

and its grounds should be looked upon for what they really are—a monument to our form of Government and a symbol of our past and our hopes for the future. The measure of the success of

George Stewart should be in his achievements in improving the Capitol and maintaining its traditions while bringing it into the mid-twentieth century, not in the question of whether or not

the Architect should be an architect. I believe he has met the challenge set down by a long line of predecessors and that the Nation has benefited from his dedicated service to us all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 21: 7: He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.

O Thou who art the source of strength and courage, of light and hope in these days that are shrouded in darkness, grant that we may know the secret of victorious and joyous living as we look wistfully and anxiously toward the future.

We pray that Thou wilt deliver and lift mankind out of its atheistic and agnostic tempers of mind. Fill us with a real and radiant faith in the Lord God omnipotent who reigns as the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

Enable us by Thy grace to gain for ourselves and others the mastery over all trials and tribulations and may the spirit of our blessed Lord be the strength of our souls, His truth our shield, and His companionship our joy.

May integrity of character, fidelity to duty, and obedience to Thy will be the cardinal and crowning virtues in our lives.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what general debate we will have today?

Mr. ALBERT. The only general debate will be special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Bass	Keith	Plicher
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Powell
Dulski	McDade	Roberts, Ala.
Edwards	Matthews	Shelley
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Grant	Nix	Thompson, La.
Hanna	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Harvey, Mich.	O'Neill	Wright
Henderson	Osmer	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill, H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossed copy of the bill be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7885) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 106. Section 202(a), which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out 'and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, \$900,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years.'"

And renumber the following sections accordingly:

Page 10, strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed \$600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed \$600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed \$450,000,000.'"

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds

appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964.'"

Page 11, line 2, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

Page 11, line 16, strike out "\$1,225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000,000".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 188, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—222

Abbott	Flynt	Mills
Abele	Ford	Minshall
Abernethy	Foreman	Moore
Adair	Forrester	Morton
Alger	Fountain	Mosher
Anderson	Gathings	Murray
Andrews	Gavin	Natcher
Arends	Glenn	Nelsen
Ashbrook	Goodell	Norblad
Ashmore	Goodling	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Griffin	Ostertag
Avery	Gross	Passman
Ayres	Grover	Pelly
Baker	Gubser	Perkins
Baring	Gurney	Pillion
Bates	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Battin	Haley	Poage
Becker	Hall	Poff
Beermann	Halleck	Pool
Belcher	Harris	Quile
Bell	Harrison	Quillen
Bennett, Mich.	Harsha	Reld, Ill.
Berry	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Betts	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Herlong	Rich
Oliver P.	Hoeven	Riehlman
Bow	Hoffman	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Horan	Roberts, Tex.
Brock	Horton	Robison
Bromwell	Hosmer	Rogers, Tex.
Brozman	Huddleston	Roudebush
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Roush
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	St. George
Bruce	Jarman	Saylor
Burleson	Jennings	Schadberg
Burton	Jensen	Schneck
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Schneebell
Cannon	Jonas	Schweiker
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Cederberg	Kilburn	Selden
Chamberlain	Kilgore	Senner
Chelf	King, N.Y.	Short
Chenoweth	Knox	Shriver
Clancy	Kornegay	Sibal
Clausen	Kunkel	Sikes
Don H.	Kyl	Siler
Clawson, Del.	Laird	Skubitz
Cleveland	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Langen	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Latta	Snyder
Corbett	Lennon	Springer
Cramer	Lipscomb	Stafford
Cunningham	Lloyd	Stephens
Curtin	McClary	Stinson
Curtis	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Dague	McIntire	Taft
Davis, Ga.	McLoskey	Talcott
Derounian	McMillan	Taylor
Derwinski	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Devine	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Dole	Marsh	Tollefson
Dorn	Martin, Calif.	Tuck
Dowdy	Martin, Nebr.	Tupper
Downing	May	Tuten
Dwyer	Meador	Utt
Ellsworth	Michel	Van Pelt
Findley	Miller, N.Y.	Waggonner
Fisher	Milliken	Wallhauser

Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley

Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob

Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyder
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—188

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Duncan
Edmondson
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gialmo

Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Hollfield
Holland
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.

O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
St. Onge
Secret
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
White
Wickersham
Wilson,
Young
Charles H.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Davis, Tenn.
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Grant
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.

