1963, an estimated 42,500 persons were employed or participating in the foreign aid program. These were divided, almost evenly, between the military and the economic portions of the program. Of the total mentioned above, only about 17,000 were direct-hire personnel financed from AID and military assistance funds. The remainder were employees of contractors receiving AID funds, personnel financed from trust funds, personnel paid from Defense Department appropriations, and the like.

The true extent of foreign aid personnel costs is obscured by the diversity of sources from which these people are paid—and especially by AID practice of charging some employees to program costs. The average cost of AID administrative personnel in Washington is approximately $13,000 per year per person. The average cost of maintaining a direct-hire AID technician abroad, $34,000. And the cost of contract technicians in some cases has exceeded $50,000 per man-year.

The current practice of expanding contract foreign aid—e.g., technical and other assistance provided by private concerns under contract to AID—is particularly troublesome and raises some serious questions. Because of its magnitude and the manner in which it operates, contract foreign aid is becoming impossible to supervise effectively and to evaluate properly. As of March 31, 1963, the volume of this aid was in excess of $439 million. If contract foreign aid is to be used in the future, current policies governing such aid cannot be allowed to continue. The cost of contract technicians and specialists must be substantially reduced. The dollar volume of contracts awarded to private firms and institutions must be rigidly controlled. And the implementation of all contracts must be subjected to full and thorough supervision.

OTHER OBJECTIONABLE EXECUTIVE BRANCH PRACTICES

Certain other objectionable practices of the executive branch warrant mention at this point. These include entering into long-term aid commitments without prior congressional authorization and the misuse of the contingency fund.

For many years, ignoring repeated congressional objections, the executive branch has followed the practice of making long-term aid commitments without prior congressional authorization. Recently an agreement to provide $398.5 million in aid to Brazil—some of it from future year authorizations and appropriations for the foreign aid program—received considerable publicity. Another case in point is the Bokaro steel mill in India. It may be correct to state that the United States has made no commitment to build this mill. But the fact is that AID has financed a basic study by an American steel company, provided personnel for a followup on technical details, and the President has expressed endorsement of the proposed project. All of these steps were undertaken before the Congress had an opportunity to study the magnitude and the feasibility of the Bokaro steel mill. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to say that we are uncommitted to this project. And, finally, at the very time when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was considering this bill, the executive branch was already involved in making commitments to other countries in connection with future aid to Indonesia.

In these and other cases, once the commitment is made by the executive branch, the argument is advanced that the Congress cannot fail to provide the necessary authorization and funds without breaking faith with foreign countries and causing our Nation irreparable harm abroad. We consider this a specious argument. With the exception of long-term programs specifically authorized by the Congress, no funds should be provided for any long-term aid commitments entered into by the executive branch. Some of the amendments embodied in this bill, such as the long overdue amendment relating to aid to Indonesia, are designed to enforce this principle.

To reemphasize: The Congress should not debate this legislation handcuffed to executive commitments. The Congress must insist on independence of action and on meaningful sharing of authority in this program. Unless this is done, the legislative process will become a mockery and the Congress will become a rubberstamp of the executive.

The use of the contingency fund for purposes not even remotely related to emergency situations is also to be condemned. The contingency fund has been used to finance a variety of projects not included in the regular budget—to purchase independence day gifts for foreign countries, to finance United Nations operations in the Congo, to bail out financially irresponsible dictators, and to pay for a road project in Afghanistan which had been a part of the regular program for several years. Even more shocking are some executive practices relating to the obligation of unspent contingency fund appropriations. Out of the $293 million in contingency fund appropriations used in fiscal 1962, $87.9 million, or 30 percent, was obligated during the last month of the year—$49 million of it on the very last day. While the executive branch is to be commended this year for turning back to the Treasury some of the funds appropriated for the contingency fund, we believe that the practices described above should be abandoned promptly. The contingency fund was intended for emergency situations and should be used accordingly.

There is still another executive branch practice which we find extremely objectionable—the practice of permitting the use of our aid to create or to expand competition by recipient governments with private enterprise. Several provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act caution against such use of funds appropriated for this program. Nevertheless, some instances have been called to our attention in which U.S. aid has been so employed, even to the extent of fostering competition by recipient governments with resident business of American-owned companies. In one case, U.S. aid was provided to a foreign-government-owned corporation interested in establishing a long-distance communications service. The government-owned entity then proceeded to induce the appropriate ministry to deny the application of a private communications company to perform the same service with equipment already on order. This, of course, resulted in the cancellation of the order placed by the private company, and in the use of AID funds to meet needs which could have been satisfied by private industry. Under no circumstances should U.S. aid be used, either directly or indirectly, for such purposes.

AID AND TRADE WITH RED GOVERNMENTS

One of the tragic errors of our foreign policy since 1949 has been the direct aid provided through this program to countries with Communist governments. We refer specifically to Yugoslavia and Poland, whose peoples are stanchly anti-Communist. The Communist governments in these countries were placed in control in the closing period of World War II as a result of the Yalta and the Potsdam agreements. The peoples of Yugoslavia and Poland were thereby deprived of the right to self-determination, and their legitimate prewar officials were driven out by the Communist forces. U.S. diplomacy condoned these actions.

The Communist dictators of Yugoslavia since 1949 and of Poland since 1957, have been receiving aid by fraudulently claiming that they are independent of the international Communist conspiracy. The executive branch, under three Presidents, has claimed that direct aid to Yugoslavia and Poland was necessary to wean them away from Moscow's control. The facts are that aid to a Communist-dominated government merely serves to perpetuate its insidious control over the people and does not provide for their material or political well-being.

We discuss this subject in these minority views since, despite a direct prohibition by the Congress against aid to Communist countries, we are fearful that the executive branch intends not only to restore direct aid to Yugoslavia and Poland, but hopes to extend it to other Communist countries as well.

To compound the tragedy of using American tax dollars to support brutal Communist dictatorships, we find the present administration determined to ignore the provisions of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act by refusing to withdraw the "most favored nation" tariff status from Yugoslavia and Poland. In 1962, section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act directed the President to revoke, as soon as practicable, the "most favored nation" treatment and other trade concessions accorded to these two Red-dominated countries. The executive branch has chosen deliberately to disregard this section of the Trade Act which should be respected and administered as the law of the land.

To compound further this tragic error and dubious policy, the executive branch attempted to repeal this provision in the original draft of this year's foreign aid bill recommended by it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, as a direct result of an objection from the chairman and members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and in recognition of the strong opposition within our committee, this attempt to repeal section 231 has been temporarily abandoned.

We must direct attention, however, to the fact that the foreign aid bill being processed in the other body may well contain repeal of section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act. It is our intention to guard against the possibility in the conference committee which will ultimately resolve the differences between the two authorization bills.

If the argument for the huge foreign aid expenditures is still based on halting the spread of communism, it is completely contradictory to extend any aid, direct or indirect, or to provide beneficial trade advantages, to Communist governments. It must be recognized that a Communist government exports to the United States items of which its own people are deprived. In turn, they import from the United States materials needed to expand Communist productive resources in direct cooperation with the Soviet economic bloc. When applied to trade relations with a Communist government, free trade is actually a fiction.

The oppressed peoples of Red-dominated lands do not benefit from our mistaken policies. We repeat that aid and favorable trade conditions extended to Communist governments serve to strengthen those governments and help them keep those people in bondage. This is a direct contradiction of our historic support of the principle of self-determination of peoples, and an affront to the intelligence of the American taxpayer.

A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IS LONG OVERDUE

Military assistance has long accounted for a substantial portion of foreign aid expenditures. We are of the opinion that recent developments in Europe and in other parts of the world render imperative a thorough and dispassionate reappraisal of this program. We further believe that the issues raised by the Clay Committee provide a logical starting point for such a review.

As pointed out by the Clay Committee and other observers, our military assistance has been used for a variety of purposes—not all of them equally compelling. Military assistance funds have helped to finance national military establishments in prosperous Western Europe, and to promote military buildups in some of the developing countries. They have been used to support excessively large armies in some countries, and to prop up undemocratic regimes in others. Continued expenditure of public funds for each of these purposes is open to question. But over and above these considerations, one basic issue demands our attention. Are the objectives of the military assistance program realistic, and is its magnitude justified by the contributions of our allies to our common, collective security? The answer to these questions lies at the heart of the security problem confronting the free world.

It is no secret that our plans for a collective defense system within the North Atlantic community—a system which could enhance the security of other parts of the world as well—have suffered some severe setbacks in recent times. For over 15 years, while Western Europe proceeded with the task of reconstruction, the United States—working with and through NATO—shouldered the primary responsibility for the security of the free world. That task and that primary mission of NATO have been accomplished. Western Europe stands today on its own feet economically. It is fully capable of contributing a fair share to the common defense. What seems to be lacking on the part of our allies, however, is the willingness to discharge that responsibility within the framework of an acceptable collective security system.

NATO does not constitute such a system. The integrated supply system which we have worked hard to achieve has not gotten off the ground. Military contributions of many of the member countries have failed to measure up to NATO requirements and goals. Most of the allied forces earmarked for NATO are not actually under the control of that organization but remain under the control of individual member nations. The control over NATO military decisions in time of emergency rests with the North Atlantic Council (also referred to as Council of Ministers) within which any single member can make prompt and decisive action impossible. NATO does not at present provide, as anticipated, a satisfactory instrument of collective security.

We believe that the continuation of the current policy under which the United States still provides for most of the security requirements of Western Europe—and of other areas—should be subject to closer scrutiny. Our prosperous allies should take concrete steps to assume a larger portion of the burdens of free world defense. Until they do, we ought to be less liberal with our assistance.

CONCLUSIONS

The contribution which the foreign aid program, as currently administered, makes to our national interest and security is discouragingly low in relation to its multibillion-dollar cost.

As we have pointed out, there is no selectivity in the dispensing of our aid. The taxpayer's dollars are handed out through a multiplicity of banking windows to virtually every country in the world.

Administrative abuses and excesses still abound in spite of repeated congressional efforts to curb them.

Executive commitments handcuff the Congress in the exercise of its legislative responsibilities, making effective congressional control over this program impossible.

Under these circumstances, we believe it is imperative that the Congress face up squarely to these basic questions:

Can the United States, with a combined public and private debt of $1,700 billion, continue to try to police and wet-nurse the whole world?

Should the United States continue to spend billions on foreign aid when the recipients of our assistance—the rich and the poor alike—appear so little concerned about helping themselves and helping each other?

In our opinion, the answer to both of these questions is "No."

We believe it is high time for the Congress to pause and take a hard, realistic look at this entire program. We must put away the carrot and lay the facts of life before our allies. We must enunciate specific objectives which are within our means to achieve through foreign aid. And we must concentrate and sharpen our effort to secure those objectives.

Most of all, we must not fool ourselves that the bill accompanying this report will accomplish any of these long overdue reforms.

In the public interest, this is the course which we should follow. Until we do, the public interest demands that this legislation be defeated.

To sum up—

The aid program must be completely revised.

The aid program must be brought, in all its financial aspects, under the unfettered control of the Congress.

The aid program must be limited to the actual amount which the recipient countries can absorb effectively, and deobligated funds must immediately revert to the Treasury.

The aid program must be withheld from countries which use it for the purpose of territorial expansion.

The aid program must have stricter administrative supervision, and all featherbedding practices must be determined.

The aid program must require specific congressional authorization for each project exceeding $50 million.

The aid program must be limited exclusively to non-Communist countries.

The aid program must contain stronger safeguards to prohibit the use of our aid to finance government-owned productive facilities which compete with private enterprise in the recipient countries.

E. ROSS ADAIR.
E. Y. BERRY.
JAMES F. BATTIN.
H. R. GROSS.
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.
VERNON W. THOMSON.

AVERELL HARRIMAN IS A FINE MAN

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, my heartiest felicitations are extended to the Honorable Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, for his success in connection with the agreement on the nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow.

The magnitude of his efforts in this area cannot be assessed and his adroit handling of the delicate issues involved cannot be overestimated. The finesse he displayed in his negotiations on this particular matter are further corroboration of my own conviction of Mr. Harriman's amazingly astute grasp of political affairs when I first met him in 1945 in Moscow when he was serving as our Ambassador there.

I knew then that he was not only a sincere and dedicated American, with unswerving loyalty to the best interests of America and her ideals of freedom and justice, but that he was also a gentleman of rare perspicacity, prudent judgment, monumental patience and a keen sagacity particularly concerning the handling of Russian diplomatic affairs.

Mr. Harriman's work for his State and his Nation over a period of many years has been incalculably valuable. This, his latest service, will be a lasting tribute to the consummate skill of this wonderfully able man and his unusual endeavors for the peace and freedom of America and the world.

It is a pleasure to include a recent editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal which is devoted to Under Secretary Harriman. To this editorial I add a loud amen.

AVERELL HARRIMAN: A USEFUL PROFILE

As the great debate on the nuclear test ban begins, the possibility of reasoned judgment would be enhanced were every member of Congress to read a timely dispatch about Averell Harriman, the veteran diplomatic trouble shooter who initialed the pact for the United States last week in Moscow.

The dispatch came from William H. Stoneman, the distinguished London correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, now in his third decade as a journalistic troubleshooter in Europe.

Though Harriman is accepted as "something of a friend by the Russians and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev personally," Mr. Stoneman wrote, "he has never been gullible in 20 years of dealing with them. He was one of the first men in Franklin D. Roosevelt's official family to foresee a prolonged cold war with the Russians, once they ceased to need American help in resisting Germany and Japan.

"And he didn't hesitate to express his views.

"On a visit to London at the end of the war when he was Ambassador to the Soviet Union, he told me, within earshot of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes and Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg:

" 'We are going to have 70 years of trouble with the United States than ex-President make up our minds to it and prepare for it.'

"Harriman was far less susceptible to Russian promises and protestations of friendship with the United States than ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who enjoyed a triumphant reception in Moscow when he visited the Soviet capital after Germany's defeat.

"After being hailed by a huge crowd in Dynamo Stadium, Eisenhower chided Harriman for being suspicious of Russian motives.

"Eisenhower explained that he had drunk a toast with Marshal Georgi Zhukov, the Soviet commander, to the proposition that the Red Army and the U.S. Army together would join in maintaining peace.

"It was the general's conviction at that time that Zhukov would succeed Josef Stalin as the top man in the Soviet Union.

"According to those who were present at the time, Harriman accepted the general's friendly criticism with an amused smile.

"Harriman was a loyal ally of the Russians during the war and was accepted as such by Stalin and his underlings, including Khrushchev.

"But they have found him to be a tough customer to deal with and they have never really been able to figure him out * * * (or) how he outfoxed them in the Laos negotiations * * * those who watched him in action attributed his success to patience, an almost Oriental capacity to double-talk the Orientals themselves, and infinite skill at stalling off decisions when they were bound to be unpleasant * * * at the same time he has always appeared sweetly reasonable."

That is quite a profile, by a reporter justly famous for his tough-mindedness, of the man who won Soviet agreement to the test ban treaty and who now is seeking to convince the Senate that President Kennedy is right in terming it "an important first step" toward peace. It's a profile to be remembered as the debate continues.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I address my comments to an article which appeared a week ago in Life magazine, under date of August 16. It is entitled "Now—See the Innards of a Fat Pig."

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may be permitted to include a letter which I addressed to the editors of the magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Mr. EDWARD K. THOMPSON,
Editor, Life Magazine
New York, N.Y.

SIR: Hanging the "pork barrel" label on Federal public works in your August 16 issue is a flagrant distortion of fact, a blot on the ethical standards of a free press, and a disservice to the country in striving to meet critical water-resource development needs to protect human life and health, expand the economy and strengthen national defense.

Life's team of writers and photographers, with their hastily-acquired expertise in evaluating major engineering works, searched the country for two months. It selected a handful of projects, some brand new, others only partly built, or merely proposed for construction, and none of which have yet had the opportunity to produce their measure of public benefits. Though these projects are the handiwork of our country's finest engineering organizations, and the Congress authorized them after intensive consideration of their need and value, Life has branded them as a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Life's article deliberately ignored over 2,800 operating flood control, navigation, power, water conservation and other projects, which the Corps of Engineers has built in 50 States. It omitted the fact that these projects, costing a total of $5.3 billion, have already saved $11 billion in flood losses alone, without counting the savings in human lives, or the tremendous expansion in industrial output, jobs and other benefits they have brought about.

Couldn't Life's team find the Ohio River lock-and-dam system, teeming with barge-laden commerce, where low-cost water transportation, providing an abundance of goods at lowered costs for American consumers, has caused industry to invest $18 billion in new plants in a single decade?

Didn't it visit any of the great harbors, naturally too shallow for modern vessels, which the Army Engineers had to dredge to deepen channels so the United States can import and export the necessities of modern society?

What about the 37 hydroelectric plants the Army Engineers have built in 18 States, producing enough firm power for 11 cities about the size of Detroit, sparking new industry such as the phenomenal growth of the Pacific Northwest? I recall that self-appointed journalistic experts a generation ago predicted that the only customers for the power from dams such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee would be the jackrabbits roaming the sagebrush.

I wonder what the uncounted thousands of Americans who are kept dry by the flood control projects, or the families which visited Federal reservoirs, for healthful, outdoor recreation in numbers 120 million strong last year; or the manufacturers, the businessmen, the farmers, and the labor organizations who know what these Federal projects have done and are doing for their benefit think about your article. I am concerned, too, of what they will think about the $20 million subsidy in taxpayers' funds Life and its associated publications enjoy each year in reduced postal rates, which the Congress has voted, and which I have supported, so the people of our democracy can more readily have access to facts, information, and news of events in this rapidly changing world of ours.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be among the first—I am sure there will be others—to address comments to this article in Life magazine.

In this article, five writers and staff—who, according to the magazine itself, spent all of 2 months studying an enormous range of public works projects in all parts of the country—have presumed to set their hastily informed judgment above that of an imposing range of authorities at all levels who have spent literally years in studying each of those projects before recommending them for construction.

These writers and this article form part of a tradition which is in its way as old and historic as the "pork-barrel" cry they echo. Muckraking is a time-tested device of journals whose circulation managers are becoming concerned about competition. But when it is undertaken at the expense of national growth and strength, it may be a very costly device.

It has always been a policy of the U.S. Government to assist and pave the way for economic expansion. It explored the West, cataloged its resources, discovered highway and rail routes, and heavily subsidized their construction. It granted public lands to homesteaders, opened rivers and waterways, subsidized communications, built dams and irrigation developments, and established the basic improvements that would permit private enterprise to enter undeveloped areas and open their resources of wealth.

At each stage of national growth there has been opposition to Government programs in support of further expansion. And the opposition through the decades, far into the past, has always sounded much the same.

The authors of Life's article, in attacking the Arkansas Basin project, neglected to mention the first and biggest public expenditure which made that project possible—one that in its day was attacked in the same way. It was the Louisiana Purchase, which gave us America's heartland—wild then, undeveloped, empty, seemingly worthless.

Later, speaking in the U.S. Senate against a proposal to annex the Pacific Northwest, even the great Daniel Webster once said:

> What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, and uninviting, and not a harbor on it?

Views of this kind have never represented the outward-reaching, dynamic spirit that has distinguished Americans from other peoples. The longer range view has generally prevailed—the view of those who could foresee that the development of resources creates wealth which spreads far and wide and enriches the entire Nation. The lesson of America, taught and confirmed throughout our history, is that the dynamic drive to develop resources and create new wealth is the road to prosperity and greatness. The investment costs are temporary and infinitesimal when compared to the gains which permeate the whole community as the development drive continues.

Looking over Life's article, several points impressed me particularly. One is that it does not deal with projects that have been completed and put into service, and made an actual record. Zealous as they were in sniffing for "pork," the writers apparently found no operating projects, among all the thousands that have been built in the past, to which they could point as a bad investment.

Instead, therefore, they have resorted to dire predictions concerning the prospective usefulness of projects that are still under construction or only proposed. And in making these predictions, again they disdained the record in favor of their own gloomy imaginations.

Water-resource project proposals are probably more thoroughly scrutinized than any other pieces of legislation to come before the Congress. Let me briefly summarize the procedures by which a rivers-and-harbors project of the Army's Corps of Engineers comes into existence.

First, as a raw idea, it is brought before the Congress, which must authorize a study. Authorization is granted only if the project shows sufficient promise to justify an investigation. Many, many

proposals are screened out at this first stage. Life made a point of the fact that a canal paralleling the Arkansas River had been proposed; it ignored the fact that this proposal was sifted out at the very first stage of the scrutinizing process which protects the American taxpayer.

Next, the project is studied by the Corps of Engineers, who hold a public hearing and submit a report. Historically, more than half of the corps' reports have been negative. Screen No. 2 has operated to protect the public.

If the initial study report is favorable, the report is submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, an independent agency created about the turn of the century as a further public safeguard. At the same time it is submitted to the States concerned, to other Federal agencies, and to the Bureau of the Budget. Again, the public is invited to present its views.

Next, the report is scrutinized by the Public Works Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Once more, public hearings are held.

If it passes this first congressional scrutiny, the project is authorized in an omnibus bill. But before it can be built, it must once again pass before Congress and once more receive public hearings. This is when it comes up for construction appropriations.

This is the public scrutiny that Life magazine has disdained in favor of its own whirlwind 2-month survey of the entire United States.

I think it is noteworthy that Life magazine, for all its professed concern over the public purse, has not once appeared in opposition to any of the projects it condemns at any of the almost innumerable opportunities it has had to do so—opportunities which, as it itself says, have extended over a period sometimes as long as 20 years ago.

Instead, it has waited until the scrutinizing process is finished and the record of testimony has been made. And then it has gone through this record and culled out only the adverse testimony in an effort to make it appear that the public is being badly served by its representatives in Congress and in the executive branch.

Life has made no pretense of being fair. It has not attempted to present a rounded picture of any of the projects it discusses. It has not bothered to offer a single word of favorable testimony upon those projects.

Among the 3,000-odd projects built by the Army Engineers alone, it apparently has not been able to find a single one that was of benefit to the public. Somehow its zealous reporters could not see the Ohio River waterway project—a project that started out amid the same gloomy predictions that now are raised against the Arkansas, but which has proven to be one of the most successful internal-development undertakings in the United States, one that saw its traffic triple within the 10 years 1946–56, that fostered a huge industrial expansion, that helped the major rail lines in its area earn greater revenues than in other areas, and that is now being enlarged to accommodate the amazing increase in its use.

They ignored the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, which is earning well over its total construction cost every year, and is annually returning about $14.80 in benefits for every dollar of cost.

Take the upper Mississippi River navigation channel—river traffic has increased 12 times in the last 20 years because of the series of 27 locks constructed on the Mississippi; 500 new plants are built along the river every year. This is because transportation is cheaper than shipping bulky products either by rail or truck.

I could go on and on. But, as I said, Life has not been concerned with the Nation's actual experience with rivers and harbors development. It has been concerned only to make reckless charges against the U.S. Government, and to offer in support of those charges only its own morbid view of future regional and national development.

The falsifications in this article are not confined only to omissions. There are serious direct and positive falsifications which it is hard to believe were inadvertent.

The article derides the Arkansas River navigation project as a 516-mile channel to the landlocked port at Catoosa, Okla., ignoring the fact that this city of Catoosa is actually the port for Tulsa and the central Oklahoma oil region, and that the waterway will serve many other cities en route, including Little Rock.

I cannot take time now to point out the many other flaws in this article. I am sure that every Member of this body has collected his own list. I will take time only to mention one more of its startling omissions. In its sweeping review of alleged "pork" and public subsidies, the article somehow completely omits any mention of the subsidy which Life magazine itself collects from the Federal Government in the form of lower-than-cost mailing rates. We can easily understand this omission. "Pork-barrel" is always something that somebody else gets, not something that we ourselves obtain. But I think we may fairly ask ourselves this question: If we were to allow ourselves to be swayed by this article into cutting down on some of our public investments for internal benefit, might we now well begin by eliminating the subsidy which the Federal Government now finds itself paying to have itself libeled?

I do not dispute the right of these writers or any writers or citizens to question the things done by the Government in any of its activities. We are responsible as Representatives of our respective districts throughout the country to supply the answers, and the agencies, just as we question the agencies that come before our committee to give justifications of either what they propose to do or what they have done. But I do publicly express my contempt for this type of journalism, that comes to broad, sweeping, but inconclusive conclusions indicting all of these operations in all categories on the basis of a very perfunctory investigation, in this article.

We have distinguished colleagues, men who have been engaged in resource development work for years and I am looking now at my very dear friend, Mr. ASPINALL, the distinguished chairman of that very important Committee on the Interior who has handled billions of dollars worth of reclamation projects closely related to areas of flood control and navigation which we in the House Committee on Public Works have to do with. We have had a splendid liaison and cooperation over many, many years and the distinguished chairman will be able to verify the meticulous and systematic method by which projects are given every scrutiny right from the grassroots level on up through the Bureau of the Budget and through our Committee on Appropriations and to the Congress and they are not, as this article says, "dreamed up by somebody in the Corps of Engineers or in the Bureau of Reclamation."

I am delighted to yield to my colleague Mr. ASPINALL, the gentleman from Colorado, the able and distinguished chairman of the House Interior Committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this rebuttal of the magazine article which five either uninformed or misinformed members of Life magazine wrote in their most recent issue. They use the term "pork barrel." My reply to their article is hogwash—or balderdash—it makes no difference.

Mr. Speaker, these five men by making this attack without substantiation, in Life magazine, have undertaken to undermine some of our worthy national resource projects and programs.

As Abe Lincoln said:

> You can fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

This time I am sure the people of the United States will not be fooled by such a foolish article. It appears that the five, and I name them, Keither Wheeler, Henry Suydam, Norman Ritter, Bill Wise, and Howard Sochurek, were assigned the responsibility of manipulating public opinion in an effort to throttle current development and hamstring future Federal development.

Mr. Speaker, if they did not have this in mind in the first place, they would not have proceeded as they did.

While it is always wise to view sensationalism with suspicion, one should be willing to investigate into the qualifications of the author as a test of the soundness of his criticism. Since the critical attack appeared in Life with no hint of expertise of the authors, it is appropriate to inquire into their qualifications.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. We talk about expertise in that field. I cannot help but think and wonder if Life magazine had any expert on public works and reclamation as an adviser and consultant and technician on these large projects. Life made no reference to any real expert or specialist in this field.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think that is right. If my colleague from Minnesota will permit me so to state, I think in the statement I have I will refer to some of the constructive positions that Life magazine has taken heretofore.

No responsible biographical data was available from Life's Washington office. It is worthwhile noticing that.

A search of biographical directories at the Library of Congress revealed that none of the authors were so renowned as to be listed among the notables in "Who's Who" or "Current Biography."

A survey of articles written by the same authors since March 1961, is no more flattering. While two of the coauthors are credited with no other articles since that time, the "Reader's Guide" reveals that Sochurek has written one about photography and another about Outer Mongolia. Suydam has written three articles including one about a victim of the Hartford circus fire, while Wheeler's list includes an array of subjects from Cuba to transfusions to crime in Denver. None of the titles suggest any special knowledge from which these authors could accurately judge the merits of any Federal water resource programs.

In short, the most to be said of the critics is that their names appear in Life's masthead and that three of them "spent 2 months of travel and research" in preparation of a story covering a geographical area from Florida to California and technical subject areas as complicated and different as reclamation projects and the space program.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Minnesota was kind enough to mention some of the work that this speaker and the members of his committee have done in the past in studying these projects. Now, the gentleman from Minnesota and the committee of which he is a member also spent weeks, months, and years in the study of some of these projects, and here are five writers who come up with their articles on such programs after just 2 months' time. May I continue?

"Two months of travel and research" and a job with Life is just not enough to substantiate any suggested expertise. And it is certainly not enough to discredit the years of study and investigation undertaken by noted experts, in and out of Government, which precede congressional authorizations and appropriations.

Perhaps the authors could have learned more about the projects they label as "pork barrel" if they had sat at home and paged through previous issues of Life than they apparently learned by their "2 months of travel and research."

Water—the abundance or lack thereof—is a common subject for Life. Its pages abound with stories of droughts and floods, with countless losses of lives and property. Life has shown us that disastrous floods and droughts are indiscriminate—that they affect millions of people and thousands of acres of land—and yet these experts tell us that the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers fall into the not needed, pork barrel category.

"Pork barrel," a slang expression, is an appropriation of Federal funds for political purposes rather than for needed improvements. The people of the West do not have to be told of the necessity for development of their water resources, but if they did, they could read Life to learn about the water-poor West.

On December 22, 1961, Life devoted a large section of its weekly issue to water. Life states that only 25 percent of the Nation's water resources are available to the vast West. Some areas, it points out, are using water faster than it can be replaced, and it predicts that other areas—including the Colorado River Basin—could be in a similar fix by 1980.

To prevent such forecasts from becoming reality, Congress has provided the tools with which the Nation can continue to carve its own destiny. For western waters, it has meant development of massive, largely self-liquidating, multiple-use water storage projects, like the Upper Colorado River storage project.

Even Life has recognized the vital role which the Colorado River plays in supplying water for the seven States in the arid basin. The construction of the Upper Colorado River storage dams, said Life on April 9, 1956, "will replenish diminishing water supplies for more than 3 million people in 5 States. The power they will generate will permit the full exploitation of the region's mineral resources." Coupled with previous development of the lower basin, this will add to the vast irrigable acreage of the West. "In all," Life continues, "the project will open a rich new region to the United States which could produce everything from sugar beets and peaches to uranium and molybdenum and provide a promising new center of population for the country."

Mr. Speaker, I shall take only this additional moment. It seems to me that a magazine as widespread as this magazine, a magazine which has enjoyed subsidies from the Federal Government as has this and other magazines, could at least stay consistent in its approach to the question of water resources. If water resource development on these projects specifically mentioned heretofore by Life were good projects and they lent to them their strength and their support, why all of a sudden does Life come out with a sensational article attacking the very basis of the Federal program as far as our water resource development is concerned?

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the distinguished chairman for his usual modest but very solid and factual presentation. I believe the chairman will agree that in flood control alone, we should think of a total of about $5 billion plus spent in the whole history of the Corps, and already there has been over $11 billion of saving to property and industry, and to life. That is just in the flood control aspects. Also I am thinking of the millions of arable, productive acres of farmland that used to be barren and dry.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in his statement of the value of these projects. He was talking only of flood control. When you add to that the values that come out of irrigation, the values that come out of Federal power, the values that come out of recreation, the values that come out of municipal water and, above all, adding these together, you have the indirect values that go to the Nation as a whole, it just shows how much nonsense there was to the way that the Life article was written.

Mr. BLATNIK. I think the chairman will recall with more clarity than I, I believe, the arguments that were used when the Bonneville Dam project was being built in the great Northwest and the ridicule that was heaped on that project. I recall as a young man at that time seeing the headlines, in this wild sagebrush, barren, arid, dry country, that said, "What is the electricity for? To light up the sagebrush for the jackrabbits." When you think of the great industrial development, the economic contribution, the development of a great and important part of our country and the contribution to defense—when we talk about the atomic plants and the great aircraft plants and then think of a project like that, and recall the ridicule that it was subjected to in its day, we can see how wrong they were.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. BLATNIK. I would be pleased to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am sure that they made no study of this area before that project was authorized and that they could not have gone so far as to have flown over it before they wrote this article on which they call themselves experts.

Mr. BLATNIK. I could mention at least one project out of all the 3,000 projects handled by our committee and the thousands which are handled by the gentleman's committee as well as other committees, but I am thinking of the Ohio Valley in order to show how different parts of the country were covered. Here is the report of a very authoritative magazine, the Television Broadcasters, entitled "Ohio River Links Vast Industrial Area."

I am not going into it all, except one key point:

> The Ohio River Valley, from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi owes much of its swift development since World War II—

You see, through the programs in flood control and navigation these improvements have come about. But listen to this:

> Within a decade $18 billion has been spent in the Ohio Valley on plants costing $1 million or more each by private-venture capital investment in industrialization because of the cheaper traffic, protection from floods, accessibility and availability of adequate supplies of waters.

These figures come from the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, these are their own figures—$18 billion, more than all we have spent on reclamation

and public works in the history of the country.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to the Mississippi River and the St. Anthony Falls lock which was mentioned. The river traffic on the upper Mississippi between St. Louis and on up toward Minneapolis increased 12 times in the last 20 years. Five hundred new plants were built along this river every year. We could go on and on with this.

Now, it is bad enough when this article in Life commits these errors of omission. Not one of these thousands of projects are referred to at all. At least, they could have said, "We wish the Congress would have approved more projects of this type. This is the type project we approve of; we ought to have more of this type project," and not these that in their opinion alone are a waste of the taxpayers' money. But, not one good project was referred to.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman could tell the Members of the House what is involved even in those projects listed in this article which I regard as very unfair in respect to the cost-benefit ratio that is required before a project can be approved?