Keith
Keogh
McDade
Matthews
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Roberts, Ala.
Schwengel
Shelley
Thompson, La.
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Osmers against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. McDade against.
Mr. Harvey of Michigan for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Keith for, with Mr. Wright against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bass with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Nix.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. GROVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, acting under the instructions of the House, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I report back to the House the bill, H.R. 7885, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 106. Section 202(a), which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out 'and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and inserting in lieu thereof, '\$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, \$900,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years.'"

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Page 10, strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed \$600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed \$600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed \$450,000,000.'"

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964.'"

Page 11, line 2, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

Page 11, line 16, strike out "\$1,225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 186, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—224

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Frances P.
Brademas

Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett

Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell

Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hollfield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati

Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meador
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska

NAYS—186

Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hempfl
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas

Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
St. Onge
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Senger
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wyder
Young
Zablocki

JONES, MO.

Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lange
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morris
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush

Rumsfeld	Snyder	Van Pelt
St. George	Steed	Waggonner
Saylor	Stephens	Watson
Schadeberg	Stinson	Weaver
Schenck	Taft	Westland
Scott	Talcott	Wharton
Secrest	Taylor	Whitener
Shipley	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Short	Teague, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Shriver	Thomas	Wilson, Ind.
Sikes	Thomson, Wis.	Winstead
Siler	Tollefson	Wyman
Skubitz	Tuck	Younger
Smith, Calif.	Tuten	
Smith, Va.	Utt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Griffin

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Keith	Pilcher
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Roberts, Ala.
Dulski	McDade	Shelley
Edwards	Matthews	Thompson, La.
Elliott	Nix	Willis
Grant	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Hanna	O'Neill	
Harvey, Mich.	Osmers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Harvey of Michigan against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Bass for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Edwards with Mr. Elliott.

Mr. MINISH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to this foreign-aid bill because I believe as the Clay Committee has reported in its appraisal of our foreign-aid program that we are attempting "too much for too many."

It is impossible for any nation regardless of its wealth to continue indefinitely to support most of the countries of the world and the extent of our national debt and decreasing gold reserves present dramatic proof that our financial condition cannot support a continuation of such great foreign spending programs. In my opinion, our foreign aid should be severely restricted with assistance given to those nations willing to take a stand for democratic government and those with an ability to make proper utilization of the funds supplied them.

There has been a continuing of the absence of selectivity in the recipients of our foreign aid. We have found both economic and military assistance being given simultaneously to countries on both sides of international quarrels as well as aid going to Communist-dominated countries like Yugoslavia and Poland.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, there is a proper concern about the accumulation of unexpended balances from prior appropriations. As of June 30, 1963, we find such balances to be estimated at \$6.8 billion and it is difficult to see the necessity or advisability of authorizing additional foreign aid expenditures when several such exorbitant unexpended balances now exist.

Another matter which should disturb every responsible legislator is the fact that we are being called upon to authenticate or approve long-term foreign aid commitments by the executive department when congressional approval was not sought in the initial phases of such agreements. I fail to see any logic or justification in the argument advanced that Congress is breaking faith with foreign countries when we fail to rubber stamp those Executive commitments to which we were not a party. Such agreements should have prior congressional approval before being entered into by the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, of the most serious concern not only to members of Congress but the American people is our continuation of aid to Communist governments, which is being given under the pretense of preventing a further Communist buildup or wooing them away from the Soviet's control. Actual experience reveals that neither objective has been accomplished but instead our aid to Communist-dominated countries has merely served to perpetuate its dictatorial control over the people and does not provide any measure of personal or political benefit to the people.

Certainly I am, as is every other American, desirous of giving assistance, both economic and military, to the friendly nations of the world who need such help, but I am convinced that the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program has contributed far less than its cost to our national interest and security.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that this aid program must be limited to those friendly nations which can absorb and utilize those funds effectively and should in no wise be given to Communist-dominated countries. Additionally we must withhold all aid from nations which would use our funds for territorial expansion and we must provide adequate safeguards to prevent the use of foreign aid to finance Government-owned facilities which would compete with private enterprise.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this bill I have been reminded of the story with which we are all familiar of the constituent who demanded to know: "What have you done for me lately?"

In this annual debate on the foreign aid bill it might be well to ask ourselves if we too are not guilty of a "what have you done for us lately?" attitude.

Each year the program comes up, and Members ask for a list of successes or accomplishments. The administration representatives dutifully prepare lists of successes and then the critics retort: "We know all that, but what about now?"

This sort of dialog obscures the real purposes of foreign assistance and the

kind of aid program upon which we are now embarked.

The basic purpose of foreign assistance is to assist nations to achieve independence, freedom, and self-sustaining economic growth. We seek neither satellites nor domination. Our aid is aimed at encouraging independence.

Many of the nations, which have received economic assistance in the past, no longer receive aid. The record of successes has been well documented. We also know of the failures—they have been well documented, too.

The important point about this week's debate is that, in order to understand this program, we should not talk simply in terms of success and failure, good and bad, friend and enemy.

It is very easy to rise and denounce this bill; it is easy to discover mistakes; it is easy to criticize and say we are being played for suckers.

But the purpose of this debate should be to discuss the full value and ramifications of the present aid program.

Victories in the area of foreign aid are really the absence of defeat. We win if a country remains independent and does not go Communist.

We are embarked upon a long-range program of development assistance. The 1960's have been called the "decade of development."

The two words "decade" and "development"—need emphasis. We are thinking in terms of 10 years, and accomplishments should be measured over this period.

And what is involved is development, the basic development of economics, often in nations many hundreds of years behind the West.

How much foresight would we have attributed to a British investor in 1870 who put his money into the United States, as many did, and said, "I will give them 5 or 10 years to become an industrial nation?"

It might be well in viewing the progress of other nations—many of which lack the resources, the trained manpower, and the domestic tranquility of 19th century America—to remember some of our own history.

Development will take many years. The process is slow.

The remarkable fact is the speed at which many nations are emerging into the 20th century. Years are compressed into months as projects are completed, agricultural production jumps, diseases are conquered, and more trained persons contribute to their country.

The task requires patience and sacrifice on the part of the American people. But surely it is in our interest to spend—and in a majority of cases loan—less than 1 percent of our gross national product for this effort.

Certainly no nation in the history of the world has such a record for generosity. It is a record of which we can be proud.

As a result of such programs as foreign assistance, we are gaining in the struggle against totalitarianism.

I do not believe communism will win. And I do not believe in the men of little faith who say it will.

We have heard a great deal of talk about what we are doing to our grandchildren. I would certainly not want my grandchildren to grow up in a world where the richest nation—having more than half the world's wealth—ignored the needs of the two-thirds of the world who lived in poverty, disease and hunger. It might not be a very stable world. And it would be a dubious legacy for our grandchildren to pass on to succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, the great leaders in our history have had faith in our country—in the wisdom and generosity of our people. They have been men and women of vision.

If we are true to our great heritage, democracy will triumph, and the legacy of freedom will be passed on to succeeding generations in America and the world.

Mr. GLENN. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years I have voted for foreign aid but with more and more misgivings. Today, I have cast my vote against foreign aid for several reasons, the first being that I can no longer justify in good conscience the giving of aid to foreign governments when we withheld aid to deserving American citizens in times of need.

I am referring specifically to disaster conditions within my own district in the wake of last year's violent coastal storm. This storm raged up the eastern seaboard and along the New Jersey coast leaving thousands of persons either homeless or faced with heavy costs of replacing and repairing severe storm damage.

In the Atlantic and Cape May County portion of my district, these damages were particularly disastrous, and a great majority of those whose homes were destroyed or severely damaged by the storm were elderly people—men and women living on small pensions or social security; men and women who in many cases had invested lifetime savings in homes for retirement years.

Now, when disaster strikes in practically any portion of the world—be it flood, famine, earthquake, or any of nature's other violent outbursts—the United States gives aid in the form of housing and dollars, or whatever else may be needed.

This is a commendable philosophy, but unfortunately our charity does not begin at home. In the aftermath of last year's storm no relief was extended to needy victims of the disaster in rebuilding or repairing their homes save for the offer of emergency small business loans at 3 percent interest to finance the rebuilding or repair of their homes battered or flooded by violent winds or tides.

There is, of course, no insurance available for flood protection. Homeowners have no choice but to obtain the emergency loans, which many will be repay-

ing for the remainder of their lives or forsake their storm-ravaged dwellings.

By any yardstick, this was a disaster area. Up and down the Jersey coast thousands of persons suffered great hardship and staggering financial losses, yet no relief was forthcoming. The charity which our Federal Government always hands out to the less fortunate across the seas just did not apply to American citizens whose hard-earned tax dollars have supported foreign aid throughout the years.