Mr. BLATNIK. In everyone of them I can give the gentleman the details. I have them all here and they will be available for anyone who writes for them. In everyone of them the basic criteria used by the committees of Congress—that is, the authorizing committees, the Appropriations Committees, by the Bureau of the Budget and by the respective governmental agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and whatnot—is this: that the investment in dollars yield an economic return, spelled out in quite some detail. That for every dollar invested we should receive more than $1 of economic benefit in one form or another. These projects do. Some of them are close. Some of them may come to 1.1 to 1. Others may be 1.4 to 1. But they do meet the criteria.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield further, in any case, notwithstanding the priority given to the various projects, they were reviewed by all of the standing committees of the House and other groups that are required to pass on them, would the gentleman agree that these represent very important capital improvements in our country?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. As I say, they are only the start and at the moment their record may show nothing spectacular. But still in the best considered judgment of engineers and hydraulics experts, technicians on the economics of water utilization and the other different aspects of it, in their judgment they say in the long run there is no question in their mind but what economic benefits will be greater than the cost involved.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I notice here on page 25, I believe it is, the article referred to most of these public works projects which are included in the amount of some $3 billion-plus which are referred to and discussed in this article.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great heritages of our democracy is a powerful and free press; a heritage we take for granted like the air we breathe. Freedom of the press is grounded on the premise that the truth will emerge from free reporting and free discussion. But press freedom, Mr. Speaker, requires responsibility. Press freedom carries with it an obligation to inform; not to mislead, misrepresent or misinform.

These obligations, however, have been largely overlooked by the writers of the Life magazine article of August 16; an article which paints a biased, distorted and untruthful picture of many of our governmental programs for the development and utilization of natural and human resources.

To analyze and refute all of the misstatements and distortions contained in the Life article would take more time than I have this afternoon. But I would like to join my colleagues in examining some of those which pertain to one of these programs—the public employment service.

One of the worst distortions is the statement to the effect that the public employment service spends most of its funds "on people who are employed—to find them better jobs." It also states that "last year only 40 percent of the people USES placed were unemployed."

This, Mr. Speaker, is the same propaganda that the lobbyists for the private fee-charging agencies have been feeding to the public, the Congress, and the press for many months, but it is simply not true.

In fiscal year 1963, the public employment service made nearly 1 million job placements of youth, more than 275,000 job placements of handicapped workers, and 1.3 million nonfarm placements of workers age 45 and older.

Responsible officials of the public employment service, both National and State, have repeatedly declared over the years that only a small percentage of their placements have been of employed workers. These statements are given strong support by a survey made in May of this year; a survey which covered 22 States in which 75 percent of the total placements of the public employment service were made. This survey showed that unemployed persons were given decided preference and priority; that 97 percent of the placements were of unemployed workers.

It seems strange that an otherwise reputable magazine would not check the facts on what is so obviously a ridiculous and unfounded charge.

The article also states that "this agency managed on a $1 million budget in 1933 when it was trying to find work for some of the 12.8 million unemployed. It now spends $169 million a year."

This statement, unfortunately, overlooks two important factors, Mr. Speaker. First, in comparing the fiscal year 1933 budget with funds available for 1963, Life does not take into consideration the changes in population and labor force over a 30-year span, or the effects of technological change on the job needs of American workers and employers. It also disregards the increases in costs of such items as salaries, rents, equipment, and the many added responsibilities under new legislation.

Second, in fiscal year 1933, Federal funds were only provided for 20 offices of 1 or 2 persons, each primarily to route migratory farmworkers; 30 offices to serve veterans; and 100 small offices primarily in metropolitan areas. This was not a nationwide system and, it would clearly be totally inadequate, in both space and staff resources, to meet the urgent requirements of today.

In its 30 years of operation the 53 States and territorial employment services which make up the public employment service have made more than 321 million job placements. This includes not only placements, but related services such as aptitude testing, occupational counseling, and job guidance for millions of young people, older workers, handicapped, veterans, minority groups, and for workers displaced by automation and job obsolescence.

This clearly is an outstanding record of public service in a field which supports and needs both public and private efforts. It is a record, in brief, which does not warrant the unfounded attack which has been made.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] for his efforts in setting the record straight.

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California and I thank him for bringing to the House important facts and information in connection with this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], an able and distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with appropriations for the Department of Labor.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from California has very adequately stated the case of the U.S. Employment Service in regard to the article appearing in Life magazine. It seems to me the authors of the Life magazine article used questionable techniques in a broadside aimed at all Government programs in referring to them as pork barrel projects. There are examples of pork barrel in the expenditure of Federal funds; however, I feel the USES is not a good example.

The U.S. Employment Service was one of the operations used in error in the article. The gentleman from California very adequately pointed out some very pertinent information as far as the U.S. Employment Service and its operations under the Department of Labor are concerned.

I should like to point out further that in the Life article, appearing on page 21, line 11, there was a clear implication that the public funds that were spent by the U.S. Employment Service represented a "commitment to tap the U.S. Treasury."

The facts, of course, are that the moneys are not appropriated to the U.S. Employment Service from the revenues

of the General Treasury but are collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and set aside in an unemployment trust fund for administration by the unemployment insurance and Employment Service programs, and from this fund are appropriated by the Congress to the U.S. Employment Service activities in each of the 53 States and territories.

The implication is made in line 12 of the article on page 21 that the public funds used by the U.S. Employment Service are "for political advantage first and the public welfare second."

As a member of the subccmmittee that has worked closely with the U.S. Employment Service, I believe that the facts do not bear out this statement. The gentleman from California very adequately set forth the answer to this particular charge. I believe that this broadside levied against the U.S. Employment Service of the Department of Labor is not borne out by the facts of the case. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota and also the gentleman from California for calling this to the attention of the House.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I will include my remarks pertaining to the U.S. Employment Service at this point in the RECORD, to save time, so that I may yield to many others of my colleagues.

I was also struck by the broadside aimed at that agency.

First of all, Life infers that public funds spent by the U.S. Employment Service represent a "commitment to tap the U.S. Treasury." If the editors had taken the time to check the facts, they would have found that Employment Service funds are not appropriated from the General Treasury, but are collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. They are set aside in an unemployment trust fund, from which they are appropriated by Congress as the need arises for the unemployment insurance and employment-service programs.

Second, Life implies that funds spent for the U.S. Employment Service are "for political advantage first and public welfare second." I think the record of 321 million placements made by the Public Employment Service in its 30-year existence demonstrates beyond any doubt that the purpose of this agency is to serve the public welfare. This dedication to the national interest is proven not only by figures on placement, but also by such related services as aptitude testing, occupational counseling, and labor market information for millions of young people, older workers, handicapped, veterans, minority groups, and for workers displaced by automation and job obsolescence. These are the vital programs which, in reality, Life is attacking.

Third, Life tries the old trick of comparing the Employment Service budget of 1933 with the budget for 1963. The conclusions they reach in the article are absurd. The 1933 budget supported only 150 one-man or two-man offices—these were completely inadequate to service a national labor market. Life disregards the 30-year differential in population and labor force, and the growing need for a wider variety of labor market services as the economy becomes more complex and jobs are harder to find for those with no marketable skills.

I have received a copy of a telegram which Commissioner Starkey of the department of employment security in my home State of Minnesota has sent to the editors of Life magazine. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD following my statement. The commissioner explains very well the role of the Employment Service in today's economy. Among other things, he points out that if the Employment Service managed to place any individual even 1 day sooner than he would have got a job on his own, the increase in the gross national product would be enough not only to pay the cost of placement, but would return a very handsome profit to the economy as well. The same goes for Employment Service operations in the country as a whole. I hope my friends and colleagues in the House and Senate will take cognizance of this so that we can lay to rest once and for all these attacks on the public Employment Service.

My friends, someday Life might like to write a pork barrel story about itself: a story on how the Post Office Department goes about 4 cents in the hole for each magazine it sends through the mail. To make it quite simple, the taxpayers are putting about 4 cents per mailed copy into Life's pork barrel. And that is the truth, not fiction.

DATA BASED ON FISCAL 1962 OPERATIONS, ADJUSTED FOR MAXIMUM POSTAGE INCREASES AND EMPLOYEE PAY INCREASES AUTHORIZED OCTOBER 1962

SECOND-CLASS MAIL

Regular rate publications, outside county and transient:

Number of pieces: 4,689 million.

	Millions	Percent	Average per piece (cents)
Costs	[1] $310.5	100	6.6
Revenues	[1] 94.5	30	2.0
Deficiency	[1] 216.0	70	4.6

[1] Source: 1962 cost ascertainment report, p. 20, Post Office Department, Bureau of Finance, Aug. 14, 1963.

Estimate of Life magazine annual second-class mailings (51 by Oct. 1961 count):

Pieces 315,000,000
Percent of total above 6.7

(NOTE.—It is estimated that Life magazine's per piece cost is below and the per piece revenue is above the corresponding averages for the subclass as a whole.)

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 14, 1963.

Representative JOHN BLATNIK,
Washington, D.C.

(Copy of the following wire sent to George P. Hunt, managing editor, Life magazine, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.)

Your comments on the U.S. employment service in the list of "tasty items in the dish" of the "the steaming pork casserole" is a piece of not only unfair but inaccurate reporting.

If your reporters had taken the trouble to find out they would have discovered that to compare the Employment Service of 1933 when the first law (the Wagner-Peyser Act passed by Congress June 6, 1933) establishing a Federal-State system of public employment services was enacted with the present nationwide system of Federal-State employment offices in terms of the budget provided is not only absurd but extremely unfair. Anyone in his right mind by simple arithmetic can calculate the amount of job-finding help available to each of the 12.8 million unemployed by a $1 million budget less than 8 cents apiece.

The greatest growth of the Employment Service was largely the result of the requirement in all State unemployment insurance laws that claimants be registered for work in public employment service offices. This was and is certainly a reasonable requirement since the public employment service provides the best exchange possible for the return of unemployed claimants to gainful employment.

Your reports, if they had used a minimum amount of research, would have discovered that their figures indicating that only 40 percent of the peoples placed by the USES last year were unemployed, are the highly distorted figures submitted to Congress by a lobbying organization which is bent on reducing the effectiveness of the public employment services. Research conducted in Minnesota this year indicates that 12 percent of persons placed by the Public Employment Service were employed. This indicates that in Minnesota 88 percent of those placed were unemployed and this corresponds with studies made in other States. Our experience for fiscal year 1963 for direct personal services connected with placements was $393,678. We made 101,437 nonagricultural placementr. That averages out to $3.88 per placement. It is difficult to allocate precisely nonpersonal services between unemployment service activities and employment service. It is safe to say that total cost per placement was less than $30 each. If through our activities we were able to fill these positions 1 day sooner than would have been possible without our service, this cost would be approximately 50 percent of the first day's earnings.

This addition to purchasing power and gross national product by a reasonable calculation would result in a very handsome profit to the country as a whole.

The subsidies that the Government is making to business (including your own in the way of mail subsidies) is so large that we can make no comparison with the minimum amount of Government funds that find their way into helping unemployed people find employment. Don't overlook the fact that it is a saving to the employers to have a readily available source to keep their operations staffed. The only people who would profit by the curtailment of the employment service are the fee charging agencies who are waging a campaign before Congress to curtail public employment activities. The inclusion of the employment service in your tirade on Congress makes it appear that you are in league with them.

FRANK T. STARKEY,
Commissioner, Department of Employment Security.

In its issue of August 16, 1963, Life magazine, using the name-calling technique, aimed a broadside at many worthwhile Government programs under the general label of "pork barrel" projects. The U.S. Employment Service was one of the targets. The following is an analysis of some of the misstatements and inferences regarding the USES.

1. Life, page 21, line 11: Inference is made that public funds spent by the USES represent a "commitment to tap the U.S. Treasury."

Answer: "Monies are not appropriated from the funds in the general treasury, but are collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, set aside in the Unemployment Trust Fund for administration of the Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service programs and from this fund appropriated by the Congress."

2. Life, page 21, line 12: Inference is made that public funds spent for USES are "for political advantage first and the public welfare second."

Answer: "The record of 321 million placements in 30 years of its existence demonstrates the integrity of the public employment system which was established solely in the public interest to provide job market services. In terms of public welfare, these statistics represent not only placement but related services including aptitude testing, occupational counseling, and job guidance and referral for millions of young people, older workers, the handicapped, veterans, minority groups, and for workers displaced by automation and job obsolescence."

3. Life, page 25, first line under USES: "This agency managed on a $1 million budget in 1933 when it was trying to find work for some of the 12.8 million jobless. It now spends $169 million a year."

Answer: "This statement completely overlooks two factors—(1) In comparing the fiscal 1933 budget with funds available for 1963, Life does not take into consideration the differences in the population and labor force over a 30-year span, or the effects of technological change on the job needs of American workers and employers. It also disregards the increases in costs of such items as salaries, rents, and equipment, and the many added responsibilities under new legislation; (2) In fiscal 1933, the Federal funds were provided only for 20 one or two-man offices for migratory farm workers, 30 offices to serve veterans, and only 100 of that size offices primarily in metropolitan areas. This was not a nationwide system, and it was totally inadequate in both space and staff resources.

4. Life: "It now spends $169 million a year, most of it on people who are employed—to find them better jobs."

Answer: "While public employment service doors are open to all job seekers, the overwhelming majority of its applicants are the unemployed, since all unemployment insurance claimants must by law file applications for work. Moreover, youth searching for their first jobs constitute a significant portion of the unemployed, and they comprise nearly 25 percent of new job applicants at local employment offices. In fiscal year 1963, the public employment service made nearly one million job placements of youth, more than 275,000 job placements of handicapped workers, and 1.3 million nonfarm placements of workers age 45 and older.

In a survey—based on a national sample which included all of the large industrial States—conducted by the Bureau of Employment Security during the week beginning May 19, 1963, it was found that 97 percent of verified placements were placements of unemployed persons. However, under the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act, the public employment offices are required to provide placement service to all persons legally qualified to engage in gainful occupations.

5. Life: "To attract professional people, some State agencies build elaborate offices with free parking lots in downtown districts."

Answer: "Nationwide, there are only 10 separate local public employment offices devoted exclusively to placement of professional people. These offices are in downtown locations and most of them are modern businesslike facilities. Not a single one of them has a free parking lot. Some of our other local employment offices in downtown districts that provide across-the-board placement services do provide parking."

6. Life: "The unemployed laborer, once the main concern of the service."

Answer: "The unemployed, skilled or unskilled, have always been and still are the main concern of the public employment service. As for 'unemployed laborers' despite the downtrend in total unskilled job openings, the public employment offices found almost 2 million jobs for unskilled workers in fiscal year 1963."

The table below gives the occupational pattern of the placements:

NONFARM PLACEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES BY OCCUPATION—FISCAL YEAR 1963

By occupation:	
Professional and managerial	$247,500
Clerical and sales	1,058,600
Service	2,145,200
Skilled and semiskilled	1,245,500
Unskilled and other	1,935,500
Total	6,632,300

7. Life: "The unemployed laborers * * * once the main concern of the service, are directed to report to separate offices in the slums."

Answer: "In many metropolitan areas, public employment offices are organized on an industrial-occupational basis, each serving the whole community in specialized occupations and industries. For example, industrial or service offices are situated near the centers of need for such workers and their potential employers. Likewise, clerical and professional offices are located in business districts. This policy hardly merits the interpretation that unemployed laborers 'are directed to separate offices in the slums.'"

8. Life: "Last year only 40 percent of the people USES placed were unemployed."

Answer: "This completely false statement originated with the lobbyists of the private fee-charging agencies. Life did not bother to check its accuracy.

"Continued observations of placement operations over the years indicate that only a small percentage of those placed were employed workers. This was supported by the May 1963 survey which showed that only 3 percent of public employment service placements were of employed workers seeking better jobs, or seeking to make better use of their skills and abilities."

(Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., Aug. 16, 1963.)

I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by someone that you never mention rope in the house of a man who has been hanged. If I were the editors of Life, the last word I would want to mention would be the word "subsidy." For this magazine and others of its kind enjoy the most juicy piece of "pork" in the barrel. I am a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, and I want to mention some of the facts that deal with the mailing subsidy accorded this and other magazines.

Now the cold, hard fact of the matter is that in this year of our Lord, 1963, it will cost the Post Office Department $310 million to deliver second-class publications such as Life. The Department will get back in postage $95 million. In other words, they have a subsidy of $215 million. This pays about 31 percent of the cost this year of delivering these publications. The Luce publications, it is estimated, will this year receive a subsidy of something in the neighborhood of $20 million. While my 1963 figure is an estimate, I do have more exact figures from some studies made by the House Post Office Committee covering the year 1956. In that year a statement was sent to the stockholders of the Luce publications and in his annual report, Mr. Luce said:

> The level of earnings attained by Life has never been equalled by any other magazine in the history of publishing.

Luce went on to boast that this corporation had been able to show "a net profit of nearly $14 million."

Life paid a dividend that year of something like $7 per share on this $14 million profit. I must point out the sad fact that $12 million of that $14 million profit came as a subsidy from Uncle Sam, and I think it is with poor grace that this particular magazine comes out in this issue and attacks subsidies—which are really not subsidies at all—but which are rather programs which in large part have brought about the constructive development of the resources of this country.

If there are any taxpayers listening let me give you one final shocking fact, and some advice. If you are concerned about the costs of government—and if you are considering subscribing to Life, do not. It is my estimate that the loss to the Post Office Department and the taxpayers on each new Life subscription is $2 per year. This represents the difference between what Life pays the Department for making delivery of 52 issues, and what it costs the Department to deliver.

The editors of Life asked me last week for my comments on their article, and I responded in this fashion. I said I was more struck by Life's omissions than its disclosures. For example, I observed that Life failed to list any instances of State or local "pork barreling," leading one to the conclusion that the authors made their point rather by definition than revelation. In other words, they would have us believe that when the Federal Government builds a dam or a highway, it is "pork barreling," but when State and local government units do the same thing, it is sound, frugal, and prudent investment of the taxpayer's dollar.

However, I had to admit that this thesis suffers from Life's failure to include any Defense spending in its "pork barrel" concept, even though Defense contracts account for nearly two-thirds of all Federal spending. Evidently the authors would have us believe that the B–36s and B–50s we are scrapping for pots and pans, and the battleships we are melting down for razor blades, constituted wise spending, but the Interstate Highway System was a Federal boondoggle.

The omission which struck me as most startling, however, is the $215 million taxpayers of this country pay every year to deliver magazines like Life. In my letter to the editors I made the point which I want to make here today, and that is this: surely such a subsidy would have as much claim to the designation "pork barrel" as any program, project, expenditure or subsidy mentioned in the Life article.

Some wag suggested out in the hall a few moments ago that it might have been appropriate if the magazine had omitted the letter "F" from its title for this particular week's issue.

Finally let me touch on just one other aspect of the article.

One of the biggest attacks was made on the post office's program of building more post offices and particularly on leasing arrangements that the post office has made in recent years. As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am concerned about the accuracy of the statements in the article. It reminds me of a meeting I attended in Denver once where the guest speaker was introduced by a badly misinformed master of ceremonies. He said:

> Our speaker today is from Oklahoma. He is a big wheel in the cattle industry. I understand he is just up here on a big transaction that he has just closed in which he made $100,000.

The speaker got up and said:

> The introduction is only approximately correct. I am not from Oklahoma; I am from Texas. I am not in cattle; I am in oil. The deal was not for $100,000; it was $10,000. And I did not make it; I lost it. With those exceptions, the introduction of the master of ceremonies was entirely correct.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is about the way it is with this portion of this article I am going to discuss.

Last spring, before the Appropriations Committe of the House, the president of the Magazine Publishers Association gave his group's urgent endorsement to a 1958 $2 billion program which they called a crash modernization plan.

That $2 billion program which the Magazine Publishers Association has been consistently advocating in a drumfire of editorials and letters to President Kennedy and propaganda to Members of Congress consists of "only $1.5 billion to build 12,000 new post offices the country now needs—the other half billion to be used by the Department to equip the new post offices built by private investors." The publishers of Life magazine are among the most active and vocal members of the Magazine Publishers Association.

Yet, the current Life magazine, presumably directed in editorial policy by the same persons who have vigorously sought to sell this program to the Congress, says:

> Perhaps the oldest and most cherished of all—sources for slicing pork out of the Federal Treasury—is the Post Office Department * * * it may well be that success in scattering new post offices generously around a congressional district has kept more men in Congress longer than any other wrench in the political tool kit.

This amazing disparity between publisher's policy and editorial copy is typical of the gap between text and fact throughout the section of the article dealing with the Post Office Department building program and the participation both of the administration and Members of the Congress in same.

For example, the fictional version in Life describes the program this way:

> It seems fair to call it (post office construction) pork, except in cases where the post office is clearly necessary."

Here are the facts. In 1957 there were approximately 47,000 postal facilities in the United States. In the 17 years from 1940 through 1957 barely 900 of them had been replaced by newly constructed post offices. The last administration and this have, in toto, replaced 5,500 additional buildings since 1957 and the Department is still faced with a backlog of construction which would never be tolerated in private industry.

As an example: New York City, with the largest postal volume in the world and 40,000 employees, has not had a new major postal facility in 50 years.

Despite the fictional presentation in Life—that post offices are built to meet the whims and caprices of campaign politics—4,000 post offices were reviewed between September of 1961 and June 30, 1963, in instances where space and facilities were inadequate. Of those cases only 1,100 survived the scrutiny of space requirement and real estate technicians and the alternatives of modernization or other available space. Thus, slightly more than 25 percent of the eligible new post offices were authorized within tight budgetary limitations.

Since facts seldom support fiction, the authors naturally had strenuously to avoid the truth in scrambling for an example to support their case. They chose the campaign of Senator Kennedy to illustrate just how blatantly post office construction has been manipulated.

They pointed out, factually, that:

> Eight new post offices have been or are being constructed in Massachusetts.

They did not indicate, of course, that the space requirements for each of these offices had been developed many months—up to a year—prior to November 1962. And in the same consistently successful effort to sidestep any facts, they naturally neglected to question the need for any one of these offices.

Then to prove just how broadminded they were, they report that 14 other offices have been approved for construction since Senator Kennedy took office.

As a matter of fact, 23 projects have been approved in Massachusetts since November 1962. And in all but one instance, again, the space requirements were developed long before November 1962. In the vast majority of cases, as a matter of fact space requirements were developed more than a year before the last election in Massachusetts.

The implication that postal construction was somehow inequitably distributed to Massachusetts might, perhaps, have been less telling had the authors also reported on other comparable States. In the same period, look at new post offices in some other States—32 in New Jersey, 21 in Georgia and 32 in Indiana.

Then leaping effortlessly from Massachusetts to the State of Washington, the novelist who researched the postal section of the Life article gave what he describes as "a typical lease-building deal the Department is getting in Bellevue, Wash." In this deal, typical not of postal building, but rather of imagination unfettered by facts is the flat statement that the lessor is guaranteed "an annual 6-percent return on his land investment." There is no guarantee at all. The lessor was the lowest of 14 bidders. He signed a fixed-sum rent contract with utterly no guarantee except the payment of rent.

A "minor" error somehow crept into the article by describing the lease as a 30-year contract. In fact, the lease is for 20 years, substantially altering all aspects of the analysis of cost.

At one point, presumably by accident, an accurate figure is used—the population of Bellevue, Wash., is 13,000. But that post office like most of the new facilities built today, serves a much wider area—in fact, 41,000 people. Finally, this so-called typical case ignores the fact that the lessor is paying maintenance cost, all local taxes, and insurance. Were the building Government-owned, maintenance and insurance equivalent would be added to the cost of a federally owned building and it is a fair assumption that the people of Bellevue, Wash., prefer to receive taxes from the property rather than have a federally owned structure remove even the land from the local tax rolls.

In an article which points to local responsibility, expenditures of local funds and emphasis on local initiative in regard to other Federal projects, Life would, in its postal section, deny 54 local communities approximately $33 million.

Brushing off a factual analysis of cost differentials of $62 million "because of a disagreement on just how interest should be calculated," Life succeeds in putting itself firmly on the side of both local initiative and higher Federal costs—no mean trick even when you do forget what you set out to prove.

This inconsistency appears when Life reports that the GAO quotes the post office as "calculating the extra expenses through lease building at only $62 million" on 54 specific new post offices studied by the General Accounting Office. Space limitations, perhaps, made it impossible for Life's authors to note that of the alleged $62 million, more than half—$33 million—are going to the 54 local communities in the form of local taxes which, if not paid by the lessors of post offices, would have to be absorbed through higher taxes by the people in these communities. An additional $8 million is being paid by the lessors in insurance which the Federal Government would have to pay one way or the other were the buildings federally owned. And $5½ million more represents maintenance of the buildings by their owners—another expense which would be borne by the taxpayer directly were those buildings owned by the Government.

But this last $15.5 million completely evaporates unless it is assumed, as it was by both Life and GAO, that the cost of construction is the same whether the building is a Federal project or built by private enterprise. Given the cynicism on the cost of Federal projects exhibited by the authors in the forepart of the article, it is completely illogical that they would swallow such an assumption.

The average taxpayer should be pardoned for thinking that all post offices are long-term leases, since Life makes the flat statement:

> The post office binds itself to rent the buildings from 20 to 30 years with renewal options up to 50 years.

This statement, like most of the rest of the material used, is almost unbelievably misleading. Ninety percent of all the leases are for 10 years or less—certainly a new approach to statistical analysis is born here when 10 percent of the whole is labeled "typical."

Postal operations are hamstrung by inadequate and obsolete facilities in thousands of cities and towns across the country. Mailers, postal employees, and local community leaders constantly attest to the need for new buildings to match business and industrial growth.

It seems a shame, really, for Life magazine, certainly one of the biggest bargain users of this system, to lead a scatter-shot attack on a soundly based program which its publishers are simultaneously demanding be accelerated.

Remarkably similar to building programs used by major private corporations to provide adequate physical plant, the Post Office Department's lease construction program attracts private capital which otherwise would have to come from the Federal Treasury.

It is unfortunate that Life's article was in conformance neither with the facts nor the policy of their own industry.

I wanted to say that we do have a great need for new post offices. This is adding every year enough additional people to equal a city the size of Philadelphia. We need more roads, more schools, and more post offices. We can either do nothing or take action to provide post offices for these people. If we act, and I feel we must, there are two ways to go about it. One is for the Government to build these post offices. We would need a tremendous program of post office construction. The second way to do it would be to have an intelligent, reasonable leasing program. This is what the Department has worked out, under both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. We have taken the lease road because Congress, with the big budgets it is faced with, has been unwilling to provide the money for a crash program of post office construction. This program has been carefully calculated and I think has been well administered. You can make a good argument for having the Government construct the post offices itself, but in view of the fact that this is not a realistic option, the Post Office has done the very best it can.

As one who has studied closely the workings of our fine Postal Establishment I am particularly aggrieved at the misleading and erroneous charges leveled at the U.S. Post Office Department, which is one of the world's largest and most efficient business operations.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his, as always, very penetrating and effective presentation.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Public Works Committee and a very effective one.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished chairman at this time for correcting a very distorted report relative to public works and other functions of our Government.

I want to commend particularly the gentleman on his coverage of the very important Gulf Intracoastal Canal, which I think is a typical example of the workings of the benefit-cost ratio as a formula determining the merits of public works programs. I do not think there is any question but that the real way and the best way to examine the efficacy of the public works programs is to look at projects that are actually in operation. I for one was considerably impressed by the lack of treatment in this particular article of projects that have been underway, projects that have been completed for many years. I can only conclude, in view of the viciousness of this article, that the reason why those projects were ignored was that they would not bear out the vicious tenor of the article. We can best contribute here, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, by speaking briefly about projects with which we are personally familiar. I happen to represent the 14th Congressional District in south Texas. There is a fine port at Corpus Christi in Texas. That port, Mr. Speaker, was inaugurated in 1926. From that time until the present time it has been estimated that that port averaged the location of one major industrial plant in the general Corpus Christi area each year since 1926. That port has generated much additional new business in bolstering the economy of that area, which amounts to many, many fold the sums spent on its generation. I do not think there is any question, considering the level of Federal taxes that comes out of business these days, that the port of Corpus Christi paid for itself in hard-earned Federal taxes many times over since it was originally inaugurated back in 1926, just as has the Intracoastal Canal.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to me, and I know it is the same to you, public works projects are an expression of the confidence that the American people have in themselves and in their future. They are investments in the future of this country.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement.

I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works, such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONSON] in overruling the implication of the Life magazine article issue, of August 16, 1963, entitled "Pork Barrel Swells."

According to the foreword, this article is the work of five men, three of whom spent 2 months of travel and research reporting, the fourth put their findings into final form, and the fifth took the photographs. The article covers an extremely wide field and includes rivers and harbors, flood control, irrigation and, generally speaking, the entire civil works operations of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. It also includes the post office building program, the activities of the Small Business Administration, and the work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It is difficult to believe that three investigators in one editorial review can in 2 months cover more than the barest fraction of this tremendous program. Books have been written on one aspect alone of one of the programs. In general, the article must be considered as extremely superficial, extremely one-sided and in many ways distorted. In some respects the distortion is so great as to constitute a major fallacy. Even with respect to the comments on the civil works projects of the Corps of Engineers which are covered in this analysis the article is superficial. There is very little reference made, and then only indirectly and in passing, that there might be some merit in some projects. Finally the projects and programs which are commented upon are the result of the work of literally hundreds of engineers, economists and other technically trained experts; they have been reviewed again and again at all levels of government as well as the States and other local interests. In the great majority of cases they have received approval of the Bureau of the Budget acting for the President which has been noted as a conservative body. They have been approved by the legislative committees of the Congress and funds have been made available through the Appropriations Committees. There is no known activity in the world on the part of any government which is subject to the intense scrutiny, to the multiple review and to the countless checks and balances than the civil works program.

The article uses the term "pork barrel" in its caption and throughout its context. This term first appeared in the 1880's and was a result of criticism leveled at so-called unworthy projects which were claimed to have been selected through a logrolling process where the Members of Congress would support each other's projects regardless of the merits in turn for their colleagues' support of their own. Whether this criticism is true or not is not the point at issue here. Subsequent to that time legislation and administrative procedures have grown up over a period of some 60 years designed to prevent the construction of unworthy projects. One of the first steps in this direction was the creation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, an arm of the Corps of Engineers, to review objectively, subject to no influence from anyone, all reports of the corps made by its field offices. This is not an autonomous body and is composed of senior officers of the corps who have had wide experience in civil works. They are usually division engineers, which means that they are in charge of several districts each covering a considerable portion of the country. In addition to the staff of each division engineer there is a well-trained and highly competent civilian staff stationed in Washington whose only function is to review the various reports submitted from various parts of the country and to present the

facts to the Board in its monthly meeting. The Board is quasi-judicial in nature and generally conservative in makeup. It is common knowledge that any report which runs the gauntlet of the Board of Engineers must per se have unquestioned merit.

In addition to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors the reports for the Corps of Engineers have many other gauntlets to run before they finally result in authorized and constructed projects. It would take too long to describe each of the 18 steps which must be taken, but I would like to insert at this point a list of these steps from the original conception of a project to its eventual accomplishment.

Also at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from California on the responsibilities of the press and also to insert this procedure involving the conception, authorization, and ultimate construction of Corps of Engineers rivers and harbors and flood control projects which in detail list the 18 steps from the beginning to the realization of the public works project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

PROCEDURE INVOLVING THE CONCEPTION, AUTHORIZATION, AND ULTIMATE CONSTRUCTION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS' RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

STEP NO. 1: INITIATION OF ACTION BY LOCAL INTERESTS

Local citizens who desire navigation, flood control, or related water resource improvements should contact their Senators and Representatives with a request that provision of the desired facilities be considered by the Federal Government. Local interests may also request advice of representatives of the Corps of Engineers, who will furnish pertinent available information and advise them of the appropriate further procedures.

STEP NO. 2: CONSULTATION BY SENATOR OR REPRESENTATIVE WITH PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Either one of two courses of action may be taken by a Senator or Representative in securing authorization of an investigation. If a previous report on navigation, flood control, or allied purposes has been made for the area in question, the Senator or Representative may request the Senate or House Committee on Public Works to adopt a resolution authorizing a review of previous reports to determine whether any modifications of the Chief of Engineers' recommendations in such reports would be advisable, as contemplated by section 4 of River and Harbor Act approved March 4, 1913. If no previous report has been made, the Senator or Representative may request the committee to include authorization for a survey in either an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill or a separate bill.

STEP NO. 3: ACTION BY THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

If the committee is convinced of the need for a review report, an appropriate resolution calling upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to make the review will be adopted by the committee and referred to the Chief of Engineers for necessary action. However, if a previous report involves the project for the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River and tributaries, the resolution will call for a review of that report by the Chief of Engineers rather than by the board. If the committee is convinced of the need for an original report, the authorization for an investigation will be included in either an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill or a separate bill for consideration by Congress. Each committee may request advice of the Chief of Engineers on the desirability of authorizing such study.