Yes, I will admit to being bitter—and with valid reason, too. Since this disastrous storm, I have spoken with these stricken families and received letters from many others. I know firsthand their hardships and financial crises resulting from this storm, and if we cannot afford to offer a helping hand of aid to disaster-struck American citizens, I am certain we cannot afford foreign aid handouts to people of other lands, deserving though their needs may be.

Now, I am opposed to foreign aid for other reasons, too—reasons which I will briefly cite here—for I know they have been thoroughly detailed in debates over this issue during the present, as well as past, consideration of foreign aid legislation.

Since the end of World War II, foreign aid has cost the U.S. taxpayers more than \$120 billion, and still has, in my opinion, failed to accomplish its intended objectives of shoring up the bonds of friendship, understanding, and cooperation between the United States and other nations of the world community.

As the Honorable OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, distinguished veteran chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which deals directly with the annual multi-billion-dollar appropriations for foreign aid, pointed out:

Of the aggregate amount of our aid, \$100 billion, in round figures, has been given out on a unilateral basis, going into 111 foreign nations and entities, including Communist, Communist-leaning, and so-called neutralist countries alike. In addition to this, indirect aid has been extended by the United States through capital investments, exceeding \$5.1 billion in five different international financial institutions, which have, in turn, disbursed assistance totaling more than \$7.5 billion.

But, even so, after all this money and all these years—and despite the seriously damaging drain the program is making on our economy—the trend for expanding foreign aid continues upward, rather than heading downward.

This year, for example, the United States is giving economic aid to at least 73 countries and 7 entities and, fantastic though it is, military assistance to 70 countries. This program not only is uncontrolled, but it is uncontrollable; and it is imperative, in our own national interest, that it be drastically curtailed and tightly administered.

I have during this session of Congress given considerable exhaustive study to the foreign aid issue, and I find that its negative factors far outweigh its positive arguments.

Without question, foreign aid has served to undermine the dollar since we made a series of strategems—all futile—which have been tried to stem the outflow of our gold. These attempts have been

unsuccessful for our foreign aid program is a one-way street. The goods and services go out, the U.S. Treasury pays the bill, and the United States receives nothing of a tangible commercial nature in return.

As Mr. PASSMAN pointed out:

So great has been America's outpouring of wealth through foreign aid that many of the recipient nations have accumulated dollars far in excess of their needs. Consequently, they demand gold in exchange for the dollars, and in the past 10 years our gold reserves have been reduced from more than \$23 billion to less than \$16 billion. Over the same period, other free world countries increased their gold holdings from \$13 billion to nearly \$25 billion and their short-term dollar credits from less than \$11 billion to \$25 billion. For these dollar credits, those countries can demand gold, and if such a demand should come, the United States could not meet it.

If such a demand should be made, we would indeed be in serious trouble. We would have no recourse but to devalue the dollar with a resultant chaotic upset to the world of finance. Yet in these days of crisis the use of this extreme measure is never out of mind and is even talked about in committee hearings.

Beyond this, it is my feeling—a conviction shared at least privately by many of my colleagues—that foreign aid has made the dollar a symbol of international handouts, a substitute for initiative and effort, and an endless drain on the American taxpayer. Also, the foreign aid has constituted not only an added tax on our producers, but also a subsidy to our foreign competitors with the result that our prices have become so high that we cannot now compete successfully in world trade without the Federal Government subsidizing our exports by as much as 30 percent.

And, last, despite the mountainous foreign aid expenditures, our position in the world has not improved. Indeed, it has become increasingly precarious. Certainly, by now we have proven that dollar diplomacy will not work, that we cannot buy friendship or cooperation with dollars.

In view of these factors, I have voted against foreign aid with a clear conscience.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the 15 years I have been a Member of the House, I have voted against the annual foreign aid authorization bill, and have done so most reluctantly, because I am not against a reasonable foreign aid program, efficiently and effectively administered. Many times in the past I have voted for these authorizations, with the same kind of reluctance, hoping that I would later have the opportunity of reducing the appropriation to the level which I felt was necessary and justified. I expect to give the same careful study and consideration to the appropriation bill that I have given to the authorization bill, but in view of the information which I already have, I am prepared to vote against the appropriation if it exceeds \$3 billion and I am hopeful the Appropriations Committee can assure us that even this sum is not justified and is not needed to carry out the best interests of

this Nation. It is regrettable when partisan politics enter into consideration of a bill of the importance the foreign aid bill is to the security of this country, but unfortunately both parties engaged in such politics. To mention just one specific instance, I would refer to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable DURWARD HALL, representing the Seventh District, who offered an amendment to reduce and limit the contributions of the United States to the special programs operated by the United Nations, to not more than 33.3 percent. I have advocated such a reduction and limitation for many years, and in my remarks yesterday cited one specific instance of where we have paid as much as 90 percent of the cost of operating a program only to find that the administrators of the program were using our funds to buy commodities—wheat—which the United States had in great surplus, from other nations, giving as a reason therefor, our price was too high. For several years I have expressed the view that any time this Nation is inclined to pay more than 50 percent of the cost of any program, that we should operate the program ourselves; let the United States bear the entire cost of the program and get the full credit for any benefits therefrom. I think this is a sound policy and one which should have been adopted by the Department of State many years ago. I believe the Hall amendment, if offered by a Democrat, would have been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I do not look upon the foreign aid program as a partisan program, and I do not look upon the opposition to the program as evidenced by the vote which recommitment of the bill to the committee, or the small margin by which this bill was passed as necessarily being a reflection upon the Kennedy administration. Rather, in my opinion, it is a protest against the way the program has been administered by the State Department over the past several years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations. It is not difficult to read the facts from the Record that some Democrats who vote for the program when a Democratic administration is in power, voted against it when the Republicans were in power; and that some Republicans who voted against the bill today voted for it when President Eisenhower was in power, and this despite the fact that former President Eisenhower, as well as former President Truman both advocate a continuation of the program, although I believe that both of these former executives would agree that the program should be administered in the most efficient as well as the most effective manner, and that we should profit by our mistakes of the past.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that those career bureaucrats in the Department of State, and more especially in the AID program would realize that there is great dissatisfaction in Congress over the manner in which this program has been administered, and that Congress is going to demand a more effective program, and the elimination of the great waste which has brought such discredit that Congress is fed up with many

features of the program. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when Members like myself, who can see the need for continuing the program in many areas, find it necessary to take such drastic action as voting against the entire bill in order to impress the bureaucrats that we mean business.

Mr. LINDSAY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my feelings on the foreign aid bill pretty clear during the course of debate, as well as earlier in a special order, and in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee 2 months ago.

The Clay Committee came out with a sound report. It reflected the thinking of many of us. Each year I, among many others, have pressed for greater selectivity in the foreign aid program, decreased emphasis on the heavy amounts of military assistance, increased priority to loans instead of grants, and tighter administration.

The Foreign Affairs Committee reported out a bill that was tighter than any previous bill in the past on this subject. It reached compromises in every title of the bill. I was pleased that it accepted a proposal offered by me in testimony before the committee designed to provide greater opportunity for the private sector in the American economy to participate in and gradually take a greater share of American aid. The reported bill had the support of the ranking Republican Member, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], and most of the more senior Members of the minority side.

I was particularly impressed with the argument stated on the floor during debate by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has demonstrated a sharp eye for economies and the elimination of the unnecessary and the wasteful from foreign aid programs and in all other programs.

During the course of floor debate a series of other amendments were adopted by the Committee, most of which were against the wishes of the majority members that I have mentioned.

Today, a motion to recommit was offered, which makes a reduction to the extent of \$160 million in the Development Loan Fund; \$150 million in the Alliance for Progress; \$50 million in the contingency fund; and \$225 million in military assistance—a total of \$585 million. The bill is reduced thereby to \$3.502 billion, and it is expected that the Appropriations Committee will reduce this figure to well under \$3 billion.

In the course of amendments on the floor, I supported an amendment to reduce the military assistance program by \$100 million. I also supported the Broomfield amendment. But these across-the-board slashes contained in a motion to recommit strike me as beyond reasonableness.

I supported President Eisenhower each year the foreign aid bill was introduced during the Eisenhower years. The tightening process that he began has been continued, and I cannot in good conscience reverse myself in the present instance.

Foreign aid remains an important—though we hope diminishing—aspect of foreign policy. It should receive a high degree of bipartisan support. In the tradition of Vandenberg, that obligation has always been a special one for Republicans and should not be forgotten. Hence I will vote against the motion to recommit and for the bill on final passage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to require congressional approval of all proposed foreign aid projects costing \$100 million or more.