STEP NO. 4: ASSIGNMENT OF INVESTIGATION BY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Whether an investigation is requested of the Chief of Engineers by committee resolution or by authority of an act of Congress, the Chief of Engineers will assign the investigation to an appropriate reporting officer, usually the division engineer in whose territory the area is located. Division engineers may further assign the investigation to the proper district engineer. However, before work can be undertaken on an investigation, funds for that purpose must be appropriated by the Congress.

STEP NO. 5: PUBLIC HEARINGS BY DIVISION OR DISTRICT ENGINEER

The division or district engineer, in order to ascertain the views and desires of local people, will hold public hearings as appropriate at localities accessible to all concerned. Local interests will be afforded full opportunity to express their views on the character and extent of the improvement desired and on the need and advisability of its execution. A hearing in connection with cooperative beach erosion studies will be optional with the reporting offices and the cooperating agency.

STEP NO. 6: INVESTIGATION BY DIVISION OR DISTRICT ENGINEER

The division or district engineer after carefully analyzing the data obtained from local interests and developed through field and office studies, will devise a plan of improvement best suited for problems under consideration and the area in question. During development of the plan of improvement, consideration will be given to optimum use of all water resources of the area by providing allied improvements. A favorable recommendation will depend on whether the benefits to be derived through the plan of improvement exceed the costs to be incurred.

STEP NO. 7: REVIEW BY DIVISION ENGINEER AND ISSUANCE OF PUBLIC NOTICE

Upon completion of the report by the district engineer, the division engineer having jurisdiction will review the report and transmit it to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. At that time he will issue a public notice to all parties known to be interested in the investigation, setting forth the findings of the district and division engineers and their recommendations for improvement, and informing those concerned that they may furnish their views to the Board.

STEP NO. 8: REVIEW AND HEARINGS BY ENGINEER BOARDS

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, an independent body with separate staff in Washington, D.C., is required by law to review all survey and review reports except beach erosion reports. The Beach Erosion Board, also an independent body and staff in Washington, D.C., is the review board for beach erosion studies. These Boards may hold public hearings before making recommendations to the Chief of Engineers.

STEP NO. 9: PREPARATION OF PROPOSED REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS AND REVIEW THEREOF BY THE AFFECTED STATES AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

When the Board concerned completes its review of the report and transmits its recommendation to the Chief of Engineers, the latter will prepare his proposed report and will refer it, with the Board's report, to the Governors of the affected States and to other interested Federal agencies in order to obtain their views and recommendations on the improvements discussed in the report. The Federal agencies involved may include the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the Federal Power Commission; and interested branches of the Department of Defense. The States and the other Federal agencies normally will be expected to forward their comments on the proposed report to the Chief of Engineers within 90 days.

STEP NO. 10: TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT TO BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

After the Chief of Engineers receives the comments of the Governors of the affected States and those of other interested Federal agencies, the Secretary of the Army will submit a draft of his letter of transmission to Congress, with the report of the Chief of Engineers and all pertinent papers, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for a determination of the relationship of the report to the program of the President.

STEP NO. 11: TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT TO CONGRESS

Upon receipt of the comments of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chief of Engineers will submit his report, together with all allied papers and comments, to the Secretary of the Army, who will transmit it to Congress. This step will complete the action required of the Chief of Engineers and the Department of the Army insofar as compliance with the congressional resolution or act authorizing the investigation is concerned.

STEP NO. 12: PROJECT AUTHORIZATION BY CONGRESS

After the report is forwarded to Congress by the Secretary of the Army, the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House may hold hearings on the report with a view toward formulating a bill including authorization of projects recommended in the report. The report may be ordered to be printed by a committee and then is known as the project document. Authorization for construction of projects will usually be included in omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills.

STEP NO. 13: ASSURANCES OF LOCAL COOPERATION

When scheduling of planning and construction of an authorized project is considered, the district engineer notifies responsible local interests that they will be required to furnish formal assurances that they will provide the authorized measures of local cooperation. If assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army are not furnished projects generally are placed on the inactive list. In the specific case of local flood control projects, projects are deauthorized as provided by law if the assurances are not provided within 5 years after the request is made.

STEP NO. 14: REQUEST FOR PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

In order for the Corps of Engineers to construct a project authorized in an omnibus bill, funds must be requested from Congress. All requests for planning and construction funds will be reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget, and, if found to conform with the President's budgetary policies, will be transmitted to the House Committee on Appropriations for consideration.

STEP NO. 15: APPROPRIATION OF PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Upon completion of hearings by the Appropriation Committees considering the Department of the Army Civil Works Appropriations, a bill will be reported out of committee and referred to the full Congress for

passage. The enactment will then go to the President for signature. Authority and funds will be thereby given to the Chief of Engineers to initiate detailed planning and construction of the projects referred to in that bill.

STEP NO. 16: PREPARATION OF PLANS

Before construction of the project can be started, detailed plans, specifications, and cost estimates will be prepared by the district engineer, with such assistance and review by the division engineer and the Chief of Engineers as are necessary. At this time, the formal assurances of local cooperation required by law, of which local interests were notified in step 13, must be provided by local interests and approved by the Secretary of the Army.

STEP NO. 17: INVITATION TO BID

Upon completion of plans and specifications, prospective bidders will be invited to bid on constructing the proposed improvements. Upon determination of the eligible low bidder, a contract will be awarded to him for construction of the project in accordance with those plans and specifications, or, if satisfactory bids are not secured, Government construction with hired labor may be undertaken as provided by law.

STEP NO. 18: INITIATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECT

After award of the contract, the successful bidder will mobilize his plant, equipment, and personnel, and start construction.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a Member who has served for years on the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad Mr. BLATNIK has taken the time to answer Life magazine who receives such a large U.S. subsidy. The article implies that the Members of Congress are interested only in those projects which affect their own districts. Nothing could be further from the truth. Those dedicated to the development of our Nation's water resources are concerned with the optimum development of river basins throughout the entire United States. It is natural, of course, that a Member will devote special attention to a project which lies in his congressional district. But it should be noted that the leadership in this field have been famous for their general knowledge of the water problems throughout the United States and for their energetic devotion toward their solution. A reading of the hearings before the legislative committees and the Appropriations Committees that the members of these committees have asked penetrating questions and shown great interest in projects far removed from their district.

In addition to the attention given by the appropriate committees and by the Congress itself to the problem of developing the Nation's water resources the agencies involved in this field have made every effort to meet on common ground and to reconcile any differences which might have arisen in the treatment of these problems because of differences of administrative practices. An Interagency Committee was created about 1940 consisting of the three principal constructing agencies in the field of water resources; the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Soil Conservation Service. This was expanded several times in the fields that followed to bring in other agencies interested in this field such as the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and others. Various subcommittees were formed to permit all the agencies to share in the specialized work of each. One of the most difficult problems in the field of project formulation and evaluation is that of economics. A subcommittee was formed called the Benefits and Costs Subcommittee with a staff composed of representatives of the various agencies involved which met regularly once a week for a period of 5 years to thrash out problems of mutual interest in the analyses of projects. The members of the staff and of the subcommittee were highly trained specialists in the field and have devoted many years, most of them working up from the grassroots. The subcommittee finally prepared a pamphlet commonly known as the "Green Book" and officially entitled "Practices for Economic Analyses of River Basin Projects." This in effect consolidated the practices of the various agencies which up until that time had differed in some important respects. The principles laid down in this treatise were later embodied in official orders issued by the President through the Bureau of the Budget in setting up a standard which would be correct technically and would meet all the criteria necessary for the development of sound river basin planning.

The "Green Book" is not easy reading because the subjects it covers are extremely complex and require a great deal of background and knowledge. It is possible that the writers of the Life magazine article might well have spent the 2 months in comprehending the basic principles underlying this volume and similar publications bearing on the subject before they had attempted to investigate individual projects. It is noted that the article contains no figures except a listing of the costs of some of the projects discussed. There is no listing of benefit cost ratios which is the accepted means of measuring economic worth of the project. There is no analysis or statement of the amount of traffic to be carried and the savings estimated from the various navigation projects referred to in the article. Perhaps the most noticeable thing about the article is the lack of substantiating information in the use of broad generalities and practices. The use of a picture of a navigation channel to prove that it lacks merit is certainly unfair. Equally noticeable is a lack of reference to the thousands of projects which are accepted as being meritorious and which have proved their value over the years.

This article is not isolated in its indictment of the Congress. I believe in criticism—where it is constructive and serves a purpose, but where a communication media uses a distorted article which reflects upon the judgment and integrity of the House, I think it serves as a disservice to the Members of Congress and the American people, who have a right to press reporting without distortion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for taking this time today in order to answer the unfounded charges contained in the so-called "pork barrel" article which appeared in Life magazine last week. I was greatly surprised when I read this article. I could not understand why the article was written. The article is obviously misleading. The readers of Life will get a very distorted impression of our reclamation and flood control programs. The conclusions drawn by the writers of this article are not based on facts.

I received a letter last week from Mr. Morton B. White, assistant to the publisher of Life, in which he requested that I comment on the article, which I did. I inserted a copy of my letter in the remarks I made on the floor last Thursday, August 1, when I answered the charges made against the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

I now wish to make some additional observations, and I shall confine my remarks to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project because this is the project with which I am most familiar.

I was happy to sponsor this project from its inception. When I read the reference in the Life article to this project, I immediately recognized the article contained some very glaring misstatements, which I called to the attention of Mr. White in my letter. I did not check the entire article for similar misstatements on the other projects, but I suspect some of the same inconsistencies and inaccuracies will be found in the history and description of all of the projects mentioned in the article.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for us to make any defense today of the irrigation and reclamation, or the flood control programs in this country. These programs have received the closest scrutiny of Congress over the years. I feel that both of these programs have contributed a great deal to the growth and development of our Nation. They do not deserve the characterization given them in this article.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], has been most zealous and diligent, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, in sponsoring and supporting projects for the development of our natural resources, and flood protection. These projects are authorized by Congress only after prolonged hearings by subcommittees, and then reviewed by the full committees. It is a long and tedious process for a project to obtain authorization. After the project is authorized appropriations must be obtained, at which time the merits of the project are again reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, we in the West realize and appreciate the importance of our irrigation and reclamation program. We know what it has meant to so many arid areas in the West, which are now prosperous agricultural communities due to

these reclamation propects authorized by Congress over the years.

I call attention today to one of these projects, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which has been completed for several years and is now in operation in northern Colorado. This project is located in the districts represented by my colleagues from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL and Mr. BROTZMAN]. This is a very similar project to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project mentioned in the Life article. Water is brought from the western slope to the eastern slope of Colorado and made available to the farmers in the northern part of our State.

Colorado has been suffering this year from a prolonged drought, probably one of the most severe droughts in the history of our State. Except for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and the irrigation water it is making available, the farmers in a very rich agricultural area in northern Colorado would have suffered large crop losses this year. It is most fortunate for them that this project is in operation. The water stored by the project is also available for municipal use by the towns and cities in the conservancy district, which was formed to repay the cost of the project.

That is just one example of what a reclamation project means to our people in the West and I could name many more. Water is the lifeblood of any area. No community can grow and prosper without an adequate supply of water.

I mentioned in my letter to the publisher last week the importance of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project to my disdrict, and that it would bring the same benefits to southern Colorado that other reclamation projects have brought to their respective areas. I also commented on the fact that reclamation projects pay for themselves and are not handouts. All of the construction money is repaid to the Federal Government, with certain exceptions. These projects benefit not only the immediate areas they serve, but the entire Nation. They are not handouts, but a good investment for the American taxpayer.

This is why I have given the irrigation and reclamation and flood control programs, my full support since I have been a Member of Congress. This will continue to be my policy as long as I remain a Member of this House. I feel very strongly that these programs are essential to the economy of our country. I protest against the charges made in the Life magazine article that these are pork barrel projects.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter Mr. J. Selby Young, president, board of directors, southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, Pueblo, Colo., addressed to Mr. George P. Hunt, managing editor, Life magazine, in which he comments on this article as it relates to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. I wish to state that this conservancy district was organized under the laws of Colorado and is the sponsor of this project. I ask unanimous consent to include this letter in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

SOUTHEASTERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Pueblo, Colo., August 16, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE P. HUNT,
Managing Editor, Life Magazine, Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned district is the corporate entity under Colorado statutes that represents all property owners to be served by the Fryingpan-Arkansas Transmountain Water Diversion project, including the cities of Pueblo, Colorado Springs, and other towns within an area embracing 280,000 acres of already irrigated and cultivated land in the Arkansas Valley of Colorado. Population of the district is approximately 360,000. The district, by order of its board of directors, vigorously protests the incredible, unfair and biased smear label the Life magazine article of August 16 places on the Fryingpan project without presentation of the true facts. It protests also inclusion of the Upper Colorado River storage project in the same category.

The $170 million Fryingpan project will repay $150 million to the Federal Government, plus interest at a rate which reflects the cost to the taxpayer over a 50-year period. The balance is charged principally to general flood control under established national policies.

In addition to the revenues derived from the sale of water to farmers and municipalities and the production of electric power by reason of water falling over a course beginning at 10,000 feet and ending at 4,800 feet altitude, the taxpayers of the district will also pay a tax on all property included within the district as part of the repayment contract with the Federal Government.

The project not only involves the diversion of 69,200 acre-feet annually from the Colorado River Watershed to the Arkansas River in Colorado, but it also provides reregulation of native waters of the Arkansas River to more efficiently utilize water resources which are becoming of greater value and concern to the entire Nation.

The new water will constitute a supplemental supply to already irrigated farmlands and will not bring any new land under irrigation and cultivation. It will be used to firm up an already established farming economy. The farmers and municipalities will pay for the water they use to the Federal Government under the repayment contract.

The project will not increase crop surpluses in the categories of surplus crop price supports as stipulated under Federal law. It will permit farmers who have invested their money in seed, fertilizer and labor in the spring to have a reliable water supply in August which is sufficient to finish their crops and prevent economic loss to the agricultural economy of southeastern Colorado.

In behalf of the Upper Colorado River Storage project, it should be noted that 72 percent of the water of the Colorado River rises in the Colorado mountains and that the dams and reservoirs being currently constructed and planned for future construction follow the same criteria as those used for the construction of Hoover dam under the Boulder Canyon Act, and the highly successful Colorado-Big Thompson project of 25 years ago and such other projects as Grand Coulee in Northwestern United States.

Harnessing water for beneficial use is an economic investment which will return to the economy of the United States many times the funds invested by the Government with the greatest part of the investment repaid, plus interest to the Treasury.

Colorado does not have one million acres of alfalfa in the soil bank since alfalfa, to the extent needed for local feeding operations, is grown on irrigated land, not on the arid plains. A small portion of grazing lands and dry farming wheatlands in the nonirrigated areas have been put into the soil bank, but not irrigated lands in the said district, which produce crops, not subsidized by price supports by the Federal Government.

The district officials were not contacted by your reporters, nor requested to furnish any information.

We must assume you were not interested in the true facts, but only desired to include, unjustifiably, some projects administered through the Bureau of Reclamation which has constructed many beneficial projects throughout its 60 year history. Such project costs are being repaid to the Federal Government with extremely few defaults or failures.

Even your geography of the project is garbled when it states on page 56 under the Twin Lakes picture: "Out of this pair of neighborly Colorado lakes in the Rockies, water that now flows west will flow east." Twin Lakes are on the east side of the Continental Divide. Water from the west side will flow through the tunnel into Sugarloaf Reservoir, and then into Twin Lakes.

The Fryingpan project is a sound investment in a better America and designed to meet the needs of an established economy but, more important, it will provide for the needs and welfare of future generations.

Sincerely yours,

J. SELBY YOUNG,
President, Board of Directors, Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota and to join with him and other Members of the House in replying to the deceptive and dishonest article published in the August 16 issue of Life magazine. I wish Life readers would have the opportunity to hear the other side, that is being presented here today.

The Life article gives further evidence of the real purpose of the Luce interests in trying to confuse the American people and to create suspicion and distrust of representative government.

It is a slick magazine with lots of fancy trimmings to cover its real objective in pressing for its own selfish interests and those of associated wealthy monopolies whose objectives so often are in conflict with the common good and with the public welfare.

The Life article on "pork" is an example of crass hypocrisy. If programs for river development, water conservation, veterans benefits, and various public works projects can be described as "pork," then surely postal subsidies should be included.

I can think of no group or any special interests which benefits more from so-called Government handouts and giveaways than the Luce publications. They try to hide their grab by giving their readers the silent treatment on programs from which they benefit.

From my own personal experience, I know how they try to browbeat Representatives and malign and punish those who dare to speak out against their unwarranted postal subsidies.

Dishonest practices by this monopoly pollute and corrupt the important bloodstream of news and information in our

country which is so vital to our free and democratic society.

The recent attack on Congress by the Luce interests is only one of many such articles which reflect intellectual dishonesty that has contributed substantially to the confusion and difficulties in meeting the serious problems which confront our Nation in these troubled and dangerous times.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include excerpts from remarks I made to the House in reply to a previous attack on Congress in a Life magazine article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POSTAL SUBSIDIES AND THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

(Excerpts of remarks by Representative GEORGE M. RHODES in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1960)

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a full-page ad published recently in the Wall Street Journal and many other newspapers throughout the Nation, in which Life magazine asked, "What Shall We Do With Our Greatness?" This define-our-national-purpose campaign by Life needs at least these points included in the definition. Just how can we define the national purpose when the full facts are not known to the American people? How can Life piously call for a national debate on the objectives of American society when it is part of a campaign to confuse and mislead the American people? Distortion, slanting, and rigging are all part of the Life approach to reporting news and information. Has not the Luce monopoly studied democracy sufficiently to learn that the most essential element of a vibrant democratic people is that they are well informed on the issues? By pushing and squeezing and stuffing the issues into the predetermined Time-Life frame of reference, they make a mockery of a "crusade to define our national purpose."

"The sanctimonious Mr. Luce, publisher of Time and Life, most especially is guilty of hypocrisy. He is a man much given to declarations of patriotism: his publications parade him as godlike; he is clamorous in defense of the free press. Yet, his magazines are masterpieces of bias."

Like some of my colleagues, I have been the victim of a stab by Life and Time. For over a year I have been followed by character assassins and have now felt the Luce stab in the back, because I have dared to call public attention to their big and unwarranted postal subsidies.

The excuse for the recent Life smear was a $33.75 purchase I made on my stationery account in 1958—a purchase with funds that every Member knows were my own. The real reason, however, for the Life smear, is because I did not yield to the influence and pressure to abandon my efforts in curtailing the Luce postal subsidy and Federal aid which cost American taxpayers a million dollars a month. I knew what to expect after a visit last July, from a representative of Time, Inc., and Mr. Francis Cawley, lobbyist for the Magazine Publishers' Association.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 17, I addressed the House to explain the reason for what was back of this smear attack by the publishers of Life and Time magazines.

I gave the real reason for this smear; namely, the fact that I have repeatedly fought to place a dollar ceiling on postal subsidies paid to magazine publishers—the largest of which go to Time, Inc., publishers of Life and Time magazines and four other nationally circulated publications.

I was not surprised at the news blackout on my remarks, nor was I surprised at the silent treatment given to the excellent speech last Thursday by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. On last Thursday Mr. HARRIS gave evidence that clearly shows that the attack by the Luce and Knight news monopolies was for no other purpose than to smear and punish Members of Congress who have been investigating unethical and corrupt practices in the important field of communications, or, as in my case, for calling public attention to the big unwarranted Federal handout in postal subsidies. It is an attempt to browbeat Congress to prevent the probers from reaching and exposing the growing monopoly and corrupt practices, of which the Luce and Knight interests are guilty, and to purge from Congress those who do not yield to their power and corrupting influence.

What is more unethical, I ask, and what is more dishonest and more corrupt than to fake a picture such as was used to discredit a respected and honorable Member of this House as we all know OREN HARRIS to be? This is but one of many such corrupt practices.

The publishers of Time and Life, and of the Knight chain of newspapers, are insincere and dishonest in pretending to crusade for disclosures of information on the expense spending by Members of Congress.

I would not object if that were the real intent, but when the objective of these publishers is to dominate Congress and gain selfish advantages for themselves, I say that we fail in our responsibility when we ignore such unscrupulous and dishonest tactics.

I strongly favor publicizing expense spending by Members of Congress and full disclosure of all information. But this is not what these publishers really seek, for when it comes to really withholding or suppressing vital news and information, it is these same publishers who are most guilty.

They tend to have one standard when they measure the performance of officials and public figures, and another standard when it comes to measuring their own performance, or to put it another way, they hold other institutions up to searching scrutiny, but are unwilling to have the same scrutiny applied to themselves.

The best example of this is the complete blackout of news and information in regard to the million-dollar-a-month postal subsidy which goes to the Luce publications. On this question, they try desperately to keep their readers in the dark. Their reprisal technique is swift. Anyone who calls public attention to their unwarranted subsidy, as I have done, will naturally be marked for reprisal by the beneficiaries of this big Federal handout.

Because of suppression of these facts by the news monopoly few people know that so many of their tax dollars are going to the Luce empire. Very few people know that this subsidy to Life, Time, and other Luce publications amounts to more, much more, than the combined salaries of 437 Members of the House of Representatives, including the cost of their living expenses in Washington, and the total cost of all stationery allowances for 437 Congressmen.

If Congress has been lax on checking expense accounts of its own Members, it has been far more lax in permitting such unwarranted and costly subsidies, without proper scrutiny.

Since Luce interests are receiving millions of dollars annually in tax dollars, why should they not report how this money is being spent?

Would it be unreasonable to ask these Luce officials to inform the public on the amount of the salaries and pensions these executives take for themselves, and which American taxpayers through these subsidies help to pay? Why should the taxpayers not know how much is spent for junketing by executives of Time, Inc., and for liquor, yachts, and entertainment, and such other big spending, particularly when a good portion of the bill is paid by American taxpayers.

The hypocrisy of the Luce empire is obvious. They have opposed Federal aid for needed public services and legislation to help the average citizen. Yet this monopoly is the Nation's largest beneficiary of Federal aid, Government handouts, and welfare stateism.

Luce publications have been the most severe critics of farm subsidies. Yet postal deficits over a 10-year period have exceeded the total cost of all farm price-support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation for the last 25 years.

The House Committee on Appropriations published in the hearings on the agricultural appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1959 a table setting forth certain Federal expenditures in recent years for business aids and special services. This showed that mail subsidies, of which Life and Time get a lion's share, in a 10-year period, 1946–56, amounted to $5,968 million.

The CCC farm price-support losses from the beginning of the program in 1933 to January 1, 1958, amounted to $5,173,746,788—House Committee on Agriculture report to 85th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent estimates of postal subsidies for Life magazine by the Post Office Department were based on the first three issues in March 1956. They revealed that Life paid revenue of $7,485,000 for the year, while it cost the Department $16,979,000 to deliver the 249,600,000 copies of Life to its mail subscribers. Thus the annual subsidy during that year to Time, Inc., for just one of its six magazines was $9,494,000. As I have said in the past, actual postal subsidies to Luce publications undoubtedly total well over $1 million a month, if subsidy payments for other Luce magazines are included.

Spokesmen for the magazine publishers' lobby try to explain away their multimillion-dollar annual subsidy at taxpayers' expense, by claiming that the Department's subsidy estimates are unrealistic and inaccurate. Often by its own statements, the Department seems anxious to avoid relying on its own figures. It is claimed that these subsidy estimates are not based on actual traffic studies of each individual publication. However, a previous detailed study by the Department several years ago of the traffic pattern and costs of performing each of the many services in handling and delivering Reader's Digest produced a subsidy figure which was almost identical to the Department's estimated subsidy for this magazine.

Moreover, one publisher whose magazine paid $3.4 million in postage and received an estimated subsidy of $6 million told a congressional committee that my amendment to limit postal subsidies to $100,000 a year would cost his company $11 million—an unintentional admission that the Department's estimates were several million dollars on the conservative side.

The large gains in circulation of Life and other magazines since the 1956 subsidy estimates make these subsidy figures far less than they are today. The million dollars a month to Life magazine is a most conservative estimate.

Let me make it clear that it is not my purpose to eliminate these subsidies. But I do think there should be some limitation. And most of all I believe we should expect a higher standard of ethics and responsibility from those who are the Nation's biggest beneficiaries of Federal aid and subsidies. Taxpayers should not be forced to pay such a heavy tribute for being deceived and misled.

The subsidy limitation bill I introduced this year offers a gradual approach to this problem and sets the limitation for the first year at $5 million.

I believe, too, that consideration should be given to limiting the spending for salaries, pensions, and junketing by corporate officials who benefit so handsomely from big postal subsidies.

My constituents are not very happy in being taxed to help pay salaries of $50,000, $100,000, and $200,000 a year and fabulous pensions for beneficiaries of these subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, one of my purposes in asking for this time is to call public attention to the dangerous drift in this country toward a monopoly and totalitarian press and its threat to our basic freedoms. It would be unfair to place the blame for this on one person or even a group of persons. All of us are to blame, particularly we in the Congress, for not taking adequate steps to cope with this growing evil.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the subsidy for the Luce publications continues to grow. A most conservative estimate by the gentleman from California, Representative JOHN MOSS, is $12 or $14 million a year, while other estimates by experts on postal matters are as high as $20 million in pork annually for the Luce magazine monopoly.

Compare this with the cost of franked mail so often denounced in editorials and syndicated news columns. The cost for all mail sent out by all Members of the House and Senate and congressional staffs is less than $5 million a year.

It costs the American taxpayers about three times as much to make up for the loss in postage for the Luce publications as it does to handle all the mail of 535 Members of the House and Senate.

The Life story is no credit to the publishing industry which includes many outstanding and dedicated publishers and newswriters. It is an insult to their readers and a disservice to the Nation.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the very able and effective member of the Committee on Public Works for many years, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the very able and distinguished leader of this discussion, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], on the manner in which he has so factually and forthrightly approached this subject today. It is characteristic of the forthright and able and dedicated manner in which the gentleman frcm Minnesota over the years has provided leadership and presided over the consideration given in subcommittees of our Public Works Committee to many of these important functions of the Government of the United States. I know of no Member in the Congress who is better equipped through personal knowledge, experience, and background than is the gentleman from Minnesota to speak authoritatively on the matter of water resource development, particularly, and many of these other programs for the development of our domestic resources in general.

Mr. Speaker, as I look up into the press gallery of this Chamber, I am impressed with the irony by which a magazine with such great mass circulation can give so many people throughout the United States an erroneous impression of the essential business of the Congress of the United States. I compare the circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which these remarks that are being made today will be printed, with the circulation of a great magazine such as the one under discussion, and I realize how difficult it is for those of us in the Congress to make available to the public the factual answers to the broad charges and sweeping allegations which so often are leveled against this lawmaking body.

As I look into the press gallery today, I see five members of the press listening to these debates and recording them at this moment. At times during this discussion there have been as few as two at a time in the press gallery. One almost despairs of ever being able to correct the false impressions which can be spread throughout the country by one magazine article.

As I look about and beyond the press gallery, however, I see on that plaque which all of us in this House have read time and time again, the words of Daniel Webster which are held up as something of a goal for the House of Representatives in its dealing with public problems. Daniel Webster said:

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.

Now it seems to me that this is precisely what the Congress undertakes to do in these great development programs for the water resources of our land. Nobody who has ever seen the human wreckage of broken dreams and shattered hopes which lie in the wake of a rampaging flood can seriously think of soundly conceived and executed flood control works as essentially pork barrel. Truly nobody who has ever seen the booming industry and thriving commerce that have sprung up on the Nation's navigable waterways can seriously begrudge America the economic strength which they have created and facilitated for our Nation since the Congress voted in 1832 to launch a conscious program of promoting our inland navigation.

The point is that soundly conceived flood control and navigation projects demonstrably pay for themselves. They have paid many times over in the economic strength they have generated for our Nation. The first $3.5 billion which Congress in 14 years voted for the flood control program of this Nation resulted in the creation of dams, levees, and similar projects which, in the short span of their existence already have saved the Nation approximately $9 billion in damages which otherwise would have occurred. With these structures already in place and still in place to tame and harness future floods, the incalcuable damages already prevented by them would have taken in their absence a property toll 2½ times their total cost of construction. Does that sound like a pork barrel? Does that sound like boondoggling or wasteful expenditure? I think not.

The impression is gained from the tongue-in-cheek manner by which some publications refer to these programs that, as this particular magazine charged, Congress considers these matters on the basis of—and I am quoting from this magazine—"political advantage first and the public welfare second." Is that true? One would get the impression that the composition of these omnibus bills that are passed by Congress from time to time is largely a matter of granting some political advantage to various Members of Congress. Certainly this should not be the criterion, and I am convinced that it has not been.

I think I can prove that this charge is not true. In 1958 Congress enacted such an omnibus bill. It was the first one in 4 years. A grand total of 130 new construction projects were embodied in the legislation as it came to the House, affecting this many widely scattered areas throughout the United States and its territories. Seventy-one of these projects involved flood control and allied purposes; 48 were to facilitate navigation; 11 were concerned with hurricane protection and beach erosion.

As will be recalled, 1958 was an election year. The Democratic Party at the time was the majority party in the Congress and I suppose we might recall that the Democratic Party would have been anxious to maintain and, if possible, to increase its majority in the House. Under those circumstances, if political advantage had been the motivation, as is charged in this and other articles, one would have expected this bill to have been lopsided with authorizations in behalf of districts represented by members of the majority party in the House. Laying aside any possible political motivation, the law of averages would have leaned in favor of the Democratic districts, since at the time the House was composed of 231 Democrats and 199 Republicans. Yet a Democratic majority was presenting legislation which authorized projects in 67 districts served by our Republican colleagues and in only 55 districts served by our Democratic colleagues.

Nor is that merely an isolated case or a wild exception to the rule. The same general principle applies in the omnibus authorization bills of 1960 and 1962. Political advantage to individual Members is not and has never been the motivation of this great Committee on Public Works nor of its subcommittees, one of which is so ably headed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

I think these facts should be known to the public. I congratulate the gentleman for having taken this time in order that those of us who have some experience in the matter might make them available in the public record and help to correct, insofar as possible, the damage which has been done to the reputation of the Congress and of the Government itself.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. I yield to my good friend from California and our colleague [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my commendation to those of my colleagues who have expressed their gratitude to the gentleman from Minnesota for taking this time today in order

that we be permitted more objectively to deal with the matters raised in the article published in Life magazine than Life itself demonstrated. Irresponsible, intemperate, and inaccurate best characterize the article to which I refer.

On page 22 I have been interested in noting three-fourths of the page taken up by a picture of a project in my home district.

"Seaports No One Needs Are Fat Slices of Pork" is the heading. Down below is a subhead "42-Mile Canal To Link Sacramento With the Sea: $41 Million."

It has a picture of a dredge and to the informed it is readily apparent the dredge is not operating. But it says:

> Now the channel, which can silt up quickly because of its soft banks, will require constant dredging (above) to keep open a port nobody has to have.

It is obvious to anyone that the intent was to infer that the dredge was engaged then in the process of desilting a port which at that time had not been opened. Such was not the fact. That was the last contract dredge engaged in construction on that project. The record is clear that the Sacramento port is an excellent project, fully feasible, that one of its characteristics is that of a slack water port. Silting will be no problem. Maintenance on the port will be far less than the cost of maintaining the old 10-foot channel in the Sacramento River.

That is the type of misleading, deliberately inaccurate reporting which characterizes this article. I think that this whole presentation illustrates the price we must and we willingly pay for the preservation of a free press, as it represents the willingness we have always had to subsidize this free press in order to permit dissemination of even the most prejudiced type of reporting to the American people.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] dealt briefly with the matter of the subsidy enjoyed by the Time-Luce publications. I would like to go just a little further. Of the $216 million deficiency in the handling of second-class mail I am interested in finding that in 1961, the last year for which figures are available, Life mailed 315 million pieces or 6.7 percent of the total of that deficiency.

Now, it would be inaccurate—but not as much so as Life's reporting—for me to say that the 6.7 percent of the $216 million represents the total of Life's subsidy. I do not say that, because it would be difficult with precision to spell out precisely how much it is. But it certainly runs around $12 million to $14 million a year, and during my time in the Congress, the time in which we have been engaged in constructing the port in my district to which $41 million was committed, I would point out that in that 10 years Life has received a subsidy which would at least build two or three projects of the type which the people of my district sought and worked for for more than a half century.

It does no service to the American people, it adds nothing to the stature of Life's publication when they resort to the deliberately misleading and inaccurate reporting characterized by this article.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this House recognizes that there is ample room for sound and constructive criticism of what we do here in this body and what our colleagues do in the other body. None of us is so perfect in the discharge of our responsibilities that we will not make error, and the contribution of a free press is to point out the error objectively, to aid in correcting it, to aid in removing abuses. But a shotgun indictment, inaccurate and misleading such as that contained in this publication, demeans Life and does damage to our institutions.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from California for a most knowledgeable presentation and contribution.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to my neighbor, friend, and colleague from my own State of Minnesota, northern Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding. I shall not take more than a very brief moment of the gentleman's time, recognizing the extent to which he has had demands in order to cover the subject that is before us at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with what I hope is diligence and interest to the discussion that has been going on this afternoon relative to an article recently appearing in Life magazine. I am sure that everyone of us as Members of Congress have no time for any kind of distortion or any kind of an article that may tend to be misleading as far as the public is concerned. To this degree, I think it behooves everyone of us as Members to point them out to the public.