The Clay Committee report, of which we have already heard much, declares that in many respects the planning and administration of our aid program has not been as effective as we and the American people whom we represent have every right to expect, considering the tremendous cost of the program.

In their excellent presentation, the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have particularized this charge and pointed out how this condition will be perpetuated in the present bill. They have also directed the attention of the House to several usurpations by the executive branch of congressional powers. I heartily concur with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], who in the discussion of the rule commended the minority for their perceptive analysis of the situation. It remains for us to act upon the suggestions made by these gentlemen by enacting this and related amendments to the bill.

The present amendment, it seems to me, is well-calculated to put a brake on the liberties which the executive branch has been taking with our function and to prevent a continuation of a particular practice which I find specially disturbing. I refer to the use of American tax dollars—the fruits of our system of private enterprise—for the purpose of encouraging State socialism in the developing economies of certain nations, particularly in Africa and Asia.

The prime example of what I am speaking about is, of course, the proposed Bokaro steel mill in India, a billion dollar operation—the tab for which is to be picked up by the American taxpayer. I say “proposed” steel mill, and I fervently hope that it is no more than that, but despite careful questioning by committee members, it did not emerge too clearly in the hearings how deeply the administration has committed us to this venture.

The Indian Embassy has been kind enough to furnish me with iron-steel production figures for the last two calendar years. In 1961, the private sector produced some 2,694,093 metric tons, and the public sector produced 1,258,802 metric tons. In 1962, the private sector produced some 2,830,323 metric tons—an increase of 144,000 metric tons over the preceding year. The public sector in 1962

produced 1,850,958 metric tons—an increase of 608,000 over the preceding year.

Thus, we see a promising privately owned steel industry being outstripped in production by a state-owned competitor. And American funds are sought to facilitate the process. The wonder of it all is, not that the Indians seek to do this, but that there are Americans who are willing to see it done.

This is precisely the kind of practices which the Clay Committee opposed, and in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, the head of the AID indicated that he was in agreement with this judgment. But he went on to say that due to differing historical, cultural, and economic forces at work in recipient nations, it would be unwise for the United States to encourage the free enterprise system in every such nation. Certainly, one need not be a gifted observer to perceive substantial differences between the Republic of India and the United States, but I can see none and I have heard none advanced which is so insurmountable as to militate against free enterprise in India.

Here is a nation which already has a private steel industry and the United States is being asked to throttle it. An imposing array, ranging from the President of the United States down to a pair of aspiring pundits in one of the local papers, ardently support this project. The pundits, writing yesterday, seemed to feel that the dubiousness which has already been expressed by Members of Congress arises from some anti-Nehru bias which is alleged to inhere on the Hill. And they warned that if we refused to shell out for this project, India would be forced into the arms of Russia—an interesting and seldom-heard argument in foreign relations debates.

Mr. Speaker, the more I read in the press, the more firmly convinced I become that the amendment under consideration here is essential for the preservation of our national self-respect.

As I understand it, the major reasons advanced in support of our foreign aid program are two:

First, there is some sort of a moral obligation upon us in this country to share our bounty with those less fortunate. It has always been interesting for me to note that exponents of this position failed to observe that our wealth is the product of good hard work by ourselves and our forebears—no one gave it to us on a silver platter. I also note that the humanitarian impulse of the moralists seldom extends to the American taxpayer and the crushing burden of debt which is being piled on the shoulders of generations yet unborn.

Second—and somewhat more soundly, I think—it is argued that the Nation is engaged in a great struggle with the disciples of Marx who are seeking by every means at their command to extend their sway over the face of the globe. In part, this war is being waged economically: The less-fortunate peoples of the world must be helped to achieve some minimal degree of prosperity so that they will be less easy prey for the blandishments of the Marxists. And in part, it is being waged ideologically: The superiority, the vitality of our institu-

tions must be demonstrated to these peoples. They must be afforded opportunities to see that a politically and economically free society offers more to each individual than does one which is subjected to government controls.

And so I ask, How do we advance these economic and ideological fronts by encouraging the spread of socialist institutions? I think it is clear that we do not advance either.

But, it is said, there is not sufficient private capital in India to finance this venture. And I say, and I have reason to believe that people across the Nation are saying, then let us work out an arrangement to get the capital to private developers in India. Surely this cannot be too difficult to do, and it certainly cannot be any more expensive than the present scheme. Let us, instead of spotlighting socialism, make Bokaro a show-place of private enterprise, and thus win a round on both the ideological and economic fronts.

And the first step to accomplishment of this is the adoption of the present amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the debate the other day on the Foreign Assistance Act, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] raised a question which indicated that there is some apparent confusion about the amount of our foreign assistance funds which are used for procurement in the United States. This confusion arises, I think, for the following reasons:

Expenditures under the foreign assistance program during any period of time include expenditures for which funds were committed, that is, obligated in previous years, and expenditures for which funds were obligated during the immediate year. It is obvious that changes in procurement policy primarily affect funds obligated after the changes are adopted. Therefore, there will necessarily be a considerable period of time before actual payout under the foreign assistance program will fully reflect the policies which restrict funds to expenditure in the United States.

For some time, the administration has been taking steps to increase the position of aid funds which are spent in the United States. There is no doubt that the rate of actual expenditure of aid funds in the United States has been increasing. However, since actual current expenditures reflect funds committed in previous years as well as in the current year, the percentage of procurement in the United States today is not as high as the percentage of procurement in the United States which will be spent in the future under funds now being obligated.

To make an evaluation of the effect of current foreign aid procurement policies, it is necessary to analyze its impact on current commitments to be spent in the future.

The percentage of procurement statistics demonstrate this lag between policy and effect clearly. In 1961 an estimated 50 percent of foreign assistance expenditures were made in the United States; in 1962, 63 percent; and in 1964, the estimate is 70 percent. However, the percentage of new money committed, that is obligated, which will be spent in

the United States, was an estimated 81 percent in 1963 and will go up to 85 percent in 1964. The lag between commitment and expenditure is evident.

I have in my hand, and will insert in the RECORD, a copy of the latest Agency procurement policy issued on July 5 of this year. Although we can all see that prior procurement policy actions have been extremely successful in reducing the effect of foreign aid spending on our balance of payments, the goal which the President and AID have set is even greater. That target is to restrict non-U.S. spending to \$500 million by fiscal year 1965.

To repeat, we must keep in mind that funds committed under old policies in prior years are being expended now. New funds now being committed of which 85 percent is for spending in the United States will not make their impact on the statistics until actually paid out.

COMMODITY PROCUREMENT SOURCE AND ORIGIN POLICY

The President has recently written to AID along with other agencies requesting a review of steps which could be taken to further relieve the burden of Government programs on the U.S. balance of payments. Specifically, the President requested an examination of what cutbacks in the aid program would be necessary to provide significant relief to the U.S. foreign deficit.

For some years it has been the target of this agency to reduce AID payments abroad to not more than 20 percent of total expenditures. It now appears that this target will be reached under fiscal year 1963 obligations. However, this agency is still making an estimated \$770 million of payments offshore this year, and it is now agreed target to reduce this amount to \$500 million in fiscal year 1965.

EXISTING POLICIES

To reach this target will require a continued and concerted effort throughout the agency. Existing policies requiring the procurement of U.S. goods and services for AID-financed projects where possible must continue to be carefully and thoroughly applied. This is also true of existing policy to maximize the contributions of participating countries to the local cost of AID-financed projects and activities, including the over-sea living and operational expenditures of AID technicians and contractors. Cash transfers must be reduced to the absolute minimum possible. Except for negligible amounts or as specifically waived by the Administrator, any necessary AID financing of local costs, whether on a budget support or project basis, should be introduced into the recipient country through financing of current commodity imports from eligible sources.

NEW POLICIES

As a further measure toward increasing the share of U.S.-produced goods and services in the AID program, this agency will, effective immediately, cease to finance goods of which the United States itself is a consistent net importer except under exceptional circumstances. Such consistent U.S. net imports include crude oil, petroleum fuel, tin, rubber, wool, sugar, and the additional items appearing on the attached list prepared by the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources. The list is obviously subject to revision from time to time and must take into account any adverse effects on U.S. industry. It is contemplated that an inter-agency committee, with possible inclusion of membership of representatives of the Departments of Commerce and Labor (with the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources and Program Coordination Staff for

AID) will be established to advise the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources on additions to or deletions from the list. The exceptional circumstances under which these items may be included in AID programs are:

1. Goods released from Government-held stocks or cases where the supplier agrees to accept an equivalent amount of goods released from Government-held stocks or strategic materials.

2. Goods acquired under barter contracts for surplus agricultural commodities under Department of Agriculture barter regulations and usual marketing criteria; or for stockpile surpluses under similar or related criteria and procedure.