By the same token, in this area and I say this as a former member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and presently as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that I am not so sure that we ought to leave the impression that there is not some room for Members of Congress to take a look at projects and expenditures that have been referred to. By that I again repeat that certainly we ought to clarify the record so that the public is not misinformed. But as a member of that committee I have had occasion to look at a number of projects. Some good, some not so good. Some expenditures, by experience, have been noted not to work out as intended. I think we should be just as conscious of them.

It is not my purpose to develop that at this point, because I do not want to use the time of the gentleman for that purpose. However, there are a few of them that I think the Congress ought to be cognizant of. I shall develop them at a later time on my own time in order that the record may be completely straight so that we, in turn, as Members of Congress can together keep the people informed and practice every kind of prudence in the expenditure of moneys in view of the budget problem and the deficit problem that we now have as we look at projects in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his kind consideration in yielding to me.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue and on this occasion.

If the gentleman from Minnesota will allow me, I would like to make a comment here at this time with regard to the general picture that has been brought here to the floor this afternoon, because with the lone exception of our friend who has spoken to us last, on the other side of the aisle, we have had a series of Members of Congress from all over the Nation, I think almost to a man, viewing with genuine concern and with genuine disappointment the treatment of the news which occurred in Life magazine in its August 16 issue. From New York to California, from Texas to Wisconsin, the membership of this House has expressed itself pretty forcefully on the question of whether or not an accurate picture of the facts has been presented to the people of the United States in the August 16 issue.

Personally, I doubt very much if Life magazine and its editors care very much what the Members of the Congress have to say on this subject. I question very much whether they regard the respect of the Members of the Congress on either side of the aisle very highly. I do not think it would be possible for them to produce a journalistic monstrosity like this, if they did have any regard for the respect of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States.

But, perhaps, while the Congress is an easy target, they will not find the people of the United States who are concerned with problems like flood control and the need for navigation quite such easy targets.

It might be helpful at this point to make reference to what is being said across the country by some of the folks who are not Members of the Congress and, yet, who still may hold opinions of some importance to Life magazine.

I have here, for example, an editorial which appeared in the Daily Star of Nowata, Okla., on Wednesday, August 14, in which the able editor of the Daily Star, Mr. R. Marsden Bellatti, states:

> It is a shame a nationally circulated news magazine doesn't check facts before leveling charges of pork barrel. But that's exactly what Life magazine did in its inaccurate description of the Arkansas River navigation and basin development program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this editorial may be a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

LET'S USE THE OOLOGAH, NOW

It is a shame a nationally circulated news magazine doesn't check facts before leveling charges of pork barrel. But that's exactly what Life magazine did in its inaccurate description of the Arkansas River naviga-

tion and basin development program. Perhaps Oklahoma's Representative TOM STEED best described the magazine's inaccuracy:

"The article is journalistic prostitution. It's a funny thing they don't find any fault with foreign aid, rather than something that benefits America. The article seems to be more by design than ignorance. It's no surprise to me because the whole press seems to be preoccupied with grabbing on to anything that will discredit the legislative branch of Government."

It should be remembered that for more than a century the Congress has had an established yardstick for determining development of the natural resources of the Nation. And that yardstick has been "will it generate new taxes that in a maximum of 50 years will more then repay cost of the development."

The development of the Nation's harbors have resulted from such a sensible plan. Also the great rivers of the Nation, the Ohio, the Mississippi, and other tributaries have been developed by this method. The result has been the creation of new industrial complexes supplying new jobs and a sounder economy for the various regions involved and eventually for the betterment of the entire Nation.

Senator MONRONEY had this to say of the misleading article:

"Many of the resource developments required for the tremendous population growth immediately ahead can only be provided through huge subsidies and expenditures under public control."

This is a most important point. It is not socialistic to bring about the development of the Nation's enterprise and labor can develop new work opportunities. For the crepe hangers we have a question: How do you propose to make job opportunities to meet the needs of an increasing population? Certainly the answer is not made-work. And certainly the answer includes development of natural resources that be used by private venture money to create new job opportunities.

This district's Representative ED EDMONDSON said of the Life article of misinformation that it is a "travesty of misinformation * * * a libel on the memory of Senator Kerr and a libel on the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas."

How does all this affect Nowata. Since the Oologah is an important segment in the development of the Arkansas navigation complex we're in the position of knowing that in its present stage it is of little use. But, under the far range plans the Oologah will be most important when completed in 1970.

Our problem is to encourage the Congress to hasten the development of the Oologah so that it can immediately generate new jobs and new business and industry and the expansion of old business and industry. Only then will there be new tax money for the Treasury to offset the cost of the Oologah.

It is shortsighted to permit a potential asset, such as the Oologah, to remain nonproductive for 7 long years.

The level of the Oologah needs to be raised to 638 feet now, not 7 years from now. By making possible the impounding of the extra 30 feet of water now there will be every incentive for private citizens to carry on the development that will result in new tax money for not only the U.S. Treasury but new tax money for our schools and units of government in Oklahoma.

We are confident the Congress when fully apprised of the facts will not want to delay the development of a resource that will generate new taxes. If you are really interested, sign one of the Nowata petitions to the Oklahoma congressional delegation asking for immediate remedial action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I also have a copy of a telegram sent by the mayor of the city of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, Mr. W. A. Hensley, to the managing editor of Life magazine, on the 16th day of August in which the city of Bartlesville takes exception to the article appearing in the August 16 issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

GEORGE P. HUNT,
Managing editor, Life magazine,
Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.:

The city of Bartlesville takes exception to your article, "See the Innards of a Fat Pig," appearing in the August 16 issue. Our city has worked cooperatively with the Federal Government through the Corps of Engineers in contracting for and purchasing our water supply, present and future, from reservoirs forming a part of the multiple purpose project on the Arkansas River Basin. Water from many of the other existing and planned reservoirs is already under contract to municipalities for their supplies. Multiple purpose usage of water (muncipal and industrial supply, maintenance of low flow, navigation, conservation, and recreation) in the area of the project is absolutely essential to provide for anticipated growth. It is our considered opinion that the authors of this article failed completely to appraise these and other benefits in the light of future requirements. We are confident that had this been done the conclusions would have been entirely different and that they would have found a project or projects similar to the Arkansas plan a necessity for the future of cities in the river basin.

W. A. HENSLEY,
Mayor, City of Bartlesville, Okla.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I hold also a telegram from one of the Nation's leading businessmen, the chairman of the board of the Phillips Petroleum Co., Mr. K. S. Adams, which he addressed to the managing editor of Life magazine.

The telegram is as follows:

GEORGE P. HUNT,
Managing Editor, Life Magazine,
Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.:

In reference to the article, "See the Innards of a Fat Pig," appearing in your August 16 issue, the views of your writers seem extreme to an unwarranted extent. The resulting effect places the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, their citizens generally, and their congressional delegations in an unfavorable light on a nationwide basis. Had the article attempted to analyze the multiple-purpose project in the Arkansas River basin and the other projects on an unbiased basis from an engineering and economic standpoint giving effect to the present and future needs of the areas, the conclusion would have been different. Certainly your article is not one of which you, as managing editor of a supposedly most important magazine, can be proud.

K. S. ADAMS,
Chairman, Phillips Petroleum Co.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the opinion of the chief executive officer of the Phillips Petroleum Co. will carry a little weight in some circles at Life magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I have also a newsletter dated August 16, 1963, put out by the Arkansas Basin Development Association, Inc., which includes on its board of directors some of the principal businessmen and industry leaders of the State of Oklahoma, including a number of bank presidents and other officials of major corporations in the State of Oklahoma. This newsletter is also in response to the article carried in Life magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that may be part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The newsletter referred to is as follows:

NEWSLETTER BY THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., AUGUST 16, 1963

To: Members and friends of the Arkansas Basin Development Association, Inc.

LIFE CARRIES A FINE PICTURE OF BANK STABILIZATION WORK AT LITTLE ROCK

In the August 16 issue of Life magazine is a large airphoto of bank stabilization work on the Arkansas River at Utah Point which is within the city limits of Little Rock, Ark.

The photo shows clearly how the river has been eating away the land in one of the city parks, and how the erosion has been halted by dikes which stretch far out into the river bed and force the stream to stay in a channel against higher ground on the opposite bank.

In 1927, a major flood washed away between 2,500 and 3,000 acres of rich bottomlands at Utah Point. Subsequestly, the Rock Island Railroad placed piles of rocks beside its roadbed and built two small dikes in an effort to curb the river's appetite for land.

In 1943 there was another great flood on the Arkansas River, so great that it closed every crossing in Arkansas from border to border, completely cutting off one-half of the State from the other. At Utah Point, the bank caved in for a mile, the railroad lost its two dikes, and the city golf course lost three holes.

DAMAGES IN GREAT FLOODS INSPIRED ARKANSAS RIVER PROJECT

The damages in the great flood of 1943 ran into millions of dollars in Arkansas and Oklahoma. The losses in Oklahoma were not as great as Arkansas, but they were staggering, and the Governor of Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr, mobilized every available State and Federal agency in an effort to assist the flood victims.

As he traveled from county seat to county seat, meeting those whose homes and farms and businesses had been destroyed, Bob Kerr became interested in a plan which was being studied by the Army Engineers at the request of Congress and which was designed to control the floods on the Arkansas and to make the at times savage stream a servant instead of an enemy of the people who lived along its banks.

Before the end of his term Governor Kerr and Gov. Ben Laney, of Arkansas, obtained from Congress the authorization of a multiple purpose plan for the Arkansas River which involved not only flood control but the making of hydroelectric power, and provision of a 9-foot slack water navigation channel from the Mississippi River across the State of Arkansas and upstream to the vicinity of Tulsa. With these benefits, the project would more than justify the cost of taming the river.

BARGE TRANSPORTATION WILL MAKE ARKANSAS VALLEY AN INDUSTRIAL CENTER

As Senator from Oklahoma from 1948 until his death on January 1 of this year, Kerr's primary goal was to turn this plan into reality, and before he died more than a fourth of the $1.2 billion required to complete the project had been appropriated by the Congress.

Moreover, businessmen in and out of the valley were in agreement that when barge

transportation was added to the wealth of rich mineral resources in the Arkansas Valley, America would have all the ingredients necessary for the creation of a river valley economy capable of becoming at least as important industrially as either the Ruhr Valley in Germany or the Ohio Valley in the United States.

Publication by Life magazine of the picture of the Arkansas at Utah Point could most appropriately have been a tribute to Bob Kerr and to other Members of Congress who have had the courage and vision to devote lifetimes to the conversion of natural resources into wealth for a nation. But it was not. Life magazine labeled the Arkansas project the biggest slice of fat in the Federal pork barrel and called Kerr the biggest boondoggler of them all. Flood control and power benefits from the project would be negligible, it asserted, and its writers hooted at the idea of providing barge navigation to a spot on the land locked prairie called Catoosa, Okla.

MAGAZINE CONDEMNS PUBLIC WORKS AS PORK BARREL

Congress, said Life, is throwing away billions that belong to you.

Life says public works projects are political pork and nothing more, 100-percent waste, designed solely for the glorification of Congressmen as a means of winning reelection.

To Life the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway was pork barrel. Given the power to turn back the clocks of history, and applying Life's philosophy, Congress never should have agreed to the construction of the Hoover Dam and of a pipeline to carry water to the deserts of southern California where Los Angeles now stands. It should have fought the Houston ship canal tooth and toenail, and without the ship canal Houston would not now be one of the great industrial and shipping centers of America.

We wonder if Life's editors consider the millions spent making the Ohio River dependable for navigation a waste of money. The Ohio is today the world's richest valley and a billion-dollar-plus fully justified lock modification program is now underway on that river fulfilling a prediction made by President Herbert Hoover when he dedicated the last lock of the original system in 1929.

Life surely would have opposed the dredging that created a harbor at Los Angeles, and similar work at New York, and in every other U.S. harbor on either coast.

Life would certainly have opposed winning the West as pork barrel—which it most surely was. Life would have never permitted the Army Engineers to make the surveys for the railroads which linked the Atlantic and the Pacific, much less the subsidies in public lands which make these investments in uninhabited areas pay off in the creation of the greatest economy the world has ever known.

As a matter of interest one wonders why Life doesn't mention the billions the United States puts into foreign aid around the world each year in order to finance a larger public works program in other countries than it is carrying on at home.

ATTACKS REMIND US WE CAN NEVER TAKE OUR OPPOSITION FOR GRANTED

The chasm between those who believe that never-ending water power should be used in place of energy fuels which can never be replaced, between those who would curb the floods and stop the erosion of land which has been thousands of years in the making and those who would not, is too broad to bridge with a few words.

However, Life's story may serve a useful purpose because it reminds us that we cannot take the accomplishment of our program for granted. We certainly have not done the job of educating people that needs to be done when the editors of a great magazine show themselves to be so completely uninformed.

The great industrial complexes which have grown up in the Ruhr Valley, the Rhine, the Ohio, the lower Mississippi and the gulf coast are eloquent testimonials to the part river development has played in the great economic growth of the free world, in both the United States and Europe since World War II. Without them, we could not possibly carry the tax load made necessary by the cold war being waged against us by nations which are doing everything in their power to harness their own natural resources in the hope that in this way they can some day outstrip the United States.

It occurs to us that the pork barrellers of yesterday are the ones that present generations venerate as the men of vision who helped to build a great nation. If there is any criticism, it is not that they built too much, only that they did not comprehend how great the future would be—nor how soon.

The public works program of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation represents less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the annual gross national product. This seems a very small share from the profits to be plowing back into the business, and, of course, the business is America.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one further point concerns me beyond the unjustified attack upon the Congress and that is the unjustified attack upon great government organizations like the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I think, answered more than adequately the attack which was made the other day in this magazine upon the Bureau of Reclamation, in his speech to the House on August 14, 1963, entitled "Reclamation Is Money in the Bank."

I wholeheartedly endorse the statement of the able spokesman of the Ohio delegation [Mr. KIRWAN] in his articulate defense of the Bureau of Reclamation. I think it is just as easy to answer the unfair allegations and unfair insinuations made about the Army Engineers because this also is an organization which has earned an enduring place in the respect of the people and in the history of our country. From its very start 188 years ago the Army Engineers have made tremendous contributions to the defense of our Nation and to its economic growth.

They are an organization of which every American is justly proud.

The Army Engineers are fighter-builders. Perhaps the taxpayers are more aware of their peacetime accomplishments in the construction of civil works. Since 1824, when Congress directed the Corps to plan a national transportation system of roads, canals, and waterways, the Engineers have been a spearhead of progress. They surveyed and mapped the West; laid out the routes of the early railroads; developed rivers and harbors; introduced the first iron bridge; collected information on meteorology, geology, mineralogy, zoology, botany, and the culture of the Indians among many things.

The corps has built or completed many great structures over the years, including the dome of this very capitol, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, Key and Memorial Bridges, Library of Congress, the State Department Building, the Pentagon, and the Army Medical Center. Army Engineers completed the Panama Canal when that project had bogged down, and the corps was the construction agency for the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation.

All of the Members of this body, I am sure, are aware of the work of the Engineers in fighting floods, a responsibility assigned to the corps by Congress in 1936. By the outbreak of World War II in 1941, the corps had made comprehensive reports on surveys embracing power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and other water uses for virtually all of the major river basins and on some 200 individual rivers.

When the fighting stopped in 1945, the corps moved quickly into the water resources development programs on the Missouri, Columbia and other rivers. Great dams, such as McNary, Garrison, and Fort Randall began to rise, and subsequently tasks such as the modernization of the Ohio River navigation system and construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway were undertaken. Work is now proceeding on vital rivers and harbors projects virtually throughout the entire United States.

The Corps of Engineers' program is based on the concept that the continued phenomenal growth of our country will require the fullest practical use of virtually all of our water resources. The corps is now working toward the maximum development of our rivers for flood control, navigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, public recreation, fish and wildlife protection. The program has reached about the half-way point in the construction of active projects under the program as now conceived and authorized by Congress. However, the dynamic growth of our country and recent changes and increases in water resources needs require that these programs be modernized. It is the Corps of Engineers we call upon to reexamine our requirements and potentials and to produce the plans for meeting these problems. We can depend upon the Engineers' technological capability to give us the solutions.

We need an expanding program for two reasons—national advancement and military security. Each is essential to the other—our dynamic growth gives us greater power to develop our military posture, and a strong military protects our economic advancement. Both are in danger from the threat of world communism.

To meet this threat to American and free world security, the Corps of Engineers is concurrently engaged in a worldwide military construction program for the Air Force and Army, costing more than a billion dollars a year. The chain of military defense includes missile bases for launching the Air Force intercontinental ballistic missile as well as construction for the test bases for Nike-Zeus, the Army's antimissile missile which, it is hoped, will be able to shoot down anything the enemy may send over.

The corps has modernized and strengthened capabilities for providing engineer combat support for the Army so as to enhance the mobility and effectiveness of our ground forces in this day of technological warfare. This program of research and development alone has opened up vast new areas of scientific and engineering challenge. These include the development of nuclear powerplants which can be airborne to remote areas of the world; improvement in the accuracy of maps and refinement of data on the size and shape of the earth.

The Armed Forces of the United States must be able to fight anywhere on the globe and under any conditions, and it is the Corps of Engineers' job to provide the engineering skills that will enable them to do so.

Today, the Army Corps of Engineers is the largest and most highly diversified engineering organization in the world.

With its civil and military functions, there is no organization like the Corps of Engineers anywhere. In its existence, lies one of the Nation's bulwarks in war or peace. And now we are in the so-called space age. Where we will be able to go appears to be limited only by the imaginations of our scientists and missile experts. As our horizons expand so do the challenges to the Army Engineers. When the first expedition lands on the moon, you may be assured the Army Engineers will have played a vital role in making it possible, including construction of the extensive and complex ground facilities, such as the launching bases at Cape Canaveral, and the great research and training facilities required by NASA.

I am confident that the challenges will be no more difficult than were those which the Engineers encountered in our early years as a Nation. The courage and accomplishments of their predecessors over the years stand as an inspiration to the men of the Corps of Engineers whose motto is "Essayons"—"let us try."

The civil works program of the Corps of Engineers has contributed to the economic development of the United States by providing:

First. Most of the major harbors through which flows the Nation's vast commerce, as well as numerous small harbors for fishing and recreational craft.

Second. The greatest system of inland waterways in the world.

Third. Most of the major reservoirs that have contributed so greatly to the Nation's development by preventing flood losses, by generating electrical power, by storing water for municipal and industrial supply and for regulating rivers in the interest of downstream water quality, navigation, power and the enhancement of the fish and wildlife resource, and by providing wholesome recreational opportunities for vast numbers of the Nation's citizens.

Fourth. Many miles of levees for the protection of cities and important agricultural areas from floods.

Fifth. Many miles of channel improvements for flood protection and land improvement.

Sixth. Works to protect the coasts from damage by hurricanes and other great storms.

Seventh. Rescue and disaster relief during great floods and other natural disasters.

Over a period of 138 years ending June 30, 1962, the civil works program has contributed to the Nation's economic development by the construction of:

First, 214 reservoirs providing 165 million acre-feet of storage capacity.

Second, 500 local protection projects—including the vast levee system protecting almost 24 million acres of flood plain land along the lower Mississippi River.

Third, 34 power installations having an aggregate capacity of 7 million kilowatts.

Fourth, 3.2 million acres of water area—summer season—which provided more than 120 million person-days of recreation in 1961, and which is being used more intensively each year.

Fifth, 22,500 miles of inland waterway which provided 123 billion ton-miles of low-cost transportation service in 1960.

Sixth, connecting channels between the Great Lakes which have converted them into a great inland sea providing 99 billion ton-miles of transportation service in 1960.

Seventh, 500 deep draft commercial harbors on the shores of the oceans and Great Lakes.

Eighth, 250 small-boat harbors for refuge, recreation, and commercial fishing.

Ninth, shore protection works along more than 300 miles of coastline.

Tenth, rescue and disaster relief work during great floods and other natural disasters.

Eleventh, numerous project and basin-wide plans: the latter with the cooperation of the other Federal agencies and the States—as in the Delaware River basin. The corps has also made important contributions to the development—still underway—of comprehensive river basin plans for which leadership is being provided by U.S. Study Commissions for the Southeast River basins and for the Texas River basins.

In addition to the completed works mentioned above, the corps has under construction 172 new projects, including 62 reservoirs which will increase the aggregate capacity of corps' reservoirs by about 46 million acre-feet, and will increase the capacity of power installations by nearly 4.5 million kilowatts—to 11.5 million kilowatts. The corps also has underway, or is participating in, the formulation of several comprehensive river basin plans. A program of flood plain information studies was initiated during fiscal year 1962 to encourage States and local governmental entities to regulate the use of flood plain lands for the purpose of slowing down the growth of new flood problems.

The works above listed have helped make possible the development of the most advanced national economy the world has ever seen. The beneficial effects of these works include:

First, a total waterborne commerce in 1961 of 1,062 million tons of which 502 million tons passed through coastal harbors.

Second, also in 1961, 87 billion ton-miles of deep draft transportation on the Great Lakes.

Third, in the same year 123 billion ton-miles of low-cost shallow draft transportation on the inland waterways.

Fourth, prevention of flood damages aggregating (by June 30, 1961) about $11 billion, which is many times the investment the Nation has made in flood control works.

Fifth, the generation during fiscal year 1962 of 30 billions of kilowatt-hours of electrical energy.

Sixth, the provision of about 1.5 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity for the storage of municipal and industrial water, and about 5 million acre-feet of capacity for storing irrigation water.

Seventh, the provision of over 120 million person-days of water-based recreation during calendar year 1961, and the substantial enhancement of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources by the provision of over 3 million acres of water area and the regulation of rivers.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a proud record of achievement for any organization, and one which speaks volumes of the ability, dedication and contribution to the Nation of the Army Engineers.

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the research that preceded its strange bit of journalism last week, Life magazine chose virtually to ignore the assistance extended to countless U.S. communities through the accelerated public works program.

Enacted last year, this program was aimed at helping those sections of the country which had failed to share fully in recovery from the 1960–61 recession. It has pinpointed its matching grants according to clearly stated indices of need, and without regard to what Life likes to call "pork."

I think it can be demonstrated that this APW money has made inroads against the gnawing pockets of unemployment that remain in a generally brightening job picture nationally.

But in July of this year, more than 25,000 persons were still without work in my home county of San Diego, Calif. Our unemployment rate stood at 7.5 percent of the total available labor force—nearly 2 percentage points ahead of the national average. This is a distinction my community has borne unhappily since September of 1960.

The accelerated public works program tackles a localized problem untouched by the Area Redevelopment Agency. The ARA is concerned with the deeper challenge of "chronic" unemployment—chiefly in the Appalachians, the northern Iron Range, Mountain States, and the Pacific Northwest. Under Labor Department standards, a community's unemployment is rated chronic if 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the previous 4 years, 75 percent above for 2 of 3 years, or 100 percent above for 1 year.

I am glad to note that no part of southern California has dropped into this classification. We need no massive outside help. Instead, the accelerated

public works was conceived for counties which, like my own, need only a gentle push. It has helped start some worthy public projects on the sound principle that these must be projects already in the long-range planning of the communities applying for grants—projects for which they are willing to put up substantial amounts themselves.

Let me cite some examples. A new city hall will be dedicated in Imperial Beach on September 7. Work is underway on new warehousing at San Diego's 10th Avenue shipping terminal, and on a water filtration plant in the Helix irrigation district. Mercy Hospital, a nonprofit institution, will build an annex.

In the San Diego area, as elsewhere in the Nation, the APW program has unquestionably proved a source of jobs which would not otherwise have been available. I believe it should be extended, with additional money authorized. The backlog of needed public works in eligible communities far exceeds the funds thus far made available by Congress. In the city of San Diego alone, for example, there are 36 applications pending which, if approved, will enable the city to build long-planned sewer extensions and improvements in water mains, fire stations and libraries.

These public works for which the city of San Diego has asked assistance—and in support of which the city administration hopes to see the accelerated public works program continued—are important and badly needed. San Diego has doubled its population since World War II—a growth which has placed understandable demands on facilities and services extended by the city. This growth, and its attendant problems, is shared by the entire metropolitan area lying beyond city boundaries.

I therefore support, and ask my colleagues to enact H.R. 7351 introduced in this session by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act, and to increase the authorization for apropriations under that act.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire may be permitted 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

VITAL CONCERN TO LABOR MOVEMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the railroad crisis is of deep concern to all people. We must judge this matter deeply. Important issues basic to democracy are involved.

A personal friend of mine, William R. Meyers of Superior, Wis., has written a guest editorial for the largest newspaper in my district, which I urge my colleagues to read and judge:

VITAL CONCERN TO LABOR MOVEMENT

(By William R. Meyers)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William R. Meyers, 1111 Baxter Avenue, Superior, is now serving his second 4-year term as executive vice president of the more than 20,000-member Switchmen's Union of North America. A native of Superior, he attended local grade and high schools and is a graduate of Superior State College. He was active in basketball and football at both the high school and college levels as a player or coach. He served in the Air Force during World War II. Following the war, he was granted a scholarship to the School of Labor at Oxford University by the British Government, but circumstances forced him to pass up this opportunity. He also was employed as a teacher. In his railroad work, Meyers held numerous posts both in the Switchmen's Union and the Superior Federation of Labor. Mr. Meyers is presently attending negotiation sessions being held in Washington, D.C.)

The subject of which I speak is of vital concern to the labor movement in general and railroad labor in particular.

Recently, I had occasion to appear before the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with Mr. Neil P. Speirs, international president of the Switchmen's Union of North America. Mr. Speirs spoke before these two bodies in opposition to a joint resolution submitted by President Kennedy to dispose of the current railroad rules dispute. This resolution provides for the disposition of the dispute by means of compulsory arbitration.

While most all persons in high Government position will not admit that the resolution is compulsory arbitration, the fact remains that it gives to a third party, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the right to impose on one of the parties work rules concerning rates of pay, rules or working conditions without the consent of one of the parties. This would destroy free collective bargaining in the railroad industry and may very well open a Pandora's box to all collective bargaining in these United States. While railroad management may look with favor on such an arrangement in this dispute, who can say that Congress will stop there? If railroad employees are forced to perform labor by Government fiat, the next step will be Government ownership of the railroad industry.

In addition to the fact that this joint resolution contains all the elements of compulsory arbitration, there is another provision in the resolution that makes it doubly onerous. This provision provides for a 2-year period in which neither party, no matter how adversely affected by the imposed rule rendered by the ICC, can move for a change. Under voluntary arbitration, if a party feels that they have been unduly treated, they may serve notice for a change in the rule and proceed through the channels of free collective bargaining to arrive at a more satisfactory agreement.

Many people wonder why free collective bargaining has failed so far to affect a settlement in the current railroad rules dispute. The carriers, through their notices to their employees, demanded the right to make, keep, revise, or discontinue virtually every rule covering the working conditions of the operating workers in the entire industry. The carriers replaced collective bargaining with public relations in two respects. First, the myth of railroad poverty was created and heavily promoted. Second, the defamation of the industry's workers. They made the term "featherbedding" a household expression of contempt.

As to the first item above, Emergency Board No. 154 in its report to the President in May of this year after studying the financial condition of the railroads during the railroad rules dispute, said in pertinent part: "We were impressed with the evidence submitted to us that the vitality and earning capacity of the railroads as a whole are improving, that the productivity of its workers is rising at a rapid rate, and that the industry can face the future with confidence and even optimism."

As to the second item above, the productivity of railroad employees is second to none in the entire United States. This was expressed by Emergency Board No. 154 in pertinent part as follows: "Recent years have been years of progress and innovation for the carriers. Technological and organization changes have been many and far reaching. Forty percent fewer employees than were employed at the beginning of this decade now handle substantially the same volume of traffic. Productivity gains have outstripped those in industry generally by a wide margin."

Since World War II, there are 200,000 less employees in the railroad operating department. This represents a tremendous savings to the railroads in wage cost. All this was accomplished without severance or separation payments or any other protective benefits.

At the time the Presidential Railroad Commission made its report (February 28, 1962), the then Secretary of Labor made the statement that the Government would not countenance a strike in the railroad industry. Statements to the same effect have been repeated by other high governmental officials including the President of the United States. The negotiators for the railroads had every right to believe that their operating employees would, in the end, not be allowed to strike. They insisted that any agreement must be within the framework of the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and that they have the unilateral right to place their interpretation on the recommendations. Management had no incentive to bargain in good faith. The employees would not be allowed to strike. All that remained was to run out the clock and the end result would be compulsory arbitration.

NATIONAL AVIATION DAY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today being National Aviation Day brings back to my mind many meaningful events leading to the designation of this day as National Aviation Day.

In early January of 1939, while a Member of the other body, I was honored by a visit from Mr. Orville Wright who told me that friends of his in the aviation industry suggested that Congress might be willing to pass legislation designating his birthday, August 19, as "National Aviation Day." He asked if I would be willing to introduce such a resolution. I, of course, was pleased to introduce the resolution as Senate Joint Resolution 111 on January 27, 1939. A companion measure was introduced in this House by a number of Members. It so happened that Senate Joint Resolution 111

passed the other body and was thereafter substituted for House resolutions of the same character and enacted by this House.

Senate Joint Resolution 111 authorizing the President to designate August 19 of each year as "National Aviation Day" and to issue a proclamation in conformity with such resolution became law as Public Resolution 14, 76th Congress, approved May 11, 1939.

On July 25, 1939, President Roosevelt issued the following proclamation:

Whereas the development of aeronautics in recent years has been so rapid that aviation in its many phases has come to exert a profound influence on the course of events throughout the world; and

Whereas American initiative and industry have contributed greatly to this development and should be encouraged to continue such contribution in order that the United States may retain its outstanding position in the field of aeronautics; and

Whereas Public Resolution No. 14, 76th Congress, approved May 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 739), provides: "That the President of the United States is authorized to designate August 19 of each year as 'National Aviation Day,' and to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate exercises to further and stimulate interest in aviation in the United States."

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate August 19, 1939, and August 19 of each succeeding year as "National Aviation Day," and call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate exercises to further and stimulate interest in aviation in this country.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 25th day of July in the year of our Lord 1939, and of the independence of the United States of America the 164th.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

After the President's proclamation, Mr. Orville Wright came back to my office and gave me as a token of gratitude for my sponsorship of the resolution a photograph of the first heavier-than-air flight made by man, which was accomplished by Mr. Orville Wright, with, of course, the invaluable assistance of his brother, Mr. Wilbur Wright, at 10:32 a.m. on December 17, 1903, at Kitty Hawk, N.C. Mr. Orville Wright generously autographed this historic photograph for me. That autographed picture by Mr. Orville Wright of that historic scene depicts one of the epic events in the history of man and shall ever be one of my most cherished souvenirs.

In my lifetime aviation has proceeded from this 12-second flight by this intrepid pioneer to the space age when men have not only flown scores of times around the world at speeds exceeding 17,000 miles an hour but our country is dedicated in this decade to landing two men upon the moon and bringing them safely home. The illimitable possibilities of man in flight in the space age almost exceed the grasp of the imagination.

Many men and women deserve to be honored this day and every day for making these marvels possible and for the treasure, the labor, and the lives they have freely laid upon the alter of sacrifice for the cause of aviation—for the realization of man's dream to rise above the earth like the birds. Today it is man, not the bird, who is the master of the air and soon will be the master of the infinite reaches of space—all to the ennoblement of man and the glory of God.

A TREATY AND ITS VALUE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States is currently engaged in hearings and debate over the recent test ban treaty entered into by the United States with Russia and other foreign powers. Much of the discussion over the usefulness of this treaty and its benefit to the United States has centered around the reliability of Russia to live up to its treaty commitments. Performances of Russia in the past have certainly justified the wariness of the American people to accept the solemn promises of Russia when they are broken at will by the Soviet Government.

We in the United States, by our Constitution, have made our treaty obligations the supreme law of the land. The second paragraph of article 6 of our Constitution indicates that all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

We in the Congress and the Federal courts have placed great emphasis upon the status of a treaty being the supreme law of the land. It is with this thought in mind and the timeliness of the test ban treaty that I call to the attention of the House a matter which is of deep concern to me. It relates to the proposed construction of the Knowles Dam in the State of Montana recently added to H.R. 6016 by the Senate.

The construction of this project will take approximately 20,000 acres of very valuable land from the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation. Its construction will also flood two and possibly three very highly desirable damsites for the production of hydroelectric power, owned by the Flathead Indians and reserved to them by various acts of Congress.

By treaty with the U.S. Government, known as the Hellgate Treaty signed in the Bitterroot Valley on July 16, 1855, the U.S. Government and the Flathead Tribes agreed that the Confederated Tribes would cede and relinquish and convey to the United States, their right, title, and interest in certain lands occupied and claimed by the Indians. In that treaty, in return for this concession, the U.S. Government recognized and reserved for the use and occupation of the Confederated Indian Tribes, the lands including the powersites, part of which are included in the Knowles project reservoir. This treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States on March 8, 1859, and is in effect today. It is the same type of treaty and should merit the same concern and treatment as is presently being given the test ban treaty. Yet the Senate of the United States, the same body which ratified the treaty with the Flathead Tribes, completely ignored that treaty and proposed the authorization of the Knowles Dam in Montana in face of the strong and emphatic opposition of the Flathead Tribes who charged that such action is a violation of their treaty rights. I should like to call to the attention of this body a news release from the Montana Standard of August 1, 1963, in which the Flathead Tribes accuse the Senate of bad faith in their action with respect to the Knowles Dam site.

INDIANS ACCUSE SENATE OF BAD FAITH WITH FLATHEAD TRIBE

(By Patricia Scott)

The U.S. Senate was accused Wednesday of breaking faith with the Flathead Tribes by Indian interests who said it was now up to the House of Representatives to "vindicate the Nation's conscience."

That failing, Tribal Chairman Walter Morigeau said the western Montana tribes will sue the Government, asking $116 million for Buffalo Rapids Nos. 2 and 4. The two damsites which the Indians wish to develop are owned by the tribe.

The Indians also claim title to the Knowles Dam site.

Statements were issued in the wake of Senate approval of a bill including authority for expenditure of $609 million including the Knowles Dam project on the Flathead River. The bill was sent back to the House for concurrence.

The Indians claim rights under the Hellgate Treaty of 1855. They said, as they told congressional committees earlier, that the treaty supersedes other law. They said it also guaranteed them the right to refuse giving their land for the Knowles project.

MC DONALD HEARD FROM

Walter McDonald, former Flathead chairman and president of the Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest and Montana Inter Tribal Policy Board, said he was speaking for many Indian tribes. He said he would like to remind President Kennedy of campaign promises in 1960.

"There would be no change in treaty or contractual relationships without consent of the tribes concerned," Mr. Kennedy had promised.

The President 3 years ago also promised to encourage Indians to develop their resources, according to McDonald. The tribal leader said this was in line with his tribe having applied for permission to develop Buffalo Rapids Nos. 2 and 4 under their own power.

The two sites that would be inundated by the Knowles Reservoir are the subject of a second FCC application. Montana Power Co. wants to develop them as run-of-the-river dams in contrast to the multipurpose development proposed with Knowles.

Tribal Attorney John Cragun, Washington, D.C., made this statement:

"The simple fact is that the Indians have rights. The Senate has decided to take (Indian land) notwithstanding the Indian opposition. The United States has power to do

this even though it be a repudiation of treaty obligations.

"The tribes will call upon the House of Representatives to vindicate the Nation's conscience and to abide by the Nation's solemn agreement. The property rights, in any event, will be protected by the courts."

Freda Beazley, a Fort Peck Indian and a past vice president of the National Congress of American Indians, said she joined McDonald and Morigeau who expressed "extreme disappointment" with the Senate and Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF, both Democrats of Montana.

Mrs. Beazley, a former congressional committeewoman for Montana's eastern district, said, "I will never be able to understand the about-face attitude of our Democrats in Congress who for years have pretended to be friends of the Indians."

She and the others said they hoped the House will kill the Knowles proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has recognized and implemented the reservation of powersites in that treaty on several occasions. By the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 781, 796) and by the act of April 12, 1910 (36 Stat. 296, sec. 25), the reservation of these powersites was specifically affirmed by the Congress. By Public Law 100 in the 70th Congress enacted March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 212–213) the Congress further recognized the rights of the Flathead Tribes to the development of the powersites on their reservations by the following language:

Provided further, That the Federal Power Commission is authorized in accordance with the Federal Water Power Act and upon terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, to issue a permit or permits or a license or licenses for the use, for the development of power, of powersites on the Flathead Reservation and of water rights reserved or appropriated for the irrigation projects: *Provided further*, That rentals from such licenses for the use of Indian lands shall be paid to the Indians of said reservation as a tribe, which money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians and shall draw interest at the rate of four per centum.

The Congress has on numerous occasions required the consent of the Indian tribes for the use of their reservation lands for power development purposes. Section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act requires the approval of the Indian tribes before tribal lands may be used for power development.

A few years ago, the Public Works Committees of Congress recommended and the Congress enacted, an authorization and appropriation for the construction of the Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania which flooded 10,000 acres of land owned and reserved to the Seneca Nation under the oldest treaty in the United States. Such action brought a storm of protest throughout the country and is presently the subject of several bills before the Congress, one of which is Senate bill 1836 introduced by the distinguished Senators from the State of New York. The distinguished junior Senator from New York very cogently stated the problem on last July 9 in the Senate when he said:

We in New York have fought a long, hard battle about the Kinzua Dam. When it was first proposed to build the power structure on the Seneca Reservation, a storm of protest arose in my State. Most New Yorkers argue that the Senecas had a long-standing treaty with the United States—which dates in fact, to 1794—granting them the lands forever. The construction of a dam on this site required our Government to breach one of its oldest treaties, and to go back on its word to the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the treaty with the Seneca Nation by reason of the authorization of the Kinzua Dam and the abrogation of the treaty rights of that tribe of Indians is currently before the House Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. I am sure the members of the Interior Committee of this House are well aware of the problems involved when the U.S. Government treats so lightly its solemn treaty obligations entered into with the Indian tribes throughout the United States. On recent occasions my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] has called to the attention of the House the shoddy treatment of the Seneca Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us in Knowles Dam an identical and similar situation in which an attempt is being made to authorize the construction of a large reservoir which inundates nearly 20,000 acres of Flathead Reservation lands and in addition two very valuable powersites, all of which are owned by the tribes in Montana and reserved to them by treaty. Such action without the consent of the Flathead Tribes is in my opinion in direct violation of the solemn treaty and promise of the U.S. Government—ratified by the Senate and now the supreme law of the land.

Just recently, the late Oliver LaFarge, president of the Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc., wrote a letter to the chairman of the House Flood Control Subcommittee [Mr. DAVIS] in which he points out that in 1960, then Senator John F. Kennedy wrote him a letter indicating that if elected, he would take care that there "would be no change in treaties or contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes involved."

Mr. LaFarge also pointed out that the 1960 Democratic Party platform further stated with respect to American Indians:

We recognize the unique legal and moral responsibility of the Federal Government for Indians in restitution for the injustice that has been done them. Free consent of the Indian tribes concerned shall be required before the Federal Government makes any change in Federal-Indian treaty or other contractual relationship.

I am sure many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are most anxious to live up to the commitments made in their 1960 platform to the American Indians and the people of the United States. Yet, you cannot do so if you run roughshod over the Flathead Indians by authorizing the Knowles project without their consent. The Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation have on nine occasions since 1948 through its governing body, gone on record as opposing the construction of the Knowles project.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, think we should heed the storm of trouble which arose out of the Kinzua Dam situation. We should live up to our treaty commitments just as we expect others to live up to their treaty commitments made to us. We should not put ourselves in the onerous position of criticizing Russia for lack of integrity in its treaty commitments and then lightly breach treaty commitments which we, the United States, have made with the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in Montana.

There are two other problems involved in the proposed authorization of the Knowles Dam which concern me very deeply. They are:

First. The inconsistent position of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to this project, between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, both of which are in his Department and under his jurisdiction.

Second. The construction of a project which is almost exclusively for power purposes in the face of a substantial annual loss to the Federal Treasury from the operation of a project of this type.

Concerning the inconsistent position of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Army in which the Bureau of Reclamation, a subdivision of his Department, is to construct, maintain and operate the Knowles project. As Secretary of the Interior, he is also the trustee of the Indian reservation lands and assets. He has the responsibility to act as trustee in the best interests of his wards, the Flathead Tribes, who have appeared before both the Public Works Committee of the Senate and the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House, and presented a very lucid and compelling argument that their best interests are not served by the construction of this project. They have indicated that they desire to develop their own tribal properties and to maintain their tribal assets as continuing income for future generations rather than have them liquidated and thus dissipated as a tribal asset.

In testifying before the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control in support of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir project on June 5, 1963, Secretary Udall said:

You may have a damsite located actually on a reservation. The whole question, of course, that Congress and various administrations have been confronted with over the years, and Indian tribes themselves, is whether we are going to say there should be no developments involving Indian lands. And, of course, the Indians themselves do not want that. Indeed, this Indian tribe wants to develop it, wants dams built. It is not taking a position the way the Seneca Tribe did in Pennsylvania and New York, that they did not want anything built; they wanted to be left alone and said they had special treaty rights and were entitled to be left alone. But this tribe is saying in effect they want developments and they are proposing a plan of development; and the question that confronts the Congress, and the Congress has rights and responsibilities with regard to the Indian people too, is whether this development plan is the best or whether some alternative plan might be made that would accord greater benefits to these Indian tribes.

I would think, if this tribe were taking the position with regard to this particular resource problem that they wanted to be left alone, that they wanted no development, that

they were proposing that nothing be done, and that they felt in their opinion that the best resource solution was for them to be left alone, I think this would present a very hard problem, for me in particular. But where they are proposing a plan or agree that a resource should be developed, then I think this puts them in a position not of raising the basic questions, the basic type of treaty questions saying "We don't want anything done. We want to be left alone. Don't take our land."

I have the following comments to make about the Secretary's position with respect to the Knowles Dam and his conflicting interest as trustee for the Indians and as head of the Bureau of Reclamation.

First. The Secretary completely misses the point when he said that by desiring to develop their own resources the Indians have agreed that their land should be taken and that it is then up to Congress to determine which alternative is best for the Indians and for the whole resource of the river. The proposed development of the two powersites, Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4, located on the Indian reservation and by treaty and congressional action specifically reserved to the Indians, does not flood the lands of the Indians and hence the Flathead Tribes would not only have the benefit of the development of their tribal powersite resources, which would bring substantial annual income to the tribe, but they would also have the full benefit and use of their lands because their plan would not inundate any of their tribal land and thus would make maximum use of both tribal resources. On the other hand, if Knowles is constructed both the valuable powersites reserved to the Indians, plus 20,000 acres of land, would be taken from them.

Second. I agree with the Secretary that the Congress and indeed the Secretary of the Interior have a responsibility to determine whether this development plan is the best or whether some alternative plan might be made that would accord greater benefits to these Indian tribes. I cannot conceive any circumstance under which the plan for development of the Knowles project would provide greater benefit to the Indians than their own proposed plan of using their own powersite resource themselves or renting their resources. It has been suggested that possibly a block of power comparable to that which could be produced by the tribal development should be assigned to them in payment for their lands and powersites. I had an analysis made of what such an agreement would do to the benefit-cost ratio of this project. The Knowles project—considering Canadian storage and on a 50-year basis with 2⅝-percent interest—has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.08 to 1. According to Mr. Bloch, the engineer who testified before the Committee for the Confederated Tribes there is 1.1 billion kilowatthours of annual firm power generation available at Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4. If this amount of power were deducted from power revenues available for the Knowles project, it would make the benefit-cost ratio of the Knowles project 0.42 to 1. I bring this out to illustrate that any substantial payment or reservation of power to the Indians in payment for their powersites and lands involved in this project would make it an infeasible project under the best of circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I think the fiduciary relationship of the Secretary of the Interior as trustee for the Flathead Indians requires the highest responsibility to insure the preservation and well-being of the tribes and their tribal assets. This project has a very narrow justification margin when viewed in the best light possible without giving consideration to the Indian interests involved. I do not believe that the Secretary of the Interior should recommend this project to the Congress in face of the strenuous opposition of the wards of the United States that such a recommendation violates their treaty rights.

Mr. Speaker, because I have many tribes and tribal reservations in my district, I have become acutely aware of the many and diversified problems concerning the well-being of the American Indians and of their desire to maintain and develop their tribal reservation and assets guaranteed to them by solemn treaties. I am most conscious of the fact that in years past, we, the people of the United States, have not dealt too honorably with our Indian groups. I think the time has come to reverse that policy and to recognize the Indians' rights and desires to develop their own assets in their own way. The Flathead Indian Tribes have indicated a desire to develop their lands and improve their circumstances, and the Federal project proposed—Knowles Dam—is one of most questionable feasibility and should not be authorized.

I hope the Members of the House will study most closely this proposal to abrogate a solemn treaty made with the Flathead Indian Tribe. I think we should be particularly conscious of upholding our treaty obligations at a time when we in Congress discuss the possibility of great powers in the world breaking treaty obligations at will.

Mr. Speaker, as to my second problem, I would like to state to the House that I believe in multipurpose development of resources where the production of power is incidental to the multipurpose benefits which are truly within the realm of Federal governmental functions, such as flood control, reclamation, navigation, fish and wildlife, and other multipurpose uses. I have supported such projects as Yellowtail Dam in Montana where irrigation, flood control, fish and wildlife, and reclamation represent some 38 percent of the allocated costs of the project with only 62 percent allocated to power. I also support the Libby project where 29 percent of the project is allocated to flood control and 71 percent to power.

However, I cannot support a project under the guise of multipurpose when it is admitted by both the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to be almost exclusively a power project. Such is the case of the Knowles project.

In the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control Colonel Garbacz, of the Corps of Army Engineers, testified that over 95 percent of the Knowles project was allocated to power benefits. Secretary Udall testified at those hearings that:

> The financial and economic feasibility of the Knowles Dam project is primarily dependent upon its hydroelectric power potential.

He further said:

> This is primarily a storage project for hydroelectric potential. It involves irrigation, reclamation in the sense that if this type of dam is authorized there will be some farmlands flooded out.

I do not think the Congress of the United States should authorize purely power projects under the guise of multipurpose. I am further most deeply concerned by the fact that a project such as Knowles can be recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers when in fact, based upon realistic standards of revenues received versus costs, and realistic interest rates, this project actually loses over $12 million annually. Over a 50-year life such a dam represents a loss to the taxpayers of the United States of nearly $700 million or based upon a 100-year life, over $1 billion. This occurs by reason of the fact that the Corps of Army Engineers places the value of the power received from this project at approximately 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, whereas the power will actually be sold for a net revenue to the Government of 1.29 mills per kilowatt-hour.

We in the Congress are in dire need of a realistic set of standards to evaluate and appraise the merits of the various public works projects which come before us. These standards should be set by ourselves and not be left to the whims and recommendations of the executive branch and its various agencies. It is indeed amazing to me that we are currently operating under a set of standards which makes feasible on a benefit-cost ratio, a project such as Knowles, when in fact it loses somewhere between $500 million and $1 billion during its lifetime.

I hope that each Member of the House of Representatives will take the time to investigate thoroughly this unneeded, unwanted, and uneconomical project.

Mr. Speaker, I might say at this point that I have today had a conversation with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and he advised that the taking of the approximately 20,000 acres of Indian land in the Flathead Reservation will have a very serious effect upon the economy and economic development of this Indian nation. He compared it to the Kinzua Dam of the Seneca Nation and advised that it was apt to cost the taxpayers an additional $30 million to pay for the lands taken, in violation of the Seneca Treaty. So, we are not talking about a small amount of money.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Montana for the information which he is bringing forth to the House on this particular question. I have been especially concerned, as a member of the

Committee on Public Works, that the cost of making recompense of some sort to the Indians for the violation of their treaty rights which might be involved in this particular project would be something that would be brought along as a charge against the taxpayers of this Nation after the project was built, if it is to be built.

I wonder if the gentleman from Montana has made any study as to whether or not this cost of the payment to the Indians in this instance has been considered as a part of the benefit-to-cost ratio for the project itself?

Mr. BATTIN. No, I would say to the gentleman it has not been considered and this is a project that is very close insofar as the cost versus the benefit ratio that has been used by the Congress in years past is concerned. The cost of the acquisition of the Indian lands in this case is not considered in the cost ratio figure. If it were figured into the cost and, because the Indians are losing two damsites on which they could either build and sell their own power or could lease the site to a private concern to provide them with an income it could not be justified. So, the loss figure here is going to be very, very substantial.

Mr. ROBISON. If the gentleman will yield further, I suppose at this point it would be very difficult to estimate what the payment to the Indians eventually would be if the project were eventually approved and built. Does the gentleman have any idea what that might be in this instance? Has anyone ever made an estimate as to whether it would compare to the proposed payment to the Seneca Indians in connection with the Kinzua project?

Mr. BATTIN. As I stated a minute ago, by comparison, it would be difficult.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], has advised that it is going to cost approximately $30 million in the case of the Seneca Nation on the Kinzua Dam. But, again, I would point out by comparison that there is one dam presently located on Indian lands, called the Kerr Dam, from which the tribe receives an annual rental of $238,000. So this being a basis or at least an established criterion for dams and where you have two such sites which would produce a considerable amount of power, we can see that this figure will go up to, I think, far beyond the $30 million about which we are talking as far as the Seneca Nation is concerned.

Mr. ROBISON. I would assume that the benefit-cost ratio on this project would probably be in a minus category?

Mr. BATTIN. It would. There can be no question about it.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman again for bringing this matter to our attention. It certainly does involve, as he is pointing out to us, a moral issue as well as a complex legal question. I can assure the gentleman that the Committee on Public Works of which I have the honor of being a member is aware of this problem and we are disturbed over it. We intend to give it very serious consideration.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, we have heard in the last hour or two a good bit about this so-called pork barrel, and so forth. I want to assure the Congress of the fact that there is pork in this, and there is no lean in the construction of this Knowles Dam; it is all fat. The gentleman knows I am interested from the standpoint of the so-called Hellgate Treaty which we have with the Indians on this reservation. I am also concerned about the Kinzua Dam situation in which we are now trying to work out some reasonable settlement with the Seneca Nation, because we have violated the oldest active treaty of the United States, signed by the first President of the United States, George Washington, in 1794.

There is another thing that I think these committees of the Congress should take into consideration, and the gentleman well knows it. In the Kinzua Dam, the supposed cost of the Kinzua Dam is $114 million. It just did barely qualify under the criteria set up by this Congress for that figure. When you add $30 million or $35 million of damages and indirect damages we must pay the Seneca people for the destruction of their property, and their homes, that project would not have qualified under any criteria set by the Congress of the United States. The gentleman is well aware of that fact.

In the case of the so-called Knowles Dam that is proposed to be built in the gentleman's great State of Montana, he is well aware of the fact that this would be the highest cost per kilowatt-hour of any electricity in the United States. They cannot claim it is for flood control; they cannot claim it is for irrigation. It is purely and simply a power project.

When we look at the reports as to how the American people are going to fare in this particular project, I want to inform the gentleman of this: The revenues from power sales, according to the estimates, will be $2,232,000 per year; flood control benefits, $447,000; recreation, which of course is something they tacked on to try to justify some of these projects, $58,000—or a total of $2,733,000. That is the revenue as set out by the Department.

And what does this cost the American taxpayers? The interest alone is $11,034,000; replacement, $163,000; operation and maintenance, $535,000; and taxes which would go to operate your schools and local government that we must forgo in this particular situation, $980,000; and the recreation expense, $27,000. This makes a total yearly cost of operation of $13,739,000. The taxpayers of this Nation are called upon to pick up a tab of $11,002,000 per year.

What does it do? It takes 19,000 acres of the finest land owned by this Indian tribe at a time when we are spending 270 and some odd million dollars to try to build up the economic situation of the Indians of America. We are taking away from them their only chance of a livelihood. The gentleman is well aware of that fact.

Over a period of 50 years of operation it would cost the taxpayers of America for this so-called little project $704,300,000, or in order to justify this project over a 100-year period, which they are attempting to do now, it will cost $1,240 million.

I say to the committees of the Congress that some of these hidden costs that are not shown in these various reports from the departments involved should be known to the Congress of the United States. I would hope that the committees going into these matters will look a little behind the figures furnished by the departments on these various projects and see what the ultimate cost is going to be.

Further, I hope they will take into consideration the damage they are doing to the American Indian that we are supposedly trying to help reach an economic level comparable to the other people in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to say that I am unalterably opposed, first to the method of going around the committees of the Congress, which is what has been done in this particular instance. The people downtown knew that if this project came to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where it rightly should be, we would look behind the scenes and develop these things.

Mr. BATTIN. Along that line, it becomes a strange coincidence when the Secretary of the Interior, who has jurisdiction over reclamation projects, signs an agreement with the Corps of Engineers who have jurisdiction over flood control that if Knowles Dam is authorized the Bureau of Reclamation will build it; and at the same time, under the same hat, the Secretary has control over the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If this is flood control then the Corps of Engineers should have the responsibility. It certainly is not dealing fairly or being fair with the Congress or the Indian nations to handle it in that way.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. We are in a peculiar position insofar as the American Indians are concerned. Not only are we trustees for the holdings and property of the Indians, but we are in a position of wardship toward them, and I have been very much alarmed and quite disappointed that something was not done by the department involved to protect the Seneca Nation. I am very much disappointed and a little bit confused, I might say, that the department with the responsibility of protecting the Indians of this country, taking into consideration the peculiar position that we occupy, has not come in here and vigorously opposed this legislation because what we are doing is taking away the economic base of livelihood of an Indian tribe. Then what would we do to them? I suppose some of our do-gooders want to put them on the public relief rolls and let them go on public welfare, because that is what it amounts to.

Of course, we would not only be violating the treaty that we have with the Indian nations known as the Hellgate Treaty but we may very well be violating a treaty that we have with our friendly neighbor to the north of us, Canada. I hope the proper committee, if they hope to authorize this project, will go into that phase of the matter because we are constantly talking about other people living up to their commitments. Let us live up to some of our commitments and, if we have to have a so-called image all over the world, let us build up our own household so to speak and build our own image to show that we are treating the people of this Nation, the first Americans so to speak, with a little more fairness and a little more justice.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. I believe the gentleman is referring to the treaty we have entered into with Canada whereby there cannot be any storage projects on this river without the consent of the Canadian Government. Of course, no consent has been forthcoming so that instead of violating an old treaty entered into in the 1800's, just with the Indians, we are also talking about a treaty recently entered into with the Dominion of Canada.

Basically, I am concerned about this not because we are talking about one tribe, even though that is very important. In the area I represent in Montana, this Indian nation is not even involved. But what it does get down to is that in eastern Montana I represent some five Indian reservations and the rights of these people to me are very basic, and when we can on the one hand say that we are going to abrogate an agreement we made with them in order to satisfy the desires of some people, it becomes imperative that we live up to our obligation even though, perhaps, we now feel we have the short end of the bargain.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the situation with reference to the proposed Federal Knowles project on the Flathead River in western Montana.

Mr. Speaker, Knowles Dam is one of the projects being recommended for Federal construction in the rivers and harbors and flood control proposals now under consideration by the House Public Works Committee.

The project has been studied and recommended by the Corps of Engineers but it now is proposed that construction and operation be in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation, although there are no reclamation purposes assigned to it.

PROJECT COST

The estimated cost of Knowles project has been set at $272,964,000, including interest during construction. However, an engineering witness of the Northern Pacific Railway testified before the Senate Public Works Committee last fall that the Corps of Engineers had understated the cost of railroad relocations by $32,970,000, so that the overall cost of Knowles may run to $305,934,000.

PROJECT STATISTICS

Knowles would be a concrete gravity and earth-fill dam 266 feet high, creating a reservoir with 3,080,000 acre-feet of usable storage. The reservoir area would flood out or take out of production 59,314 acres of land, including 9,000 acres of irrigated cropland. The powerhouse would have 256,000 kilowatts of installed capacity.

COST PER KILOWATT

Knowles would cost from $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt of installed capacity, making it the most extravagant project in the Columbia River Basin. Federal projects now on the Columbia River range in cost from $748 per kilowatt at Albeni Falls to $103 per kilowatt at Grand Coulee.

KNOWLES PURELY A POWER PROJECT

The only purpose for the Knowles project is commercial power production by the Federal Government. The project has no reclamation benefits. Flood control objectives of the region can be met by the Canadian Storage Treaty and construction of other projects in the basin with higher benefit-cost ratios than Knowles so that the project is not needed for flood control.

KNOWLES IS MARGINAL

The original analysis of Knowles by the Corps of Engineers admitted to a benefit-cost ratio of 1.08 to 1, which made it the poorest project recommended for construction in the Columbia River Basin. Later, the Corps extended the assumed life of Knowles to 100 years and achieved a benefit-cost ratio of 1.2 to 1 but the project still is the poorest one proposed for construction. The current benefit-cost ratio being used is unrealistic because first, power benefits are based on what it would cost to produce power from a steam-electric plant rather than what the power revenues of Knowles would bring the Government; second, the interest rate of 2⅝ percent is far below the cost of money to the Government itself; third, project costs do not include any compensation to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes for Indian lands and powersites which the project would flood, and fourth, the assumed life of 100 years is completely unjustifiable because developments in nuclear power will make the plant obsolete long before the 100-year period has been passed.

KNOWLES WOULD OPERATE AT A LOSS

If a realistic interest rate of 4 percent is used and if the project is credited only with the power revenues it would produce for Bonneville Power Administration, which would market the power, Knowles would operate at a loss of between $10 million and $11 million per year. Thus, the total loss to the taxpayers of the Knowles project would be $550 million over a 50-year period or more than $1 billion over a 100-year period.

KNOWLES WOULD PREVENT TAXPAYING CONSTRUCTION

Knowles reservoir would flood out the Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and Buffalo Rapids No. 4 hydroelectric projects which the Montana Power Co. is ready and willing to build and on which the company has filed an application for a Federal Power Commission license. Construction of the Buffalo Rapids projects would result in a saving to the Federal Government, payment of taxes to Federal, State, and local governments and adequate compensation to the Indians for their lands and powersites.

THE $138,600,000 LOSS IN TAXES

The Buffalo Rapids projects would have 240,000 kilowatts of capacity, practically the same as Knowles, and would produce, under Montana Power construction and operation, tax revenues of $2,772,000 annually for Federal, State, and county governments and local school districts. The tax contribution of the Buffalo Rapids developments would be $138,600,000 over the 50-year life of the FPC license.

BUFFALO RAPIDS PROJECTS MORE ECONOMICAL

The Buffalo Rapids projects would cost $42 million or $175 per kilowatt for 240,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Knowles, producing practically the same amount of power, would cost almost seven times as much.

KNOWLES DETRIMENTAL TO IRRIGATION

The Knowles project would flood out 9,000 acres of valuable cropland now under irrigation. In addition to this destruction, Knowles would not irrigate a single acre of land and because it would operate at a loss, it would not be able to contribute any revenue to assist irrigation and reclamation anywhere.

KNOWLES DESTROYS BISON RANGE

The Knowles Reservoir would flood out and destroy the Moiese National Bison Range, which is one of the few public bison refuges in the country. The man who for 11 years was superintendent of this range has stated that Knowles "will spell the ruination of this area which has stood as a monument to conservation for more than 50 years."

FISH AND WILDLIFE WOULD SUFFER

The Knowles Reservoir would flood out feeding grounds and nesting areas of pheasants and migratory birds which have made the Flathead Valley one of the finest hunting areas in the West. In addition, it would flood out winter range and calving grounds of deer and elk and would destroy some of the finest game fishing streams in the Northwest.

KNOWLES WOULD DISRUPT AREA'S ECONOMY

In addition to flooding 59,314 acres of land, the project would displace nearly 1,300 people, destroy 527 buildings, flood 35 miles of railroad lines, 115 miles of highways and roads, and 158 miles of utility lines and pipelines.

WASHINGTON LAGS BEHIND OTHER FREE WORLD CAPITALS IN HOME RULE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been working for home rule for the beleaguered District of Columbia feel as though we are watching the rerun of an old TV movie for the umpteenth time. Unfortunately in the plot fashioned by the House District Committee, justice does not triumph. In

this 88th Congress, we are now witnessing the same disheartening spectacle we have seen in every Congress since the 80th. Home rule bills are introduced in both Houses. In the other body, hearings are held or scheduled. Five times since 1948, a home rule bill has passed the Senate. But on the other side of the Capitol, enter the House District Committee. Home rule bills are committed to it and emerge nevermore. Occasionally some hearings are held but even that has been dispensed with in recent sessions.

Given the present rules of the House and the composition of the District committee, the only means of getting a home rule bill to the floor—where it would almost certainly pass—is a discharge petition. But this, in effect, requires an extraordinary majority. So the failure to obtain the required 218 signatures has been the last scene in this longrun performance.

A new plot with a happy ending that will give the three quarters of a million people of the District of Columbia the right to govern themselves and to solve their own problems is long past due.

I have recently made a study of home rule in many of the major capitals of the world. That study discloses that the residents of the District of Columbia have a lesser degree of home rule than residents of almost any other capital in the free world.

The District of Columbia, with its three Commissioners appointed by the President, a city council which is in reality the Congress of the United States, and its school board which is appointed by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, affords no opportunity for its citizens to participate in the democratic process of self-government. Why should this capital of the free world not permit its own citizens to exercise their voice in municipal government?

To make clear the remarkable contrast between the situation of the citizens of Washington and their counterparts in other free nations, I am presenting short résumés of the types of government which exist in other capitals of the free world.

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

Local self-government in Stockholm is greater than in any other city in Sweden.

Sweden is divided into 24 provinces each having its own financial government. Stockholm, however, is a separate government unit with combined functions of a city and a province.

The legislature of Stockholm is the city council, composed of 100 popularly elected city councilors. These city councilors are elected to 4-year terms. Each year, the city council elects a chairman who is the titular head of the city government but has no executive power. The city council legislates on all matters of municipal affairs, as well as on matters concerning the highly developed Swedish system of social welfare, public health, care of the aged and the poor, and the centralized school system.

The city council annually elects from among its own members 12 individuals who serve on the city collegium. One of these 12 members is chosen by the city council to serve as chairman of the city collegium. The city collegium prepares the city council's agenda and represents the city before the courts and administrative agencies.

The power of administration of city affairs in Stockholm is exercised by a board of commissioners. This board is composed of 10 commissioners elected by the city council to 4-year terms. The commissioners need not be members of the city council—although they may be—and must be "persons with special insight and experience in local government or in other pertinent functions." One commissioner is elected by the city council to serve as chairman of the board of commissioners. Each of the other nine commissioners manages one of the city's main departments—finance, personnel, real estate, city building, industry, social welfare, culture, public health, and regional planning.

A commissioner, as head of a department, does not exercise complete power within his department. The nine departments are governed by a small number of special boards designated by the city council. The special boards of between 7 and 15 laymen are elected by the city council from among the citizens of Stockholm. A commissioner chairs each of these boards. The boards decide on matters of importance within their jurisdiction.

The representative of the King of Sweden in Stockholm is the city governor. The city governor has major supervisory authority over the activities of the city authorities, is competent to hear appeals from their decisions, and is responsible for carrying out national government functions in Stockholm.

The governor acts as chief of police and chief of civil defense. He oversees the administration of justice, is the supreme tax authority, and supervises the annual census-taking in Stockholm. In general, it is his duty to "carefully follow the state of affairs in the capital city, and its needs, and to promote the welfare of the city and its population."

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

The legislative body for the federal district of Argentina is the deliberative council. The council is composed of 30 members elected by the resident of the federal district. The council deals with problems concerning city finances, local taxes, streets, public works, traffic, hospitals, and jails.

The chief executive of Buenos Aires is the intendente, or mayor, whose duties include implementing local ordinances. He is appointed by the President of Argentina.

Residents of the federal district of Buenos Aires elect representatives to Congress. Deputies are elected to the Chamber of Deputies on the basis of one deputy for every 85,000 people. Because of the high concentration of people in the federal district more than one-fifth of the members of the Chamber of Deputies are elected from Buenos Aires. Undoubtedly, this contributes to the success of federal legislation benefiting the capital city. The senate is composed of two senators from each of the provinces and two from the federal district.

PARIS, FRANCE

Because of the importance of the city of Paris, local government is more closely dependent upon the wishes of the central government than in any other city in France.

Paris has a municipal council of 90 members elected to 6-year terms by the people. The council annually elects a president who represents the city and presides over the council. The council deliberates and passes resolutions on all matters concerning the city's finances, police, highways, education, fine arts, public assistance, and public health. Resolutions passed by the council are submitted to the prefect of the Seine for approval.

The prefect of the Department of the Seine, who is appointed by the President of the Republic on the advice of the Minister of Interior, is the administrative head of the city. He directs all the administrative agencies of the city. His powers are more extensive than those of prefects in other areas of France. He has the power to void any resolution submitted by the Municipal Council of Paris. Paris, unlike any other city in France, has also a prefect of police who supervises the city's police force.

NEW DELHI, INDIA

Municipal government in the city of New Delhi is invested in the Delhi Municipal Corporation.

The legislative branch of the Delhi Municipal Corporation is composed of councilors and aldermen. The councilors represent each of the city wards. There are 100 councilors elected to a 4-year term. The councilors in turn appoint six aldermen from among the qualified electors of the city to serve for 4-year terms. Each year the corporation elects a mayor to represent the city and to preside over the meetings of the councilors and aldermen. All matters concerning public health and safety, education, taxation, finance, and public works are controlled by the corporation.

The executive branch of the corporation rests in a commissioner appointed by the Central Government of India for a 5-year term. He supervises all the activities of the city government.

OTTAWA, CANADA

Home rule in Ottawa is much the same as is found in other principal cities of Canada.

The city government of Ottawa is vested in a city council consisting of a popularly elected mayor, a board of control of four controllers elected at large, and 22 aldermen, 2 elected from each of the city's 11 wards.

The city council manages the city finances, levies and collects taxes, and supervises the work of the administrative departments of the city.

The mayor acts as chairman of the board of control and presides over city council meetings. He also is a member of all committees of the council and board of control. He is the chief executive of Ottawa, Canada.

The board of control acts as a standing committee of the city council; prepares all business for the council, supervises all financial transactions, and recommends personnel for municipal ap-

pointments. At city council meetings, a controller has the same voting privilege as an alderman.

ROME, ITALY

The city government of Rome is basically the same as that of other Italian cities.

The main organ of government in Rome is the communal council. It is composed of 80 councilors elected for 4-year terms by universal suffrage. The communal council passes regulations governing city personnel, public works, taxes, health, welfare, and police. The communal council also elects the mayor and a city council from among its members.

The city council is made up of 15 members; the mayor, 12 assessors and 2 alternates. The city council acts as an executive committee of the communal council. In addition to serving on the city council, each assessor supervises one of the city's 12 main departments: staff, properties, taxes, health, education, food inspection and control, markets, welfare, equipment, vital statistics, technological services, and supplies.

The mayor is the executive head of the city of Rome and represents it at all official occasions. He is also, by virtue of his mayoral position, a central government official. He prepares the agenda for the councils, carries out their decisions, and supervises the city's departments and institutions.

The Central Government of Italy exercises control over the city of Rome through the prefect of the province of Rome, who is the representative of the executive branch of the government in the province, and through the Minister of Interior. The prefect of Rome reviews all legislation enacted by the councils and determines whether it is in accord with Italian law. If a regulation is found to be in violation of Italian law, the prefect of Rome has the power to annul it. All matters concerning economic affairs in Rome are reviewed by the Italian Minister of the Interior, who also has the power to reverse any decision which he feels is a violation of Italian law.

LONDON, ENGLAND

The British capital, encompassing an urban area of 722 square miles and a population of more than 8 million, is governed by a number of major and subordinate local governments, including the administrative County of London, parts of five other counties, and the city of Westminister. In each of the governing units of the British capital, there is a popularly controlled council exercising power set out for it by statute.

In the administrative County of London, which covers a large part of the metropolis, there is a county council consisting of 126 councilors, who are elected directly, and 21 aldermen, who are named by the councilors. The council elects its chairman annually.

Matters of policy are decided by the council as a whole and council committees supervise administration.

The city of Westminster, where are located the House of Parliament, Buckingham Palace, and the principal Government offices, is governed by a council consisting of a mayor, 10 aldermen, and 60 councilors, who are responsible to the electorate of the city.

The local governments have authority over such functions as education, fire protection, health and welfare services, housing, sewerage, planning, and parks. Police, however, are controlled by the Home Office, a department of the National Government.

TOKYO, JAPAN

Since 1947, Japan has had a democratic system of local self-government. The capital city of Tokyo is a metropolitan prefecture. Its executive branch is the governor, and the legislative body is the metropolitan assembly, both elected by the people of Tokyo.

All city ordinances for Tokyo are passed by the assembly and enforced by the governor. The national supervision over the local affairs of Tokyo is in the nature of recommendations, advice, and requests.

VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Vienna, capital of Austria, is at the same time the capital city and one of the nine states of the Federal Republic of Austria. It holds a special position among Austrian cities combining the rights of a city with those of a state. The municipal and state functions are exercised by the same officials. The mayor of Vienna is also the state governor, and the members of the Vienna City Council are members of the state diet.

The members of the municipal council are elected by the people of Vienna. The municipal council decides on all matters of municipal interest concerning Vienna.

The mayor of Vienna is elected by the members of the municipal council. He is head of the city government and presides over the meeting of both the city council and the municipal council. In his capacity as state governor, the mayor has certain executive powers granted to him by the central government.

The city council of Vienna is composed of 12 city councilors elected by the municipal council. Like the mayor, the city councilors are not members of the municipal council. The city councilors direct the activities of the 12 principal departments of the city of Vienna.

In addition to my studies on the home rule in various capitals of the free world, I have investigated the types of government which exist in Warsaw, Poland; Moscow, Russia; and Peiping, Communist China. No home rule exists in these three major Communist capitals. I include my studies on these three cities.

MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Moscow has no home rule or local self-government as we know it in the free world. Moscow is ruled by a city Soviet. The Moscow City Soviet consists of approximately 850 members. While elected by the people of Moscow, the city Soviet has no will of its own and is constantly restricted by the intervention of the local Communist Party machinery and by surveillance from higher Soviets; both of which have the power to override the city Soviet's decisions.

Despite the large range of functions delegated to the city Soviet, it actually is the organ of Central Government power in the capital city of Moscow. All orders and regulations of the Central Government are carried out by the city Soviet.

The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee is composed of 60 members who carry out the directives of both the local and Central Governments.

WARSAW, POLAND

A great deal of home rule was exercised by Warsaw during the pre-Communist period. Even after World War II, the city council, borough council, and city executive board of Warsaw, ran that city's municipal government. This home rule was in force until 1950 when the Central Government abolished all units of local self-government in Poland. This brought an end to the autonomous position of the city of Warsaw.

PEIPING, CHINA

Peiping is a municipality directly under Central Government control. Shanghai is the only other city in Communist China in this category. The policy of the Chinese Communist Government is that the Communist Party is the organ which controls all state affairs, central as well as local. Peiping has a local people's council, but all matters discussed by the local council are subject to the approval, or disapproval, of the party committee in Peiping. Since the local council is so close to the central apparatus of the Communist Party, the policies of the party are more rigidly enforced in Peiping than in any other area of Communist China.

The District of Columbia, Mr. Speaker, has as little home rule as the capitals of the Communist world. I contend that the citizens of Washington, D.C., deserve better treatment from Congress than that afforded the citizens of Communist capitals by their governments.

DALLAS AUTHOR TELLS HOW COMMUNISM WON IN ASIA

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the review of a scholarly work on "How the Far East Was Lost" by Dr. Anthony Kubek, chairman of the political science department at the University of Dallas. The review by Ken Thompson appeared in the Dallas Morning News. I commend this description of the work and Dr. Kubek's book for all those who are concerned with the failure of our policy in dealing with the Communist conspiracy to rule the world.

OUR DISASTER IN THE EAST

(By Ken Thompson)

The story of America's most complex and disastrous era of diplomacy—detailing how the Far East was lost, from 1941 to 1949—has

been explained and documented as never before by Dr. Anthony Kubek, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Dallas. Although we are not ordinarily inclined to dole out heavy superlatives, on this occasion an exception must be made. The book is far and away the most outstanding contribution to date as a serious evaluation of this crucial era of American diplomacy.

It is a masterpiece of scholarly research and analysis. The author spent 7 years of intensive study, digesting the record of more than 300 books, articles, official government documents and private papers of key individuals. It is a formidable work of documentation, containing more than 1,500 footnotes.

And yet it is not at all dull and difficult, as comprehensive works of this sort tend to be. It is exceptionally well organized and lucidly written.

Although much of the story which Dr. Kubek tells has been published before, it has never been told so completely or so well. There is also a good deal of highly significant material which has never before been published until the appearance of this book. Although many of the conclusions drawn by the author will be vigorously challenged, the book should establish for him a reputation as one of the Nation's most outstanding, if controversial, scholars on the Far East.

Divided into three major parts plus a postmortem, the book deals first with the destruction of the traditional balance of power in the Pacific. This section covers primarily the efforts and effects of U.S. diplomacy at Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It describes briefly the causes of our war with Japan, itemizes the disastrous effects of President Roosevelt's personal diplomacy with Stalin, tells in detail how the Soviet Union was brought into the Pacific war at the last moment and analyzes the consequences of our decision to drop the A-bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The second section deals with the undermining of Chiang Kai-shek during the war by our officials here and in China. The author makes clear that this tragedy was accomplished primarily through the bypassing of policies and orders set forth by Roosevelt. It was accomplished by both enemy agents and naive officials who could not comprehend the nature of the Communist "agrarian reformers" in China. The role played by Gen. Joseph Stilwell and the Treasury Department in weakening the Nationalist government in China is one of the most fascinating episodes of the book. The section also includes a great deal of interesting and valuable information on the roles played by Owen Lattimore, John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent, John Paton Davies, Lauchlin Currie, and Harry Dexter White.

The concluding portion deals with the period after the war leading up to the fall of free China. This covers the role played by Gen. George Marshall and the Institute of Pacific Relations. In every respect it was certainly the most tragic period. For many of the disastrous mistakes made during the war had been partially uncovered. It was only after a frenzied campaign to cover up or justify those mistakes that we continued to employ both the policies and policymakers that had been responsible for the wartime calamities.

Many people may say today that this is all something now in the past. Sure, we made mistakes, but what of it? You can't erase history. That is certainly true. But it is no less true that, if we understand history, we can avoid repeating it.

The China debacle is without equal as a case study in Soviet conquest. The lessons that can be learned from it are vital for free people, both here and elsewhere. Today many of the same people who were responsible for causing that debacle are still guiding or influencing the conduct of American foreign affairs. Certainly many of the same or similar policies are still in effect.

Unless enough of our citizens and leaders take it upon themselves to learn the tremendously costly lessons taught in the Far East from 1941 to 1949, we are doomed to repeat the losses again, and next time the cost could be our survival as a free and independent people.

HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a number of long-overdue amendments to the Housing Act of 1949 in order to prevent clearly unnecessary and excessive demolition of residential and commercial buildings in federally aided urban renewal projects, and to greatly reduce the extravagant waste in them and their cost to the taxpayers.

My amendments are designed to implement a number of recommendations made by the Comptroller General of the United States. These recommendations were based on his recent studies of urban renewal projects in Cleveland, Ohio, and other cities, and also on his earlier study of urban renewal in Washington, D.C.

My new housing bill, H.R. 8138, also includes amendments to the Housing Act of 1949 which are similar to those recently introduced by Senators JACK MILLER, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, WAYNE MORSE, and JOHN G. TOWER, and by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] in this House.

My bill, H.R. 8138, would—

First. Prohibit the acquisition, disposition, or demolition of residential or commercial buildings in urban renewal projects which are not substandard.

Second. Provide a continuous watchdog review and inspection by the Senate and House Housing Subcommittees of all federally aided urban renewal projects in order to reduce the present huge cost of such projects.

Third. Strengthen and expand local government control of federally aided urban renewal projects. At the present time, such projects are usually undertaken by autonomous agencies which are not under the effective control of local governments. Under the Widnall bill, local governments would have full legal and practical control of urban renewal projects.

Fourth. Encourage States to enact laws allowing local governments to pledge increased tax revenues flowing from urban renewal projects as security for the financing needed to pay for such projects. These projects could be made self-liquidating through such local financing, and the tax burden on Federal taxpayers would be greatly reduced or completely eliminated. California already has such a law. The Widnall bill provides that in States enacting such laws urban renewal projects would be given priority and particular consideration over urban renewal projects in those States which do not provide such local financing.

Fifth. Provide that housing constructed in urban renewal projects will be designed for occupancy by persons from the middle and lower income segments of the population, and that the rentals or other charges to be established will not exceed the level which such persons can reasonably be expected to pay.

Sixth. Direct the HHFA Administrator to (a) check with appropriate domestic and foreign officials regarding tax policies and other devices, such as zoning, and housing codes used to (1) halt the development and spread of urban blight and slums, (2) make slum and blighted properties unprofitable, and (3) encourage and aid private renovation and rehabilitation of residential and commercial real property, and (b) publish his findings from time to time together with such recommendations as he may deem necessary or appropriate in order that such objectives may be achieved throughout the several States. Norman P. Mason, head of the HHFA, under President Eisenhower, was particularly interested in the use of such devices. Recently, the Social Security Agency issued a study, "Slums and Social Insecurity," made in cooperation with HHFA experts, which went deeply into this subject.

I include the text of my bill, H.R. 8138, amending the Housing Act of 1949, for the information of my colleagues and invite those who are interested, and who wish to, to introduce companion measures.

H.R. 8138

A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prevent unnecessary or excessive demolition of buildings in urban renewal projects, to require that housing constructed in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas be designated for middle and lower income families, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "and (iii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(iii) to give satisfactory assurances that any housing which may be constructed on such property in the redevelopment of the area will include cooperative housing and will be designed for occupancy by persons from the middle and lower income segments of the population, and that the rentals or other charges to be established for living accommodations in such housing will not exceed the level, as determined by the local public agency, which such persons can reasonably be expected to pay; and (iv)".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include (except as provided in paragraph (7) above) (A) the construction or improvement of any building, or (B) the acquisition, disposition, or demolition of any building other than a substandard building. The term 'redevelopment' and derivations thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment."

(b) Section 110 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(1) 'Substandard building' means any building other than a building (1) which can be economically improved or modified to

meet requirements reasonably established by the local public agency for integration into an urban renewal plan, and (2) whose owner or lessee promptly agrees, and presents satisfactory evidence that he is able, to make such improvements or modifications within a reasonable time limit set by the local public agency."

(c) Section 110(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; but no area shall be considered or adopted as an urban renewal area unless the local public agency shall have surveyed such area and affirmatively determined, after public notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, that at least 20 per centum of such area is blighted and constitutes slums".

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows: " 'Local public agency' means a country, municipality, or other local government, or a State, or any public body exercising all of its functions relating to a project as agent for a local government or a State, or two or more such local governments, States, or bodies, authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any urban renewal project with respect to which a contract has been entered into under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 prior to July 1, 1965, for advances of funds for surveys and plans or for loans or grants.

SEC. 4. Section 101 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) It is the policy of the Congress that localities desiring to undertake urban renewal or similar projects should be encouraged to take all possible steps to obtain the necessary financing from State and local sources, both public and private. In the case of a locality which will permit increases in tax revenues resulting from the redevelopment of an urban renewal area to be pledged for the payment of principal and interest charges on obligations issued for the financing of the project, or which is otherwise found to have taken all possible steps to obtain State or local financing as described in the preceding sentence, the Administrator shall give priority and particular consideration to an application for assistance under this title to provide any additional funds which may be necessary for the project."

SEC. 5. Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shall give due consideration to such studies (as "Slums and Social Insecurity" by the Social Security Administration) and consult with such State and local officials (as those in Arlington County, Virginia, Milwaukee, New York, and Boston), and with appropriate officials in other countries, where use is made of such devices as zoning, housing codes, and tax policies to (1) halt the development and spread of urban blight and slums, (2) make slum and blighted properties unprofitable, (3) encourage and aid private renovation and rehabilitation of real property, and (4) preserve areas, structures, parks, green spaces, sites, and other properties possessing local, regional, or national importance and recreational, esthetic, architectural, historic, cultural, or other characteristics or associations worthy of preservation and enhancement, and shall publish his findings from time to time together with such recommendations as he may deem necessary or appropriate in order that such objectives may be achieved throughout the several States.

SEC. 6. In order to insure that the objectives of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 (Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal) are carried out, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate shall continuously review the administration of such title and maintain such inspection as may be necessary of urban renewal projects assisted under such title in order to—

(1) insure that the recommendations made from time to time by the Comptroller General of the United States to improve urban renewal programs and administration are carried out;

(2) revise the present criteria governing the eligibility of areas for large-scale demolition with a view to relating these criteria to the structural conditions of the specific buildings being considered;

(3) clarify the present criteria for Federal participation in proposed large-scale demolition projects with specific reference to less costly forms of urban renewal such as rehabilitation and spot clearance;

(4) achieve more effective administration, at all levels, of the Urban Renewal Administration policy so that the Federal Government will not share in the cost of a project which involves the acquisition or demolition of properties which can be economically improved or modified and integrated into an urban renewal plan;

(5) achieve more thorough examinations by qualified personnel of the condition of structures in proposed urban renewal areas before urban renewal projects are approved; and

(6) make and publish their findings from time to time together with such recommendations for administrative, legislative, and other action as they may deem necessary or appropriate.

NO FEDERAL AID TO BAYLOR UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the bill providing Federal aid to higher education, including nonprofit institutions, was being debated in the House of Representatives, it was recklessly asserted by some Members of Congress, especially those on the committee handling the bill, that Baylor University, a Baptist school in Texas, had received large amounts of tax aid in the past. This has been specifically, forthrightly and strongly denied by some of those who are interested in this great institution. At the request of Dr. Daniel W. O'Reagan, pastor of the Burchill Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Tex., I quote pertinent parts of his letter to me on the subject as follows:

On May 16, the newspapers carried a story about the House bill to grant $175 million in Federal funds for construction of medical and dental college facilities, and teaching facilities in hospitals. I read about your objecting to the fact that a Texas Baptist institution, Baylor University, had received a grant as part of Representative ALBERT QUIE'S bill. I agree with you wholeheartedly. Unless you laymen in high positions champion this cherished doctrine of separation, the wall will soon be breached and our public institutions will be brought into disrepute. Education is a part of the great commission of Jesus Christ, and you can be confident that religious groups maintain educational and eleemosynary institutions to make converts for their particular faith. To give any of them Federal funds for either elementary or higher education is to take public tax revenues to make religious converts. I agree with our President that this is clearly unconstitutional.

Concerning Baylor, I have written to Waco, to Dr. Abner McCall, Baylor president; to Earl Hankamer, chairman of board of Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston; to Harry B. McCarthy, dean of Baylor University College of Dentistry in Dallas; and to W. R. White, chancellor of Baylor University in Waco. Without exception, these men have said that the money received was for research contracts in which the Government receives back services equivalent to the money involved, and in such cases no gift is received. In fact, they say that in some cases, the sums received under such research contracts do not always quite pay for the costs of research. Usually, the money is assigned to a special professor for a special research purpose. Recent research contracts have involved the training of chimpanzees for the National Space Agency in Houston, and research on blood dyscrasia and tooth decay for the Atomic Energy Commission done by Baylor College of Medicine in Dallas.

Since these men are the administrators of the respective institutions, and since the Baptist General Convention of Texas has instructed all of our colleges to accept no Government grants, could you please call a news conference to let it be known that this is a research contract, and not an out and out gift or loan?

Mr. Speaker, I have personal knowledge that Baptist institutions generally throughout the country are very much opposed to any Federal aid in the form of grants to themselves, their schools, hospitals or other establishments, and I personally glory in this principle which we Baptists inherited from one of the great patriotic, pioneer church leaders of our Nation, Roger Williams of Rhode Island. I deplore very much the attitude of many Baptist Congressmen who have forgotten all about Roger Williams and his principle and now find themselves willing to support Federal aid to church schools or institutions. It is wrong, un-American and unconstitutional and will always be so, in my opinion.

IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would implement the immigration program recently proposed by President Kennedy. This legislation, similar to that already introduced by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], represents an important and much-needed step toward correcting a serious blot on the image of the United States. Our existing immigration laws, even when viewed in their most favorable light, are grossly inequitable. The quota system is a thinly disguised attempt to key the criteria for entry to the United States to a discriminatory concept of national interests.

It seems especially ironic that a country which is composed almost entirely of immigrants and descendants of immigrants should have adopted such discriminatory exclusion policies. From the time of the first settlement of the American Colonies until early in this century our country welcomed millions of immigrants. Then, as the supply of open land became exhausted and the cities filled with persons looking for work, policies of restriction began to be imposed. While one can hardly argue that immigration should have remained completely unrestricted, it is hard to justify the way in which certain groups have been welcomed while others are turned away. The first victims of this discrimination were the Orientals. Fear of the "Yellow Peril" led to the conclusion of Theodore Roosevelt's "gentlemen's agreement" between the United States and Japan, with a resulting drastic reduction in Japanese immigration. During the First World War the Congress became receptive to an expansion of the policies of exclusion, with the peoples of southeastern Europe as the new target. After the passage of severel temporary measures, the Immigration Act of 1924 gave permanent status to the discriminatory national origins quota system. This system was perpetuated in the McCarran-Walter Act, which was passed over the veto of President Truman in 1952. While this law still remains in full effect, its provisions are frequently circumvented through special legislation and private bills. Nevertheless, the law has resulted in many serious inequities. For example, Great Britain is assigned over 65,000 quotas annually, with 25,000 of them not being used. At the same time 265,000 Italians are on a waiting list for 5,666 quotas. Additionally, such populous countries as India and Indonesia, as well as most Afro-Asian nations are given only 100 quotas per year.

The existence of this quota system has caused untold damage to the prestige of the United States. It is an affront not only to the extremely important emerging nations of Africa and Asia, but also to some of our closest allies, such as Greece and Italy. These countries must consider our immigration laws as no less than an insult to their peoples and their nations.

The principal feature of this bill is the elimination of the national origins quota system. This would be accomplished over a period of 5 years, by reducing existing national quotas at a rate of 20 percent yearly and placing these quotas in a quota-reserve pool. Quotas which are currently unused will also go into this pool. The quotas in the pool will be made available to reduce the backlog of persons now on waiting lists for entry into the United States. Persons from all countries will be admitted in the order of the dates of their applications. However, immigrants from any country, in any year, will be limited to 10 percent of the total number of quotas in the pool. Some persons would be adversely affected if, when their country's quota is reduced, they were subsequently put at the end of the long waiting list. To compensate for this, the President would be authorized to reserve up to 50 percent of the quotas to persons disadvantaged in this manner. After the elimination of the backlog, a process which will take several years, immigrants would be admitted on a first-come, first-served basis, within preference categories similar to those in existence now. The total number admitted will be limited to about 164,000, and with any country limited to 10 percent of the total.

Another important feature of this legislation is the complete elimination of the Asiatic-Pacific triangle regulations which discriminate severely against potential Asiatic immigrants.

The bill would also give recently independent Western Hemisphere nations the same nonquota status as is now accorded to those states in the Americas which were independent when the McCarran-Walter Act was passed.

An Immigration Board, consisting of seven members appointed by the President would be established under the terms of the bill. This Board would conduct investigations and make recommendations to the President on overall immigration policies and the distribution of quotas.

I feel that the President's proposals are well reasoned and that the solutions he has proposed represent a needed breakthrough in our immigration policy. I believe that the plan to at least temporarily limit the total number of aliens admitted is both wise and necessary. We must insure that we do not create further problems by stimulating a vast influx of persons who come here seeking a land of opportunity, only to find prospects for continued unemployment and life as a public charge.

It is also in the interest of fairness that the administration proposal provides that any country will be limited to 10 percent of the total number of immigrants admitted each year. This serves to give all potential immigrants an equal opportunity to enter the country.

While I would like to see the quota system wiped out immediately, I realize that such complex changes will take time to implement, and even the 5-year time period may seem somewhat long, it is a necessary feature of the legislation.

I hope that each Member of this House will carefully consider both the harm being done to our country by the McCarran-Walter Act and the basic injustice of exclusion policies, and then lend his full support to this legislation. The Members of this House, by supporting the administration proposals, are in the fortunate position of being able to help correct a serious discrepancy between our laws and our avowed national goal of equality for all.

THE REAL FACTS OF THE GESELL REPORT: INSTALLMENT THREE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, because of the intense interest on the part of Members of the House in the so-called Gesell report, providing for further elimination of discrimination and segregation practices impairing the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces, I believe Members will be interested in the following dispassionate and detailed analysis of the report and the resulting action being taken on it by the Defense Department, which was released recently, on August 14, 1963, by the distinguished publication Congressional Quarterly:

McNAMARA ANTIDISCRIMINATION DIRECTIVE STIRS CONTROVERSY

The Defense Department's recent directive covering off-base discrimination against Negro servicemen has been widely attacked by Southern Congressmen as a club to force integration in communities near military bases. But Defense officials say it will be far less sweeping in its effect than initial reports and interpretations indicated. The order was bound to provoke controversy, landing as it did in the midst of this summer's heated civil rights fight and aimed as it was at the Nation's Military Establishment, which is preponderantly located in the South.

The directive was the outgrowth of a report by a special group appointed over a year ago, in June 1962, by President Kennedy and headed by Washington attorney Gerhard A. Gesell. The Gesell report, which was submitted June 21, 1963, and forwarded from the White House to the Pentagon, is a 93-page documentary of problems still encountered by Negro servicemen on military bases as well as in nearby communities. The report made a battery of suggestions for change. It was promptly branded an "infamous document" by southern Congressmen, who have aimed as much fire at the report as at the directive. (The Gesell Committee is now studying the problems of Negroes in the National Guard and Reserves and those stationed overseas.)

The southerners' basic charge is that the administration plans to use the military as an instrument for social change. The Pentagon's basic argument is that it is strictly and simply concerned with military effectiveness, which is impaired by demoralizing segregation.

CONTENTS OF DIRECTIVE

The primary misconception about the directive, according to Defense officials, was that the Department planned to make broad use of its off-limits powers to declare whole communities out of bounds for servicemen. "We hope never to have to use the off-limits sanction," says one Department official. What the July 26 directive did was the following:

Stated that it was the Department's policy to conduct all of its activities in a nondiscriminatory way and that discriminatory practices against servicemen, "all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness."

Vested the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) with responsibility for protecting the civil rights of members of the Armed Forces and authorized establishment of a new Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

Directed the military services to issue instructions, regulations and manuals regarding the protection of civil rights on base and off base, and to institute in each service a reporting and monitoring system.

Held base commanders responsible for combating on-base and off-base discrimination, and directed that "in discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of

his military department use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States."

Directed the military departments to develop the outlines of implementation plans by August 15.

The "off-base" sanction, therefore, was raised negatively, in the context that it should not be used unless absolutely necessary, and only with the approval of the civilian Secretaries. "This was the least offensive way," said one Defense official, "because it works into the system gradually."

"There is no desire to place anything off limits," says another, least of all entire communities.

Early press reports had indicated that the Department would declare off limits whole areas where there was "relentless discrimination." This term did not appear in the directive, but was contained in a memorandum to President Kennedy from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara reporting on the Department's new antidiscrimination directive. The memo included the following sentence: "The (Gesell) Committee suggests using a form of the off-limits sanction when, despite the commander's best efforts with community leaders, relentless discrimination persists against Negro servicemen and their families." The Secretary continued: 'Certainly the damage to military effectiveness from off-base discrimination is not less than that caused by off-base vice, as to which the off-limits sanction is quite customary. While I would hope that it need never be put in effect, I agree with the Committee that a like sanction against discrimination must be available." It is obviously hoped that the mere availability of the sanction will be an effective bargaining lever in negotiations with local officials and businessmen.

Defense officials emphasize that they will move slowly and that they do not and cannot have an overall plan. "It will depend on the community," says one. "Maybe the problem is movie houses in one place, and somewhere else it's housing or schools." Base commanders will have primary responsibility for assessing the problems. The new civil rights office, headed by Deputy Assistant Secretary Alfred B. Fitt, will travel, supervise, support, advise and cajole.

The process, however, will be essentially carried out through the services' command channels, and the emphasis will be no negotiations at the local level.

Some observers have expressed doubts that the base commanders are up to the job. The Gesell report said that "the record of base commanders in dealing with such problems has not been impressive." It blamed this on a lack of specific directives or assurance of support from higher up the command ladder and on the commanders' own attitudes. "As a group," said the Gesell report, "they do not believe that problems of segregation and racial discrimination in the local community should be their concern." Most of the commanders' community contacts have been with the white power structure interested in preserving a peaceful status quo.

However, Pentagon officials expect the commanders to be cooperative. Says Fitt: "I expect the same doubts were expressed in 1948 when President Truman integrated the troops. The commanders may have had personal problems with this, but they did it." The main job, he says, is "to get instructions to the commanders and then back them up and down the line."

NEGRO SERVICEMEN'S PROBLEMS

The commanders have a long list of problems facing them. Both the Gesell report and Department investigations found that Negro soldiers, who are almost without exception thoroughly integrated with their white colleagues on the bases, frequently meet with discrimination on all fronts once they go into town.

(The Committee found just a few examples of remaining discrimination on base, and said these resulted largely from a lack of communication between commanders and their men. The Pentagon is working to correct this. The report also cited the lack of Negro officers in the services. Pentagon officials said all efforts were being made to see that promotions are given on strictly nondiscriminatory grounds, but that what is most needed is time for Negroes, who did not begin to come into the services in any large numbers until the 1930's, to gain sufficient time and experience for high posts. The normal cycle, they said, is about 30 years before an enlisted man becomes an officer.)

In many locales, Negro soldiers cannot go to a bar or restaurant with their white friends; they must ride segregated transportation facilities; their children must attend segregated schools; they cannot find adequate or decent housing for their families. Negro and white soldiers walking down the street together may be told by local police to "break it up." These conditions, says the Gesell report, "are a constant affront and a constant reminder that the society they are prepared to defend is a society that depreciates their right to full participation as citizens." Some results of the discrimination, according to the report, are that many Negro military families separate "to protect their children and to maintain some degree of dignity," and that "there are bases where Negro personnel confront such intolerable conditions off base that almost any device will be employed to effect a change in duty assignment." (The services generally deny transfer applications based solely on discriminatory problems.)

The report says that many of the problems are found in the North as well as the South, and that the housing problem is almost universal. "Some bases established in States such as the Dakotas," the report says, "have confronted forms of segregation and discrimination which have much of the same rigidity found in certain southern communities."

The committee recommended that the commanders work with biracial community committees. It said there were indications that local proprietors in many areas would cooperate if there were a uniform policy.

Defense officials do not pretend that the new directive will solve all of these problems. Fitt outlined the possibilities for progress in the various fields as follows:

Community activities: The Department already had a fixed policy that armed services bands, choirs, sports teams, etc., or representatives of the base, should not participate in community activities if there is segregation. In some areas this has not been carried out, but that will not be the case in the future because of the new instructions.

Transportation: Sometimes transportation facilities which permit integrated seating on base require Negroes to change seats once the bus leaves the base; in other cases there is desegregated seating on the main route to and from the base, but not elsewhere in town. More and more transportation systems in the South are desegregated and, according to Fitt, "there are so many alternatives of travel that commanders can work something out here."

Public accommodations: This, according to Fitt, "is one obvious area of concern to commanders. We're talking here about the ability of a man to buy a sandwich, to go to a park, to go to the movies, to go to a bowling alley. This is a typical kind of activity of men in their free time. When all avenues of that kind of wholesome activity are barred to a serviceman, it has an obvious damaging effect on his morale and effectiveness. Commanders ought to be able to achieve substantial progress for their men in this area because it's so incontestably a reasonable proposition."

Schools: This presents a different kind of problem from trying to get a community to let servicemen walk down the street together or bowl together. Progress in this area will continue to depend largely on protracted litigation. If Congress approves the President's civil rights bill's provision giving the Government the power to bring school desegregation suits, this will make a difference. In the meantime, the Government has filed five suits for the desegregation of schools in districts which receive Federal aid because they have been "impacted" by military installations. The morale of the troops was a major factor listed by the Government in arguing that it should have the right to bring the suits. The Government has won one of the suits at the district court level. Two others were lost and are on appeal. Also, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which administers the impacted areas school program, in 1962 announced that it would build its own on-base schools for the children of Federal employees who live and work on Federal installations if the off-base schools were segregated. The first such schools will be open for the fall, 1963, term. Only elementary schools have been built, because in most cases there were not enough pupils to support high schools. HEW took the position that the law did not allow it to build schools for children whose parents lived or worked off base (Weekly Report, p. 292).

"Progress in this area will obviously take a long time," Fitt said, "because there are no alternatives in the case of schools. But the commanders can make a persistent attempt to get equal schooling for their men's children, and many have done so."

Housing: The housing problem, Fitt says, "is probably the most difficult of all and certainly the most pervasive. It is particularly hard for the commander to do anything about rental housing." The Gesell report recommended that the Government plan for additional Government-owned or controlled housing where the problem is severe and that it makes sure that information on FHA-insured housing, which must be available on a nondiscriminatory basis, is made known to servicemen. The Pentagon is looking over these possibilities. (In one little-noticed action earlier in 1963, the Pentagon established the policy that service bulletin boards throughout the country could not be used to advertise the sale of housing which is not available regardless of race, color or creed.)

The Defense Department parts company with the Gesell report on a number of recommendations. The report recommended that if all else fails, the Department should consider curtailing or closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. McNamara's memo to the President said that he did "not regard this as a feasible action at this time." Thus he did not totally shut the door on the proposal.

The Gesell Committee also recommended that every base should have a specific officer to whom Negroes faced with discrimination can take their complaints. The Department feels that there are various ways this should be handled. The challenge, they say, is to let the victims of discrimination know that there is some point to raising their grievances.

One recommendation which southerners jumped on was that "it should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement." One Defense official said that "any commander who makes an especially commendable performance in this field as in any other field will be recognized, but this does not mean that officers will be promoted solely on the basis of singular accomplishments in this field."

SOUTHERN, GOLDWATER REACTION

Southerners have charged that the Department is exceeding its powers by involving itself with off-base conditions, and is wrongly using the Armed Forces as instruments of social reform. Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, July 31 told the Senate that this could "only result in irreparable injury to the military profession" and that it was "a grave and serious challenge to the long established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities." Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, insisted that by law the military has no control over the civilian areas outside the military base. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, pointed up the irony of the controversy by charging that the directive was "a complete flip-flop from the administration's concept of the danger of a military man taking over." (Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged that it was "the beginning of the police state and commissar program in America." Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, charged that the Gesell committee had recommended that "the defense functions of the military forces be subordinated to achieving the goal of complete integration."

Defense officials go out of their way to deny that they have embarked on a general civil rights crusade or are using the military as instruments of social change. Says one: "We are not trying to change the life of a town, but the way they treat servicemen. Our policy is military effectiveness; in pursuit of this we are asking the military to see that there is no segregation." They reject the argument that they are exceeding their powers. "We have the power to restrain our own troops from engaging in activities which are deleterious to their morale," says one official. "Nothing is more deleterious to their morale than to have some allowed to participate in some activities and others not because of color."

Thus, the southerners argue that the Pentagon does not have the power to compel the desegregation of public accommodations; the Pentagon argues that it is not desegregating the restaurants, etc., but is prepared to order its men not to patronize those which are segregated.

In the course of attacking the order, GOLDWATER charged that Fitt and others went into communities "armed with dossiers on the businessmen of the community, dossiers complete with every figure the committee can get out of income tax returns." The Pentagon issued a flat denial.

Those who attacked the order took pains to say that they were not attacking McNamara himself. They said that the directive had undoubtedly been foisted on him by others in the administration, probably Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy (a more vulnerable political target in their districts). Defense officials laughed at the suggestion that the directive had been forced on McNamara against his will.

TOP 10 STATES

Following are the top 10 States in terms of pay and allowances drawn by servicemen stationed within their borders. (Figures for all States are given in the next table.)

State	Pay	Servicemen
California	$820,436,000	214,861
Texas	726,590,000	177,318
Virginia	321,560,000	86,396
Georgia	312,497,000	83,773
North Carolina	302,806,000	87,489
Florida	263,167,000	62,864
Washington	184,895,000	46,831
Maryland	184,317,000	48,048
Illinois	181,462,000	45,645
Kentucky	177,817,000	49,909

MILITARY PERSONNEL BY STATE

The following table shows the number of military personnel stationed in each State, and annual payrolls, as of December 31, 1962:

	Number	Annual pay and allowances
East (percent)	14.6	14.6
Connecticut	4,933	$18,682,000
Delaware	8,111	$36,286,000
District of Columbia	19,402	$74,107,000
Maine	14,068	$61,783,000
Maryland	48,048	$184,317,000
Massachusetts	33,796	$137,882,000
New Hampshire	8,311	$36,140,000
New Jersey	41,522	$158,247,000
New York	38,914	$157,488,000
Pennsylvania	15,438	$57,800,000
Rhode Island	7,243	$27,363,000
Vermont	464	$1,995,000
West Virginia	630	$2,491,000
West (percent)	27.4	27.4
Alaska	31,452	$126,568,000
Arizona	21,501	$87,434,000
California	214,861	$820,436,000
Colorado	36,568	$147,852,000
Hawaii	41,586	$152,291,000
Idaho	6,125	$26,953,000
Montana	9,494	$42,587,000
Nevada	8,286	$36,036,000
New Mexico	22,660	$95,827,000
Oregon	4,905	$21,593,000
Utah	4,688	$19,561,000
Washington	46,831	$184,895,000
Wyoming	3,793	$17,031,000
Midwest (percent)	12.3	12.9
Illinois	45,645	$181,462,000
Indiana	8,418	$35,092,000
Iowa	1,476	$6,249,000
Kansas	36,954	$147,332,000
Michigan	22,156	$96,731,000
Minnesota	5,260	$21,859,000
Missouri	25,855	$98,737,000
Nebraska	18,621	$82,596,000
North Dakota	10,208	$45,859,000
Ohio	18,935	$81,924,000
South Dakota	5,960	$26,717,000
Wisconsin	4,422	$18,624,000
South (percent)	44.4	43.5
Alabama	21,522	$85,075,000
Arkansas	12,420	$52,032,000
Florida	62,864	$263,167,000
Georgia	83,773	$312,497,000
Kentucky	49,909	$177,817,000
Louisiana	30,708	$121,800,000
Mississippi	29,241	$130,230,000
North Carolina	87,489	$302,806,000
Oklahoma	31,137	$122,682,000
South Carolina	42,528	$167,618,000
Tennessee	18,863	$74,124,000
Texas	177,318	$726,590,000
Virginia	86,396	$321,560,000
Total United States	1,654,554	$6,517,332,000

Source: Department of Defense.

Segregation of public facilities in communities adjacent to military installations

Types of segregated public facility	Number of surveyed installations and activities with such segregated facilities [1]		Number of personnel stationed where facilities are segregated		Percentage of surveyed installations and activities with segregated facilities	
	Army	Navy	Army	Navy	Army	Navy
					Percent	*Percent*
Public schools	48	143	178,109	58,500	24	25
Restaurants and bars	68	238	257,893	110,000	34	43
Theaters	63	223	232,301	105,000	31	40
Swimming pools	19	226	178,201	102,000	9	40
Golf courses	38	164	190,931	82,000	19	29
Beaches	10	203	123,502	90,000	5	36
Bowling alleys	32	194	205,901	103,000	16	35
Libraries	10	49	130,179	28,000	5	9
Public transportation	4	47	41,091	22,000	2	8
Hotels, motels	12	252	205,618	141,000	6	45
Churches	23	163	127,402	70,000	11	29

[1] The Army survey for this table covered 201 installations and activities, while the Navy survey covered 559. Each installation and activity surveyed had 100 or more military personnel assigned to it. Less complete analyses by the Air Force and Marine Corps indicated similar patterns.

Source: Gesell report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and tomorrow, on account of death in his family.

Mrs. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BATTIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY), for 5 hours, on August 28.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, on August 20.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANIK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3872. An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6177. An act to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; and

H.R. 7043. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1136. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 9, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, Calif., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 28, 1958 and July 16, 1958, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1137. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772) providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1185. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 7044. A bill to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1154. An act to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., in Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 8123. A bill to incorporate the Companion Collie Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 8124. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8125. A bill to amend section 207 of the National Housing Act to eliminate the provision presently limiting mortgages thereunder to the cost of the physical improvements involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8126. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8127. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8128. A bill to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8129. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with child-bearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 8130. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior and Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 8131. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the requirement that certain individuals have served on active duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict in order to qualify for retired pay shall not apply to certain individuals who were interned during those periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 8132. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain officers and employees of the United States from interfering under color of law in the free exercise or enjoyment by any person of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8133. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from requiring membership in the Air Force Reserve as a condition of employment in any civilian position in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 8134. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 8135. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8136. A bill to provide for the designation of qualified interpreters to assist defendants who are unable because of deafness to understand proceedings in Federal criminal actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8137. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 8138. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prevent unnecessary or excessive demolition of buildings in urban renewal projects, to require that housing constructed in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas be designated for middle and lower income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 8139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 8140. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R 8141. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8142. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 13, 1954, commonly referred to as the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in certain activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8143. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8144. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8145. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8146. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 496. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2332) to amend title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 497. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary under Public Law 86-272; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protesting the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board rejecting the application of Northeast Airlines for a permanent certificate to run commercial flights between Boston and Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8147. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fe O. Isla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8148. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernardo Da Silva De Jesus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 8149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rebii Mehmet Hankan and his wife, Mesadet Seher Hankan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 8150. A bill for the relief of Stavros P. Tourlis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8151. A bill for the relief of Ionnis Petropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8152. A bill for the relief of Rajinder Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8153. A bill for the relief of Etsuo Miyagishima and his wiffe, Tamae Miyagishima (nee Nogawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 8154. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Caputo and Carluccia Caputo, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8155. A bill for the relief of Otto Bagai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8156. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Pima County, Ariz., to Edward O. Earl and the estate of Madelon Earl; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

251. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Georgie Ferguson, secretary, Spencer County Democratic Women's Club, Rockport, Ind., relative to approving adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment as provided in legislation introduced by Senator J. GLENN BEALL and cosponsored by Senator VANCE HARTKE, which will clarify the meaning of the Constitution of the United States and will permit Bible reading and the recitation of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

252. Also, petition of Jesus D. Sablan, Speaker, 16th Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, relative to the political reintegration of the Mariana Islands with the territory of Guam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

St. Stephen's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, for Americans of Hungarian descent August 20 has particular significance. On this day they pay homage to the great national hero of Hungary—St. Stephen I.

It is not an exaggeration to consider St. Stephen as the father of Hungary, for he was crowned the first King of Hungary in the year 1000 A.D. This act—probably the most significant in the Nation's long history—marked the formation of a kingdom out of the former tribal confederacy.

Stephen's 38-year reign was devoted to consolidating the new state. He developed political institutions which combined the advances made by his western neighbors with the solid foundation of Hungarian traditions. He showed great activity in administrative, legislative, and financial matters.

No wonder, then, that the feast of St. Stephen, the patron saint of the Magyars, has special meaning for Americans of Hungarian origin. I know this to be true in my own city of San Francisco where there are more than 2,500 Hungarian Americans. The many distinguished individuals among them—musicians and teachers, men of great learning and culture—have immeasurably enriched the life of San Francisco. It therefore gives me great pleasure to join with the Hungarian Americans of the San Francisco area and of our country in celebrating St. Stephen's Day.

Secret Deal Over A-Pact Charged—Full Revelation Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows a release to news media dated this evening in which I discuss why a secret side understanding must exist relative to the partial test ban treaty and demand that its terms be disclosed:

SECRET DEAL OVER A-PACT CHARGED—FULL REVELATION DEMANDED

Representative CRAIG HOSMER today charged a secret side agreement has been made with Russia on the partial test ban treaty and demanded the administration make public its terms.

Unless there is such an unrevealed compact, he asserted, "the language of section 2 of article 1 of the treaty will specifically prohibit the United States from using its nuclear arsenal in time of war."

HOSMER, ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of the House GOP committee on nuclear testing said the secret document has long been rumored. He said it probably is in the form of an informal memorandum of understanding between Moscow, Washington, and London as to what the published text of the treaty actually means. It also could consist of notes and memorandums made separately, but contemporaneously, by the parties to the transaction during negotiations or at followup meetings, he stated.

The California solon said suspicions of the existence of the hidden document first were aroused by repeated "ready and positive" statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster as to "exact meanings of certain provisions of the pact." He said no one familiar with Russian tactics in twisting treaty terms could make such statements with assurance unless detailed interpretations had been hammered out with the Russians before hand and put down in black and white.

"As a practical matter," he declared, "it would be reckless and improvident to conclude a treaty with the Soviets without doing so."

President Kennedy has denied any agreements were reached at Moscow other than the treaty itself, as has our chief negotiator, Undersecretary of State W. Averell Harriman and others, including Rusk and Foster. HOSMER said these denials would apply to formal treaties and international agreements, in the usual diplomatic definitions of those terms. He asserted the denials could truthfully not apply to a side-agreement memorandum of understanding or contemporaneous notes, such as he charges exist.

HOSMER said he makes his charge after examining testimony by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Thursday before the combined hearing conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations, and Armed Services Committees and the Senate section of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Taylor testified concerning the Joint Chiefs' concern over the possibility that the treaty might bar firing of nuclear weapons

in time of war. He said the Joint Chiefs "in a body" called on Secretary Rusk and gained assurance that the treaty has "nothing to do with (preventing) the firing of nuclear weapons in time of war."

"Such an assurance," HOSMER declared, "could only be based on a definite and firm understanding between the United States, Russia, and England of the definition of "war" as it relates to this treaty. Otherwise the assurance is in direct contradiction to section 2 of article 1 of the treaty which outlaws, without exception for war or any other circumstance, any nuclear explosion whatever, test or otherwise, in the air, underwater, or in space."

(Text of section 2: "Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this article.")

"In the face of this treaty provision," HOSMER continued, "it would be impossible for such assurance to have been given to the Joint Chiefs unless a side understanding had been reached as to circumstances under which nuclear explosions nonetheless could be carried on despite the treaty's explicit and blanket prohibition."

"The existence of a side arrangement on this point most certainly means that the unrevealed and secret understanding is a comprehensive one, covering all other major points of the treaty," he reasoned.

"All its terms must be revealed if the Senate is to know what it is ratifying or rejecting, and all the other countries who since have signed the treaty are to know to what they are bound."

HOSMER called for an end to "diplomatic doubletalk denials" and "semantic tricks" and for "full revelation of all the understandings reached at Moscow."

His charge was made on Westinghouse Broadcasting System's "Washington Viewpoint" program and amplified in a statement to news media.

The House That Jack Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress have been closely following the work of Frank L. Kluckhohn, prominent newspaperman, State Department security expert, political leader, and author. His three most recent books include "America Listen," "The Naked Rise of Communism," and "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy," and already the first-named has sold more than 1 million copies.

It is most interesting to note that a recent State Department report of a field trip of the Cairo Regional Publications Officer, Mr. Anthony E. Lewis, reveals a series of lists of banned publications issued by the Censor Bureau, Ministry of Guidance and Information, Kuwait. The Government of Kuwait, in addition to banning many Communist and leftist publications, also has banned obscene literature from Kuwaiti shelves.

Included in such a list of books as "Mr. Hot Rod," "Naked Lovers," "Nurses' Quarters," "One Flesh," and "A Need for Love," is Mr. Kluckhohn's work, "The Naked Rise of Communism." Yes, this most valuable treatise on what communism is and what it has done to individual freedom, liberty, and initiative throughout its history was banned on the grounds of the title alone, which apparently made Kuwaiti censors think of things other than international politics.

I am glad to note that Mr. Kluckholn has chosen a "nonobscene" title for his newest book, "The House That Jack Built," which is being published in November by Devin-Adair Co. of New York. This analysis of the men around our President—their backgrounds, philosophy, and influence over all of our lives—will feature the following chapter headings, according to the latest catalog information from the publisher. Under unanimous consent, I include these most descriptive and promising chapter outlines at this point in the RECORD:

A list of the chapters will convey the spirit of the book:

"What Breed of Men Are Making Over America?"

"Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—His Father's Only Son."

"The Genius From MIT, Walt Whitman Rostow."

"The Maxwell Mythologist, Harlan Cleveland."

"Backstage at the Pentagon, Adam Yarmolinsky."

"The Grey Man With Flaming Ideas, Dean Rusk."

"An End to Security."

"Kennedy's Economic Genius, J. K. Galbraith."

"A Bouncing Ball."

"Marvelous McGeorge."

"Lucky, Portly Pierre."

"The Boys From A.D.A."

Miami Metro Government Wins Light Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of Florida's Fourth District, I am privileged to have many occasions upon which to draw the attention of my colleagues to significant events and outstanding honors which have come to my home community.

Never have I felt more pride than I have in the announcement that Metropolitan Dade County, the first governmental body in the world to adopt a code to aid employment of handicapped people, on July 23 of this year was awarded the Mark A. Light Award for its outstanding work.

Named for a handicapped youth in Perrine, Fla., the Light Award is the highest recognition offered by the World Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the junior chambers of commerce, and others.

The code of Metropolitan Dade County covers the elimination of architectural barriers to the employment of the handicapped. This code has been implemented by establishment of means for easy access to public buildings and the facilities therein, such as special rails and other equipment.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that many other communities will follow the lead of Metropolitan Dade County in eliminating unnecessary obstructions to full use by the community of the contribution which can be made by our handicapped citizens. For this reason, I am bringing this story of enlightened community action to the attention of my colleagues.

Meet Goes to Perfection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our State is proud of the results of the recent coal mining first-aid contest conducted at Ebensburg by the Central Pennsylvania District Safety Association, the North Central District Association, Moshannon District Association, and Allegheny-Kisky Valley Safety and First-Aid Association. In one of the most evenly matched contests in 25 years of competition, a perfect score was recorded by the winning team from Diamond Mine of Imperial Coal Corp. at Boltz.

This outstanding exhibition of expert coordination and teamwork, based on thorough and persistent training, should serve as an inspiration to first-aid teams throughout the country. Further, organizations connected with civil defense activities would be well advised to look into the achievements of our first-aid groups and, where practicable, set their own rescue practice programs accordingly.

We congratulate the Diamond Mine team. The performance of each of its members might be compared to the careful and flawless accomplishment of a pitcher who retires 27 consecutive batters without having a single man reach first.

We salute every team and every individual who took part in the competition at Ebensburg. Their dedication to the cause of mine safety and first-aid merit the commendation and gratitude of us all. For this reason I am listing below the order of finish and team rosters:

First. Diamond Mine Team of Imperial Coal Corp., at Boltz, Capt. John Rensko, John Pabrazinsky, John Simon, James Clement, Maurice W. Troska, Nicholas Busoney, Francis Mort and Cleto Santucci.

Second. Mine 32 of Bethlehem Mines Corp., at Revloc, Capt. Gene Persio, Matthew R. Isaacson, Dino Menie, Fred

Parisi, Calvin Prazinko, Steve Zaffuto and John Radebach.

Third. Springfield No. 4 team of Barnes & Tucker Coal Co., Capt. George Kutchman, Robert Stratton, Walter Trybus, Gerald Farabaugh, Tony Kaschack, Peter Trybus, and Gerald Becker.

Fourth. Mine 31, Bethlehem Mines Corp., Nanty Glo, Capt. Earl Soulsby, Anthony Schirato, Illo Bartoletti, Peter Scansaroli, Louis Byich, Walter Hessler, and Ignatius Olsavsky.

Fifth. Harwick Mine, Duquesne Light Co., Capt. Joseph Wilkosz, Joseph Pitlock, Michael Kandziolka, Joseph Sarso, Lois Bott, Maurice Fowler, and John Mudlo.

Sixth. Kelso Mine Team of Bird Coal Co., Capt. Quindo Sidone, Robert Hainsey, Emmanuel Crew, Alex Litko, Andrew Brunnett and Louis Vettori.

Seventh. Harmar Mine of Harmar Coal Co., Capt. C. J. Callahan, John Krasovsky, Rudolph Stanko, Theodore Mackos, Frank Oswald and George Flynn.

The Captive Nations: A Powerful Deterrent Against War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 18, 1963, Americans of Ukranian descent in Youngstown, Ohio, observed Ukrainian Day. This is an annual event of great significance for large numbers of our citizens living in the Youngstown area. The purpose of this annual affair is to spotlight the global struggle between the cause of human freedom and the organized forces of Russian tyranny. It provides an opportunity for public-spirited citizens to renew their commitment to the principles of liberty and national independence. Believing that an alert and informed citizenry is the front line of democracy's defense, the leaders of this annual affair have chosen the theme of captive nations for 1963.

At the request of Michael Yurchison, general chairman of this year's observance, I have provided a statement on "The Captive Nations: A Powerful Deterrent Against War," which follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: A POWERFUL DETERRENT AGAINST WAR

There is no more important issue before the American people today than the captive nations. The gathering storm within the multinational empire of the Russians confronts the United States with a unique leadership opportunity to move ahead in winning peace with justice and freedom. Rising Chinese nationalism in the Far East is exerting pressures on imperial Russia to return the former Chinese territories taken from China more than a century ago by the czars. The strong tide of national independence running in the captive European nations, from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea, is exerting even stronger pressures on imperial Russia. It is these develpoments which have forced the Russians to adopt the tactics of smiling diplomacy, to agree to a limited test ban treaty and to put pressure on the United States for a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact.

The real issue involved here is whether the United States will play an active role in preserving the Russian Communist Empire or whether the United States will take an active role in promoting the emancipation of the captive European nations. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact would do nothing but place a protective Western shield over the Russian empire. On the other hand promotion by the United States of the right of self-determination and self-government for the peoples in all the captive nations, under the prevailing circumstances, would provide a powerful deterrent against war. The Russian empire is the only threat to the security of the United States and to peace. We must never lose sight of this reality.

A Tribute to Brooklyn's 50-Year Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, never before in this Nation's history has there been such a profound concern over the need to ease the pressing shortage of physicians as there is today. While the Nation's medical schools each year produce well-trained and competent graduates, new programs and new concepts designed to alleviate this shortage are constantly being advanced in virtually every segment of the community.

Certainly, every effort must be made to ameliorate this persistent crisis. In meeting the challenge before us, however, we must not overlook the notable achievements of those devoted men and women who have been and are now actively engaged in the practice of medicine. These individuals, without fanfare, live a new drama each day. The hopes and dreams of countless people are largely dependent upon their skill, their wisdom and their compassion. No yardstick has yet been devised which can adequately measure the contributions physicians have made to the health and happiness of those they serve.

Today's physician, be he a general practitioner or a specialist, shoulders a most fantastic burden because of the very shortage I have mentioned. He recognizes that the number of new men entering the profession each year does not compensate for those who either retire or leave the profession for other reasons. He must assume responsibilities which are awesome in their magnitude.

I think you would agree that they have not withdrawn from this challenge. Rather, they have responded with boldness and vigor to the general betterment of the entire community.

In an effort to offer a measure of recognition to the physicians in Brooklyn, the Kings County Physicians Guild, a most distinguished organization representing 3,000 doctors in the borough, will cosponsor with Amfre-Grant, Inc., an ethical pharmaceutical firm, a luncheon on December 11. This function will offer a tribute to those men and women who have given 50 years or more of service to the Brooklyn populace.

Dr. Solomon Schussheim, a most respected physician and board chairman of the guild, and Lewis Stern, president of Amfre-Grant, Inc., will be cochairmen of this important salute, and will jointly present appropriate awards to Brooklyn's 50-year doctors. Dr. Schussheim and Mr. Stern are already making preparations for this fete, and I believe they are to be lauded for manifesting enormous community spirit.

A healthy America is a strong America. A 50-year doctor who has witnessed the evolution from the era of the horseless carriage to the age of exploration in outer space, himself has not basically changed since the day he greeted his first patient. Now, as then, the conquest of disease and the relief from suffering are his fundamental concerns. The tribute to Brooklyn's 50-year doctors is one which is richly deserved.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 17, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

COMMITTEE COMPLETES STUDY ON TAX PROGRAM

The President's tax recommendations for 1963 have occupied the Ways and Means Committee almost daily since February. Finally, a draft bill has been completed, after months of public hearings followed by executive sessions. Both so-called structural reforms, some 32 basic areas (including individual deductible items, real estate depreciation, dividends exemption and inclusion, sick pay exclusion, medical and casualty loss, child care, moving expense, charitable, natural resources, sale of mineral properties, stock options, capital gains, etc.) and rate reductions both individual and corporate.

The structural reforms unbelievably complicate the law with changes and new formulas. Few persons, if any, will be able to fill out a tax form without legal or expert help. So our goal of simplification becomes a hollow joke. Only $1 billion additional in revenue is secured for the Government by all these changes. The rate reform or reduction is divided between individuals and corporations. The total tax cut is approximately $10.7 billion, of which individual rate cuts is about $8.6 billion and corporate $2.1 billion, phased over 2 years; two-thirds cut in calendar year 1964 and one-third in calendar 1965.

The individual rate cuts are dropped from 20 percent to 6 percent to 14 percent in the lowest bracket while in the highest bracket the rate changes are 91 percent to 77 percent

to 70 percent. Corporate rates are dropped from 52 percent to 50 percent (22 normal, 28 surtax) to 48 percent (22 normal, 26 surtax). The individual rates in all but the lowest brackets, that is from $4,000 tax liability on up, have a lesser reduction. Always for political reasons of course, the lowest brackets get preference.

My suggested amendment for the individual rate cut was a flat 20-percent cut for everyone. Tax would be figured as at present and then 20 percent of the tax eliminated to reach tax payment. This would have been fairer as I see it, although no permanent solution inasmuch as this is not a good rate readjustment. My amendment was an effort to improve the bill as were my efforts in oil taxation, real estate depreciation, and others. Yet, in the final analysis many of us knew we should relate any tax cut to reduced Federal spending. Republican efforts in this direction were defeated by votes of 13–12, almost straight party line votes. The bill will now be drafted, studied, and changed before final committee approval or rejection. Then to the Rules Committee and the Floor of the House. Since amendments are not permitted under the rule it is obvious that 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee write the tax law. Members can only approve or reject the final package. Then the Senate will act independently. It looks like no tax bill, if at all, until next year. This gives people a chance to demand reduced spending, a balanced budget, and debt reduction, as equally important to a tax cut.

AID TO EDUCATION

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, H.R. 6143, passed the House (287 to 113) with ALGER voting against. This bill authorizes Federal 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. My own opposition to the bill was summed up in the minority views of Congressman DAVE MARTIN of Nebraska: (1) This is not a proper function of the Federal Government. Our institutions of higher learning should stand on their own feet, whether private or State supported. There has been a great building boom since World War II at our colleges and universities throughout the country. Most of these buildings have been most elaborate and costly and do not indicate that an austerity program is in effect. (2) This bill would authorize to be appropriated during the next 3 years $1,195 million, divided as follows: $660 million for loans for construction grants to graduate schools, and $360 million for loans for construction. In view of the budget deficit during the present fiscal year, and in view of the projected $12 billion deficit for fiscal year 1964, as well as the expected deficits for future years, I feel that it is fiscally irresponsible to authorize new spending programs at this time. Approximately $2.5 billion is presently being spent for educational purposes by the Federal Government. This involves a hodgepodge of programs among which there is already a great overlapping and waste of the taxpayers' funds. It would be much more pertinent to make a complete study of these programs and come up with recommendations where saving could be made and expenditures reduced. (3) Although I generally do not favor special deductions to get our people to do those things the Government feels they should, I think Congressman MARTIN's approach of allowing an income tax deduction of $1,000 to a parent who is sending his or her child to an institution of higher learning and who is contributing a major portion of the student's expenditures, is a better approach than Federal aid directly to colleges and universities. Additional points against the bill were raised in further minority views by other members of the Committee. To just mention several: The fine balance between research and instruction which many institutions have sought to maintain has already been upset, and there has been a disruption of normal internal relationships in universities. University departments favored by Federal grants can become virtually independent of institutional administration. The needs of vast enrollment increases in colleges and universities since World War II have been met through traditional sources, private endowments, etc. Large-scale Federal aid could discourage and dry up these sources. There is no evidence justifying the conclusion that the needs for higher education for academic facilities cannot be met from present State and private agencies.

BRINGING HOME THE BACON

Once again the issue has been raised on whether a Congressman should be concerned with principle, in preserving the freedoms of the people, in watching out for their tax dollars, or should he forget the basic responsibilities in order to bring home the bacon, get Federal handouts for his district. If the Representative of Dallas County is to be judged on how much he can get for Dallas, then the only kind of representative would be one who would be completely subservient to the New Frontier. No Republican, no conservative Democrat, no one who opposes the Kennedy administration in any way will be free from the blackmail and political coercion practiced by this administration. My own position, and I am firmly convinced, the position of the majority of the people of Dallas County is that the principle of self-government comes first. We shall demand and fight for those things to which Dallas is legitimately entitled, but will not accept the welfare programs and planned economy theories of the New Frontier in order to get them.

Stricter Discipline and the Three R's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, is serving this country beyond the call of duty. Patriotic Americans who love the Constitution are grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for his devotion and dedication to our Federal City—a Federal City as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

As the father of five children, I enthusiastically endorse the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN'S] article which appeared in the Washington Star, Sunday, August 18. I commend a study of this article to each Member of the Congress and to educators and parents everywhere:

STRICTER DISCIPLINE AND THE THREE R'S

(By Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Chairman of the House District Committee)

In my opinion, the first and greatest need existing in the public schools of the District of Columbia today is more effective discipline. The steady increase in the juvenile crime rate in the city, the McCarthy Committee's report on the riots at the District of Columbia Stadium last Thanksgiving Day, the many complaints which my colleagues and I have received from distraught parents, all point to a desperate need for drastic tightening of discipline in the District of Columbia schools. A child who is not taught to respect the rights of others cannot be expected to grow into a responsible adult citizen, and in too many cases the school children of the District of Columbia are not being so trained today. I acknowledge that the ideal place for such molding of character is the home, and certainly many of the District's children are being properly guided and developed by their parents. However, the best of home training needs to be supplemented by a firm disciplinary control in the schoolroom; and in those cases where the proper home training is utterly lacking, the school's training in this respect is essential, both for the unruly child himself and for his classmates as well.

When the House District Committee was apprised recently of the fact that D.C. school children of compulsory attendance age cannot be suspended or expelled from school under present law, and that the D.C. Board of Education has a strict rule against the use of corporal punishment which is militating seriously against the teachers and principals in their efforts to control unruly pupils, we took prompt steps and got legislation approved by the House of Representatives which is designed to remove these two impediments to discipline in the schools.

I maintain that insistence upon strong discipline starting in the lowest grades will greatly diminish the need for special schools and classes for incorrigible older students, as well as the need for so many psychiatrists. Also, the restoration of order and discipline in the classrooms, without which there can be no teaching, will again enable the District of Columbia public school system to attract and retain good teachers in far greater numbers than is possible today.

Another obvious need in the District system is for greater stress upon the fundamental subjects—the three R's—particularly in the lower grades. This is evident, I think, from the results obtained by exactly such a curriculum at the Amidon School in the past 2 years. Children in this school, brought from all parts of the city and exposed to a steady diet of fundamental education, averaged far higher on standardized subject tests this year than did most classes of comparable size and mental ability elsewhere in the city. This does not surprise me, however, because this Amidon experiment is not new at all, but nothing more nor less than the approach to education which was departed from only when the so-called progressive education became fashionable.

Perhaps this increased emphasis upon the fundamental subjects might also eliminate the need for so many counselors; for it seems to me that more teaching and learning would necessitate less counseling. Also, I am convinced that this return to the true aims of education would make the District of Columbia more attractive to good teachers.

In connection with curriculum, I believe also that increased emphasis upon vocational training, particularly for the high school students in the lower tracks, would captivate these pupils' interest and help materially to improve discipline and to lessen the problem of drop-outs on the high school level.

I feel that the greatest threat to the future of the District of Columbia school system is the often-repeated statement that the solution to all its problems lies in the appropriation of more money for the schools. I and my colleagues in the Congress have always recognized the need for adequate financing for the schools of the District, and through our efforts more than $50 million has been spent on new school buildings in the past 9 fiscal years—much more than has been spent during this period in any other U.S. city of comparable size. Also, teachers' salaries in

the District have been maintained on a very favorable level in comparison with other large cities, and today the District of Columbia teachers are the most highly paid in the Washington metropolitan area.

But the two greatest needs in the District of Columbia schools today, as I have pointed them out above, will not involve any additional expenditures whatever. What they will *require*, however, is sound, realistic thinking and positive action on the part of the entire District of Columbia school administrative system, from the Board of Education on down. And until and unless such a philosophy prevails, the expenditure of any amount of additional money will not permit the city's schools to perform their proper function.

Rusk Assurance to Joint Chiefs on Use of Nuclear Weapons Is Deadly Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows a release to news media dated today in which I have discussed the lack of meaning of Secretary Rusk's assurance to the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to use of nuclear weapons if military situations require:

RUSK ASSURANCE TO JOINT CHIEFS ON USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IS DEADLY FICTION

Based on test ban treaty testimony by Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the charge was hurled yesterday that U.S. hands will be almost completely tied in dealing with Communist armed aggression by force and violence worldwide.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of the House GOP's Committee on Nuclear Testing said Taylor and other members of the Joint Chiefs were so seriously concerned that the treaty would bar use of nuclear weapons if war breaks out they called on Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a body to discuss the question. Taylor testified Thursday that assurance was gained from Rusk that the treaty has "nothing to do with [preventing] the firing of nuclear weapons in time of war."

HOSMER declared Rusk's assurance to the Joint Chiefs is meaningless and deadly because "war" no longer has "any meaningful definition," except in the sense of an all-out nuclear exchange between the great powers.

The California Congressman recalled that notwithstanding many costly battles, thousands of American dead and wounded, and 3 years' fighting in Korea, the entire action never was officially called a war. It was defined as a "police action."

"Secretary Rusk's assurances are no aid or comfort to the U.S. fighting men who could again be called on to wage battle if the Korean Communist regime decides to break the truce and resume hostilities. In the eyes of the State Department and under terms of the treaty, only a 'police action' would be restarted. Under terms of Rusk's test ban assurance, it would not be a war. The United States would not be allowed the discriminate use of tactical nuclear weapons to stabilize the situation and avoid more thousands of casualties.

"Almost daily Americans in uniform are being killed, maimed, and taken prisoner by weapons of war in Vietnam. Purple Hearts are awarded and legislation is pending to provide combat pay. Yet this is not a 'war.' Rusk's assurances do not apply here, no matter how badly things might get out of hand, no matter how vastly our conventionally armed forces might be outmanned by a deadly enemy.

"The situation would be the same anywhere else in the world where armed aggression of this kind might take place and U.S. troops could become engaged—for example, Laos, Formosa, and India where Chinese Communist hoards might invade with tanks, artillery, aircraft, mortars, and machineguns. These would not be wars, our diplomats say. They are only incidents—police actions. But they are very real places where Americans could be sent to do battle and to die because a scrap of paper conceived in Moscow ties U.S. hands and bars discriminate use of small, relatively clean and discreet U.S. tactical nuclear weapons to control the aggressor as he deserves to be controlled. These are only instances where the needless slaughter of the bridge at Toki-Roi could be suffered over and over again on a magnified scale.

"The vital national interests of the United States and the lives and bodies of much of its young manhood—and the fears of their loved ones—demands far greater assurance from Secretary Rusk than he so far has given the Joint Chiefs.

"What Rusk has assured to date is no more than that the United States will not use its national power effectively to prevent aggression, that we will submit meekly to conventional and guerrilla warfare harassment, losses and casualties—continued Communist armed encroachment on free world soil—all because of the naive and dangerous legal fiction, conceived by diplomats, that this is not war, simply because the Communists choose not to call it war, but revolution of the proletariat.

"The President and Secretary Rusk, as well as the U.S. Senate, are under deep obligation to declare that this gimmick in the tricky treaty must not be allowed to hamstring vigilant and effective U.S. action wherever and whenever vigilance and effectiveness are demanded by the dangers at hand.

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the execution of their solemn obligation to protect the United States of America courageously should march back in a body to Dean Rusk and demand the kind of assurance that will give our country the ability to insure its survival in a very hostile world—not the kind of half assurance they received by their first try at it," HOSMER concluded.

Foreign Aid Now Conditioned on Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid has long been criticized for not having enough strings. In the past, the usual reply has been that to attach conditions to aid would be to interfere politically in the domestic affairs of other countries. Now, after years of learning the hard way, the United States has finally begun insisting on conditions before providing foreign aid. Strings are now attached not only to grants and loans for specific programs and projects but to aid programs for entire countries, such as Brazil. At long last, our foreign aid officials are making a careful and concentrated effort, not only to see that our funds are used effectively, but also to insure that recipient countries fully utilize their own resources.

Foreign aid is an investment of the taxes of the American people, and every American taxpayer has a stake in the prudent and businesslike management of the aid program. Americans particularly object to having their tax dollars used for the benefit of the privileged few of another country.

Basically, most Americans are in favor of foreign aid. Recent polls, show increasing public support for the foreign aid program. But public confidence in the efficacy of the program has been shaken by stories of graft and corruption in other countries, or stories about the failure of other countries to do their share, or stories about programs or projects where U.S. funds were wasted because of one failure or another. The feeling has been growing among even the most ardent supporters of foreign aid that the program can work effectively only if these weaknesses are corrected, and that they can be corrected only if the United States conditions its foreign aid on performance.

For these reasons, the new emphasis on establishing conditions for aid is good news for every taxpayer. Americans can now have greater confidence that their tax dollars will be used more prudently and effectively, and that the program will achieve better results.

What kinds of conditions are now being agreed upon by the United States and the recipient governments, and how do these conditions work?

There are two categories of conditions. First, there are conditions based on the performance of an entire country, and applied to all aid programs and projects in that country. Second, there are conditions for specific programs or projects in a country, even where the country as a whole does not have to take certain agreed upon self-help steps.

Under the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress, every country in Latin America is committed to undertake certain self-help measures. It is explicitly recognized in the charter that U.S. assistance to Latin American development will be conditioned upon the necessary structural reforms and measures for the mobilization of internal resources on the part of recipient countries.

The recent United States-Brazilian agreement, which conditions further U.S. aid to Brazil upon the taking of certain steps by the Brazilian Government, was made in accordance with the charter. Under this agreement, which is the first of its kind, Brazil was to—

First. Increase revenue by reforming the tax system, as well as improve tax collection and administration;

Second. Reduce government budgetary deficits by eliminating subsidies on wheat and petroleum, eliminating deficits on publicly owned enterprises including

transportation and power systems, and curbing public pay increases;

Third. Control inflation by limiting the expansion of credit by the banks, by establishing better central banking machinery, and by appealing to unions and businesses to hold the line on wages and prices;

Fourth. Reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by establishing a realistic exchange rate and by adopting specific measures to increase exports;

Fifth. Stimulate economic growth by adopting measures to encourage outside private investment; and

Sixth. Increase agricultural growth and productivity by seeking a broad program of agrarian reform.

In addition, it was understood that Brazil should arrange with the International Monetary Fund to defer payment on an IMF obligation, as well as secure a standby arrangement under which the IMF would make temporary credits available to offset Brazilian export losses. It was also understood that Brazil would secure additional aid from other free world countries.

In several other cases development loans for Latin American countries have been made contingent upon acceptable arrangements with the International Monetary Fund for exchange rate reform and an economic stabilization program.

One example is the recent $35 million development loan to Chile which is conditional upon a satisfactory stabalization program. The loan will be disbursed at a rate corresponding to the rate of Chile's budgetary performance. Better budgetary performance will speed up the rate of loan disbursement, and vice versa.

In some cases there is a condition that the borrowing nation secure aid from other donor nations before the United States will promise assistance. A stabilization loan for Egypt, and the consortia arrangements for Pakistan and India, and more recently for Turkey, are examples of this type of condition.

There are numerous examples of specific types of conditions required by the United States on development grant and development loan projects.

In one Middle East country the government undertook to reorganize the port administration, to establish separate organizations for the goods handling and customs functions, and to finance the timely completion of complementary requirements such as connecting roads. Management, organizational, financial, and budgetary arrangements for the port satisfactory to the United States were made conditions of an AID loan.

In another Middle East country, specific conditions were set forth in a U.S. loan made for the purchase of construction equipment. Because several Government departments were involved, one condition of the loan was that a new central agency be established to handle the equipment. Employment of qualified foreign advisors and the establishment of an acceptable spare parts and maintenance system were other conditions of the loan.

A home savings program in a Latin American country requires that the U.S. contribution of $7.5 million to the savings bank be matched, and that there be established a National Housing Institute to administer the program.

Conditions to ensure repayment of U.S. loans, including Government guarantees of loans to private or semipublic institutions, are common practice. In one such case, the United States insisted upon the financial reorganization of a truck company to open up prior mortgage bonds so that AID would be ratably insured, the sale of common stock rather than of senior convertible debentures as proposed by the company, establishment of a ratio of debt to net worth not to exceed 2 to 1, and a limitation on dividend payments.

A normal condition of cost sharing between the United States and a recipient country in a grant project is exemplified by a recent work relief project emphasizing rural reconstruction. Under this agreement, the United States provides surplus agricutural commodities for food, hand tools and equipment, Soil Conservation Service specialists and junior level technicians, and the cooperating Government guarantees the provision of cash wages for 60,000 workers.

Establishing conditions for aid is one thing; enforcing those conditions, especially when political considerations are involved, is another. Flexibility in enforcing foreign aid conditions is just as essential as flexibility in enforcing the conditions of a commercial contract. Up to a certain point, exigencies must be taken into account. The problem, of course, is knowing where to draw the line.

In agreements on conditions, especially those involving an entire country program, it would be a mistake to expect the line always to be drawn where it was marked out originally. But allowing for reasonable adjustments, it is reasonable to expect conditions to be carried out, as nearly as possible, as agreed upon. Otherwise agreements on conditions will not be taken seriously.

The difficulty in carrying out conditions while at the same time serving broader foreign policy interests can be seen in the case of Brazil. U.S. aid to Brazil is being held up at the moment because the government of Brazil has not met the conditions agreed upon earlier this year. Since the Brazil-United States agreement was signed, the Brazilian Government has done little, in fact, to live up to its pledge. Inflation increased by more than 25 percent in the first half of 1963, and probably will increase by more than 50 percent before the end of the year. The Government of Brazil has loosened rather than tightened credit. The Brazilian budget deficit has gone up rather than down. Government pay raises, rather than being held to the announced 40 percent, have been increasing by 70 percent.

What happens next? From the standpoint of general foreign policy considerations, Brazil must not be allowed to founder. If the enforcement of conditions on our aid program were predicted to have that effect, it would be very difficult to make the conditions stick. On the other hand, if the conditions are modified to the point of being substantially softened or virtually removed, it would be very difficult in the future to persuade any government to live up to its commitments. The answer may lie somewhere in between. But even if there should have to be some adjustments in the original agreements—and they certainly should be kept to a minimum—we will at least have made a start on establishing, together with the host government, performance standards for a country receiving U.S. assistance. This is one of the most encouraging improvements made in foreign aid since the new program was established in 1961.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 18th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

In my speech to the House recorded on pages 13837–13839 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 31, 1963, I stated in clear unmistakable language that the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out," which was a part of the heading on earlier articles of this series, came from a chance remark of a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. In his remarks on page A5237 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1963, my colleague from southern Idaho questioned the veracity of my statement when he said the power companies were the sources of my title and that the title did come from Idaho, the Idaho Power Co. This I categorically deny as not having a shred of truth to it. I again repeat my true and factual statement from my speech on July 31, 1963:

> Actually, the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out" was not my own composition but was coined from a chance remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. The slogan immediately appealed to me.

Furthermore, I have neither corresponded with nor talked to any official or employee of the Idaho Power Co. relative to editorials, letters, or any other matter regarding Secretary Udall's order extending Bonneville's power-marketing area into southern Idaho.

As a free-born American, I have always opposed the expansion of the socialistic Federal power empire regardless of the river basin it might be in. Subsidized, tax-free competition of the Federal Government with taxpaying power companies is neither right nor proper in any section of the country.

As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I feel that I have a duty and an

obligation to expose and oppose the unwarranted and untenable action of Interior Secretary Udall in ordering the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho, when I feel—as I do—that such action is totally unjustified, and is inimical to the best interest of the Nation as a whole and of the area involved. It is part and parcel of the Kennedy administration's plan to extend the socialistic Federal power empire to all sections of the country.

With regard to the purported undated letter of a division manager of the Idaho Power Co., saying I invite people to write me regarding their thinking on Bonneville power, I solemnly swear that I neither requested nor had any knowledge of such an invitation or letter being sent out. The context of the purported letter discloses that it was written long after I had started using the heading "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: Bonneville, Please Include Us Out." The key to this is the reference in the letter to an editorial from the Boise Statesman regarding a recent statement of Lloyd Walker. It so happens that I have a copy of that editorial, which was published in the Idaho Daily Statesman on July 28, 1963. This editorial was in my possession on July 31, 1963, when I presented my rebuttal to the attack on me by the gentleman from southern Idaho. The editorial in question also related to southern Idaho's objection to the invasion by Bonneville but it contained so many derogatory references to the character and honesty of the gentleman from southern Idaho that I refrained from using it or making reference to it.

It is fully evident from the facts that here is a deliberate attempt to use a letter written long after I had coined the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out," in order to question the veracity of my straightforward statement on the origin of that slogan. I must therefore make reference to the editorial in question and say that it is readily understandable why an editorial so derogatory of him was not included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my colleague from southern Idaho.

In order that I may have the facts for the record relative to this purported letter, I have sent the following letter to the president of the Idaho Power Co.:

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Mr. TOM ROACH,
President, Idaho Power Co.,
Boise, Idaho.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Enclosed is a copy of the remarks of Congressman HARDING, of Idaho, which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1963. In view of the fact that I have neither written nor talked to you or any other official or employee of Idaho Power Co. relative to Secretary Udall's extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho, I am placing a categorical denial of Congressman HARDING'S accusations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Will you please have the matter looked into and advise me if the purported letter was sent out, and if so, what was the date and why did your division manager assume the authority for issuing invitations for letters in my name?

I fully realize that your company has an outstanding record of service at rates well below the national average and that you have loyal employees who naturally resent the invasion of southern Idaho by a subsidized, tax-free Federal power empire that is now operating with multimillion dollar annual losses. Nevertheless, I do not want nor need the help of an overzealous employee of your company in extending invitations in my name for letters about Bonneville.

The flood of letters and editorials I have received and the context thereof indicates to me that there is a widespread buildup of grassroots opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. Here is no stereotyped letter campaign but the varied personalized opinion of a people concerned with the unwarranted extension of a Federal bureaucracy which can only have an adverse effect on their area and lives. The letters have come from all walks of life and I shall continue to utilize them and the editorials and statements of responsible organizations opposing Secretary Udall's unwarranted action as long as that opposition is maintained.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR.

In conclusion I present two letters from my mounting pile which are illustrative of the individual opinion of southern Idahoans who object to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. First, a letter from a schoolteacher with a farming background who has lived in southern Idaho for over 60 years. Here is the reasoning and the opinion of a studious man who has lived close to the soil:

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO,
August 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your address listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "Proceedings and Debates of the 88th Congress, 1st Session," under date of July 8, 1963, came to my attention and was read with keen interest and appreciation. This address questioned the advisability and need and cost of extending Bonneville power into southern Idaho. Your questions were pertinent, your reasoning logical, and your conclusion practical.

I've lived in southern Idaho over 60 years and paid taxes most of my adult life. An agricultural background and with about 35 years of schoolteaching experience and a keen interest in the development and future of southern Idaho—have given me some strong feelings as to our needs and possible prospects.

Idaho is a comparatively large State geographically but sparsely settled, so there are few taxpayers and also few power users. We do well to support one set of public utilities. Local rail service has been reduced in recent years to a marked degree. Telephone service lags necessarily in most southern Idaho areas because of low population and many miles. Power service likewise is in low demand and despite reasonable industrial expansion it seems ridiculous to bring in an additional competitive public utility such as Bonneville power even if it could be done at no construction cost.

I favor legislative, administrative, and normal business support of existing utilities so that they may survive, expand, serve, and pay taxes to assist in meeting Idaho's financial and growth needs rather than spending more tax money to bring in what we don't need, can't afford, and what would reduce current utilities ability to reduce rates, and pay taxes and all at the expense of the "You Know Who's" in Idaho, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere.

Your efforts to block BPA's extension into southern Idaho is sincerely appreciated. May you have adequate help in this endeavor is my personal hope.

Respectfully yours,

IRVEN CHRISTENSEN.

The second letter is from a newspaperman who is fully aware of the complete lack of justification for Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho. His letter follows:

THE TIMES-NEWS,
Twin Falls, Idaho, August 6, 1936.

Hon JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which carries your presentation of your ideas concerning the BPA which is slated to be brought into southern Idaho. Your arguments follow my line of reasoning in this respect and I wish to strongly commend you for such a masterful presentation and stand.

One does not have to be a Harvard economist to understand that when a source of tax revenue is cut off the remaining sources have to carry this additional load. Further than this it is frightening to know that this is but one step more in being eventually submerged in a Federal autocracy. And then what?

Yours sincerely,

E. BORDEWICK.

A New Kind of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disenchantment of many Members of Congress with various aspects of our foreign aid program—a feeling which was made unmistakably manifest here last Friday—it is particularly timely to call the attention of the House to legislation which would authorize a new and potentially highly effective and beneficial private form of foreign aid, the proposed International Home Loan Bank.

The Bank would function with private funds exclusively. It would not cost the taxpayers a thing. But because it gives promise of bringing home ownership within the means of millions of families of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa, it could be a major force for social stability and economic progress in these nations—an avowed goal of our present foreign aid program.

As a constructive alternative to parts of our present foreign aid program, I suggest to our colleagues that the legislation deserves sympathetic consideration in light of the hostility which has just been shown to the old form of foreign aid.

As the sponsor of one of the bills—H.R. 6715—to create the International Home Loan Bank, I prepared the following statement in support of the bill for the Committee on Banking and Currency which has just concluded hearings on the legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, REPUBLICAN, SIXTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, IN SUPPORT OF HER BILL, H.R. 6715, AND SIMILAR BILLS TO ESTABLISH AN INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, it seems especially appropriate that our committee should begin hearings on the several bills, including my own (H.R. 6715) to establish an International Home Loan Bank at the very time the House was considering this year's foreign aid authorization bill. The approach to the problem of helping the people of the less-developed areas which is embodied in this housing legislation would be more realistic, more effective, and more beneficial—not to say, much less costly—than are many aspects of our present foreign aid program.

This is a large claim, I realize, but it is a claim which I believe can be substantiated. The International Home Loan Bank idea is based on several premises: that housing, next to food itself, is the most directly important commodity in the lives of most human beings; that the ownership of private housing gives a person a considerable stake in the community and thus is a source of social stability; that a growing middle class, provided with the opportunity to save some money and finance the purchase of residential housing, can be a bulwark against social unrest and a vigorous force for sound economic and social development in the newer nations of Africa and Latin America.

Housing, therefore, occupies a crucial position in the overall problem with which our entire foreign aid program is concerned: the strengthening of independent, self-governing nations by bolstering their capacity to meet the needs of their people for economic opportunity and social progress. To a limited extent, our foreign aid program has recognized the importance of housing and through the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank some funds have been used to assist directly in the construction of housing in Latin America. These efforts have been sporadic and relatively minor, however, and of a fiscal year 1962 total of $2.4 billion of nonmilitary foreign aid less than $200 million was devoted to housing programs.

Yet, even this restricted attention to housing has produced very encouraging results. Individual projects have been remarkably successful and U.S.-assisted housing is frequently pointed to as among the most fruitful effects of our aid programs. In addition, AID and other Government programs have cooperated in conducting surveys in Latin America and Africa which have documented the urgent need for private housing—a need, for example, which is estimated to total 14 million units in Latin America alone. A growing awareness has developed that successful housing programs provide not only significant social and political benefits but also stimulate the growth of such important areas of the economy as the construction, finance, and supply industries and have a wholesome impact on the economy generally.

My own interest in this field has been greatly heightened by the experience of one of my most prominent constituents, Mr. Everett C. Sherbourne, president of the City Federal Savings and Loan Association of Elizabeth, N.J. Mr. Sherbourne was the industry representative on a three-man team which studied the housing situation in Libya in 1961. His report is an immensely persuasive document. His group found an urgent need for considerable private housing for low- and middle-income families—a need which, nearly 3 years later, is still unmet and which is intensifying the unrest and resentment which the three members noted in 1961.

As Mr. Sherbourne and his associates pointed out, adequate private housing can be constructed at costs within reach of low- and middle-income wage earners who can afford modest down payments and the subsequent long-term mortgage charges. In the total absence of such long-term mortgage facilities, however, prospective homeowners have no alternative but to pay exorbitant rents for housing, rents so high that the owner's total investment is recouped often within 5 or 6 years.

Mr. Sherbourne's experience has been duplicated widely in other parts of Africa and Latin America. The resulting data and information document the pressing need for encouraging the accumulation of sufficient capital in the underdeveloped countries to service this market, for developing the thrift and home financing institutions needed to put this capital to work, and for creating a central source of technical know-how and seed capital which, as the term suggests, would reproduce itself many times over in the fertile areas of unfilled needs.

This would be the purpose of the proposed International Home Loan Bank. It is designed to meet such a worthy objective in such a practical way that I find it difficult to account for the lengthy delay in establishing this program. No public funds would be required for the Bank. Its capital would be raised from the investment of up to one percent of the assets of individual savings and loan associations and other mutual savings institutions. The one percent limitation should eliminate any risk at all to depositors in such institutions, while the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the State Department should assure the soundness of its banking operations and harmony with the objectives of American foreign policy. The Bank would invest in or lend to those thrift and home-financing institutions in the developing countries, which, in turn, make loans and advances to individual institutions resembling our own savings and loan associations in their thrift and home-financing functions. A few such institutions already exist in some of the developing countries, but here and elsewhere they need the experience and resources of the Bank to help them multipy and flourish.

As a sponsor of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I am particularly impressed that the Bank would be a striking example of free, private enterprise in this "capitalistic" system of ours investing private funds and talents, with no hope of big profits, into an activity of the most direct consequence to individual people of modest means in many of the less powerful or influential countries of the world. The meaning of this situation will, I feel sure, communicate itself more effectively than many a more ambitious Government project.

No more significant indication could be found of the success of the savings and loan and mutual savings industry during the last fabulous 30 years than this proposal to share its wealth with less fortunate areas of the world in a practical effort to show that the American way holds out hope for the millions everywhere.

The bills we have introduced and are considering today, Mr. Chairman, can themselves be thought of as "seed" bills—legislation designed not as a finished product but as a way of stimulating further thought about some of the real problems associated with this undertaking. Even the most worthwhile objectives pose difficult questions of organization, administration, degrees of legislative authority, financing, and the like.

I have every confidence, however, that our committee, after considering all these questions and possible weaknesses or objections to the plan, can devise a workable and effective method of inspiring and facilitating one of the most constructively revolutionary social movements in the world—the effort to spread the benefits of homeownership among the peoples of the developing world who yearn for stability, opportunity, and the hope of better things in the future.

Imperial Russia, China, and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 11, 1963, the 61st annual observance of Hungarian Day was held in Cleveland, Ohio. It was my pleasure to address this annual meeting. As is known, some people believe the Hungarian freedom revolution of 1956 was a failure because the Russians put down by armed aggression that effort of the Hungarian people to regain their freedom and national independence. Events of the recent past have demonstrated that victory of the Hungarian revolution was not lost, it was only delayed. Those events as well as events yet to unfold were the theme of my address, the text of which follows:

IMPERIAL RUSSIA, CHINA, AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Hungarian Nation has enjoyed its epics of greatness and glory just as it has endured its moments of sadness and suffering. Standing as the rampart of Western civilization on the frontiers of Christian culture, it has experienced the burdens of an endless struggle with the forces of the barbarian. In good weather and in bad weather the Hungarian Nation has clung to its heritage with a Christian conviction, and that conviction has preserved the nation for 1,000 years.

In this century alone the Hungarian Nation has enjoyed the blessings of national independence, after a long period of foreign domination, only to have that independence snuffed out by a new and completely alien domination. Those extremes of national status occurred in the brief period of 26 years—between the terminus periods of two World Wars. But 12 years of alien occupation, between 1944 and 1956, by the new barbarians of the East, drove the Hungarian people to a popular revolt, the power of which shook the empire of Muscovy to its foundations and unleashed a powerful tide of new hope and old purposes throughout that empire. Time has proven that the Russians did not defeat the Hungarian freedom revolution. At best the Russian blood bath in Hungary following the historic revolt of 1956 did no more than postpone total victory for Hungarian freedom and national independence.

The past 7 years have provided the world with abundant evidence of the far-reaching consequences of the Hungarian freedom revolution. Those voices on the American scene which predicted there was a finality to the settlements by force following World War II have been thoroughly discredited. Those voices of surrender have taken cover in the musty halls of American diplomacy

where they now work covertly for the preservation of the Russian Empire. But the powerful tide of new hope and old purposes which runs in all the captive nations will inundate those voices alien to freedom's cause as surely as that tide will inundate the Russian despots. No power on earth can contain or divert the course of that rushing tide.

There is no denying the fact that the peoples of the captive nations now under the domination of imperial Russia have striven for centuries to break their chains and to win their national sovereignty. I refer, of course, to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union as well as the central European satellite nations. All of these nations declared and held their national independence during and in the aftermath of World War I. All of them lost their independence between the great wars or immediately following World War II. All the captive nations have in common two powerful motivations. The first is a common oppressor—imperial Russia. The second is a common purpose to regain their national independence. That is what I mean by the "powerful tide of old purposes."

The Hungarian freedom revolution added an explosive dynamic to that powerful tide of old purposes. That explosive dynamic is new hope—born of the proof that multinational Red army is vulnerable to large-scale popular revolutions, as demonstrated by the Hungarian people in 1956. Providing that proof was costly to the Hungarian Nation but that proof is now bearing a rich harvest in the vast area between the Baltic and Caspian Seas wherein lie no less than 15 captive non-Russian nations. The new hope provided by the Hungarian Freedom Revolution has given a unique dynamic to the spirit of nationalism; that is, the national independence movements behind the Russian Iron Curtain. The new dynamic of which I speak takes logical recognition of the fact that 90 million Russians cannot keep in chains over 200 million non-Russian peoples in the captive nations, if the captives undertake a unity of revolt against tyranny.

The Russian leaders from Khrushchev down recognize the realities of the powerful tide of new hopes and old purposes which engulfs their empire. That is why the Russians are now engaging in the diplomacy of smiles and cocktail toasts with the West. That is the rockbottom reason which impels Khrushchev to call out for a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact. That explains the Russian haste to enter into a limited nuclear test ban with the United States—through which they expect to extract their price of a nonaggression pact.

There are those who maintain that the deepening dispute between Moscow and Peiping, actual or alleged, impels the Russians to seek a temporary truce with the West. These same people argue that now is the time to take advantage of Russian overtures for peace because Moscow is worried about Red Chinese behavior within the Communist international and along the far eastern borders between the Soviet Union and China. These arguments are the products of political myopia and political immaturity. They ignore the full political realities which a genuine deep-rooted dispute between Moscow and Peiping would produce. If it is true that Peiping is the prisoner of Chinese nationalism, that the Russians fear impatient Chinese action to recover their territories in the Far East annexed by the Czars, the conclusion must be taken that imperial Russian communism is surrounded by the hostile forces of imprisoned nationalism. It is now a generally accepted fact that the European part of the Russian empire is seething with the growing pressures of nationalism. It follows naturally that if the Red Chinese are forced to respond to the pressures of Chinese nationalism, then Muscovy, the heartland of the Russian empire, is in a state of siege by the forces of nationalism. That is the reality of geopolitics which must govern with an iron discipline all our future relations with Moscow.

A partial test ban treaty was signed in Moscow a few days ago and will soon come before the Senate of the United States for ratification. Advocates of that treaty admit publicly it will not prevent war, that it does not ban the use of nuclear weapons in the event of conflict—including a sneak attack against the United States—and that it does not bring a total halt to nuclear weapons tests. It does place a moratorium on tests in outer space, the atmosphere and the waters of the sea, while permitting a continuation of underground nuclear weapons tests. But its advocates do claim this partial test ban opens the way for a reduction of global tensions and for the settlement of major differences between imperial Russia and the nations of the free West, including the United States. This means another round of summitry is a certainty. Khrushchev has announced that his objective is a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact. Secretary Rusk has announced that discussions on that proposed nonaggression pact will soon begin among the member nations of NATO. There now can be no doubt that a major shift in U.S. foreign policy is in the works, strongly reminiscent of the Hitler-Stalin pact of nonaggression and mutual assistance, and the strange alliance of the West with imperial Russia during the course of World War II.

Secretary Rusk, in connection with the signing of the limited nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow last week, stated that history would judge the importance of the treaty. It has been said that we are living in the age of the historians, that is, a time when momentous decisions are taken from the lessons of the past with an eye to the future. If this is true, and I hope it is, the truth of Russian history is unparalleled as a constant, unchanging source of dependable guidance. The truth of Russian history under the imperial commissars is an open record for all to see—and it is a record filled with deceit, broken treaties and militant conspiracy against peace and human freedom. The truth of Russian history under a long line of imperial czars is very much the same as the record of the commissars. What we are dealing with here, if history is to help guide our decisions for the future, is a record of consistent Russian motives and behavior in international affairs reaching back for centuries.

In 1898, Czar Nicholas II issued an invitation to all the powers of the world to assemble and discuss a treaty for the limitation of armaments—a World Peace Conference. In his invitation the Czar made these observations:

"The present moment would be very favorable for * * * insuring to all peoples the benefits of a real and durable peace, and above all for putting an end to the progressive development of the present armaments. The maintenance of general peace, and possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations is * * * the ideal towards which * * * all governments should be directed."

This sounds like Khrushchev in 1963 but it was a predecessor, Czar Nicholas II, 65 years ago.

Time has exposed the realities which motivated Czar Nicholas to call out for a limitation of armaments and a world peace conference. Looking at the political climate of 1898 we find that was a time when the imperial Russian Government was in trouble with its people who wanted no part in supporting an arbitrary monarch in a long weapons race. That was a time when imperial Russia was in trouble with most of the Western powers. That was also a time when imperial Russia was in trouble with Japan because of her land grabbing tactics in the Far East, which eventually led to the Russo-Japanese war 6 years later. Russian belligerence and aggression over a protracted period of time had forced the Czar to the wall, and developed hostile powers on all flanks of his vast empire. Those were the practical reasons which drove Czar Nicholas to call out for disarmament and for peace in 1898.

The situation now facing imperial Russia under the Commissars is a striking parallel to that which faced Czar Nicholas. The major difference is the hostility of the peoples in the captive non-Russian nations of Europe and Chinese nationalism in the Far East which has forced Czar Khrushchev to the wall.

It is interesting to note that during the same month Czar Nicholas issued his call for world peace he undertook an inspection of his troops and his fleet. Along the way his military commanders began to inquire about the meaning of his call for peace and disarmament. The czar remarked, with a sly wink while inspecting his troops, "I think I could contrive to get along with a platoon or two less of them." Khrushchev is less sly than the czar about his motives for at the very time the test ban treaty was being negotiated in Moscow, he made the following announcement in reply to Peiping:

"We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism, but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

By this statement Khrushchev obviously means he is working overtime to destroy all non-Communist nations, including the United States.

There are countless parallels such as this to be found in the truth of Russian history. The Russians have not changed and will not change. Their goal for centuries has been world domination. We in our time are faced with the challenge of what to do about this centuries-long menace to peace and freedom.

As I have observed, another round of summitry is a certainty. The question is now pertinent—how shall the United States take advantage of the imperial Russian crisis to win a genuine peace with universal freedom?

Should we repeat the errors of World War II by rushing to the defense of imperial Russia in order to preserve the Russian empire against the efforts of the Chinese to regain their lost territories?

Should we desert our proven allies, the peoples of the captive non-Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain, by supporting a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact?

The answer to both these questions should be an emphatic and articulate no from the electorate of our Nation.

What then should we do in the internal crisis which now confronts imperial Russia?

I have proposed that President Kennedy extend the good offices of our country to negotiate nonaggression pacts between the peoples of the captive European nations and Moscow. The tidal wave of new hope and old purposes which is rising up in the captive nations is Mr. Khrushchev's only real problem. It is true that Chinese nationalism is a threat to the Russian empire, but Mr. Khrushchev cannot deal effectively with that problem until he settles accounts with the peoples of the captive European nations. Unless he settles those accounts to the satisfaction of the captive peoples he will soon be faced with a symphony of popular revolutions from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas. Red China is now stimulating that movement and can bring it to a point of climax at any time by using its manpower to recover her lost territories in the Far East. The Chinese people need those vast virgin

lands for its expanding population and it is only a matter of time before necessity moves Peiping to action.

Our good offices proposal to Khrushchev should include exercise of the principle of self-determination under international supervision through which the captive nations can make a free choice as to their status. The choices offered the people of every captive nation should include the right to be allied with imperial Russia, the right to independent governments of their free choice either as allies of imperial Russia or as neutrals. In all cases, however, a nonaggression pact with the Russian nation would be a certainty for every other nation involved in the plebiscites.

This proposal corresponds with the realities of life behind the Iron Curtain. It supports the cause of peace with freedom. It would save the Russians from impending disaster. It could prevent a war which will surely come if the present course of international developments is allowed to continue.

So we may conclude that the Hungarian Freedom Revolution of 1956 was not defeated in its purposes. Victory was delayed by the aggression of imperial Russia. But the seeds of new hope planted by that revolution have brought forth a rebirth of those old purposes which have moved the peoples of all central-east Europe for centuries. For that contribution the world owes a great debt to the Hungarian people. The sacrifice of the Hungarian nation to the cause of peace and freedom will be rewarded in the order of world justice which will follow the crisis of this moment. All of you gathered here today, can take satisfaction from the knowledge that the land of your forefathers has remained ever true to its historic commitments. Fidelity to that commitment will liberate Hungary and return freedom and national independence to its people.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1963

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

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

O Thou God of all grace, again with a new day we bow at this altar the Founding Fathers built at the threshold of daily deliberation, when in the ministry of public affairs, before the chosen servants of the people talk to each other, they may listen to Thee. And so, with distracting public problems haunting this forum of debate, some strange, sad, joyous yearning, unsatisfied ever, bids us put down whatever is in our hands, be they tools or weapons, that we may look toward the far horizons of Thy guiding providence. That stretched-out horizon reminds us constantly that every question which clamors for solution in our homeland has to do with the pressing problems which concern Thy children under all skies.

In this temple of democracy save us, we beseech Thee, from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. Upon the altar of our freedom may there ever be lifted the offering of an humble and contrite heart.

In these days freighted with destiny for us and for the world, as keepers of the sacred flame may we fail not man nor Thee.

Hear our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 19, 1963, The President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 192. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp.;

S. 1388. An act to add certain lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah; and

S. 1652. An act to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the 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. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

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. 6177) to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1139) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period;

H.R. 772. An act to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H.R. 1136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees;

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. 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. 4842. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5048. An act to amend section 207 of the National Housing Act to eliminate the provision presently limiting mortgages thereunder to the cost of the physical improvements involved;

H.R. 5160. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees;

H.R. 5250. An act to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities;

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6118. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities;

H.R. 6396. An act to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7221. An act to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla.;

H.R. 7405. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock; and

H.R. 7406. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the