3. Purchases of petroleum products subject to U.S. import quota, either in the United States, or offshore under arrangements which have the effect of treating the amount financed as an import into the United States for purposes of the U.S. import quota.

4. Cases where the regional Assistant Administrator, with the concurrence of the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, determines that essential program purposes would be sacrificed if the net import item were not financed.

The principles of competitive procurement and of AID encouragement of the incipient industrial exports of less developed countries are to be maintained to the extent possible. The policy of limited worldwide procurement of goods of which the United States is also an exporter will therefore be continued for nonproject assistance financed with development grants or supporting assistance funds. However, in issuing procurement authorizations the commodity categories should be selected with strong emphasis on those on which U.S. exporters can normally compete successfully, giving secondary consideration to administrative convenience as a criterion of selection.

It is an AID purpose that assistance should result in expanded U.S. exports and in such shifts in trade patterns in favor of the United States as do not undermine other U.S. policy purposes.

Furthermore, policy with regard to eligible commodities is modified, effective immediately, to exclude from AID financing all goods which contain components imported from excluded sources, the delivered cost of which exceeds 30 percent of the supplier's lowest f.o.b. or f.a.s. export price at point of export. Exceptions may be approved by the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources.

The pattern of commodity financing will be kept closely under review. Further revision of procurement policy may be necessary if the half-billion-dollar target is to be met.

In addition the disbursement of AID funds to international organizations is to be related to the disbursement needs of the organization. In cooperation with the Treasury, 10 has already taken steps to insure this with regard to the U.N. Special Fund and UNICEF. Program coordination will work closely with the Bureau of International Organizational Affairs, State, to insure comparable arrangements as feasible in other cases. The regional administrators will consider similar arrangements with regard to contributions within their responsibility.

Finally, the Assistant Administrator for Latin America is requested to join with Treasury in securing arrangements with regard to the Social Progress Trust Fund which will reduce the drain from this source on the U.S. balance of payments. The aim of these arrangements should be substantially to confine all disbursements from the Trust Fund during fiscal year 1964 and subsequently to payment for goods and services of U.S. source.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I shall cast a "no" vote on the foreign aid bill. It is not an easy decision to make in view of worldwide commitments that have been made. However, it is my conviction that we are spending too much, in too many places; that we mistakenly believe we can buy friendship; or that we can, by gift or loan, persuade a nation to reject one political philosophy and accept ours. It just does not work that way. It is my conviction that we encourage, through our aid programs in other countries, socialism and I, for one, reject the theory of socialism. Through our aid we encourage strong dominating Federal control in other countries and certainly we do not want this for our own country.

I am opposed to building competing industry such as the Bokaro Steel Mill in India with U.S. taxpayer dollars. I am convinced that military aid to many countries is being used to police their own internal problems and that this is not our problem. I am convinced that aid should not be given to any Communist country either directly or indirectly. I am also convinced that, if we are to give aid to a country, it should be a country which is on our side. Being neutral and playing both sides against the middle is not being on our side. I also believe a nation should be politically stable before any aid is given. This we are not doing.

Mr. Speaker, our great mistake has been that we have been led astray by the early success of the Marshall plan. It was appropriate. It was timely. But the same formula cannot be applied today. The ingredients are not the same. Our own economy has changed. We are dealing with nations with no history of economic success. We are dealing with politically unstable nations and the outpouring of our dollars cannot solve their problems and it is my opinion it is only adding to ours.

EXPORTS TO THE SOVIET BLOC

Mr. LIPSCOMB. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and millions of Americans have been greatly concerned about the policy of the administration on control of exports to the Soviet bloc. It has been known that certain spokesmen have espoused practically eliminating all controls on sales of goods to the Communists short of actual war materials. Many have been wondering when an out-and-out move toward this end would occur, and the speculation has been heightened since the conferences on the proposed test ban treaty.

I believe we have the answer. And that the answer is frightening and one that must be viewed with alarm.

The Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other departments of Government, has just reached a decision to allow shipment from the United States to the U.S.S.R. of highly automated mining machinery valued at an estimated \$10 million. According to reports the Soviet order is for 30 of the machines which are known as "continuous miners." They are similar to but larger than equipment used to mine coal in the United States. According to these reports, the company which would manufacture these highly automated, powerful machines, at the insistence of the State Department, filled a large order for coal mining equipment for the Russians during World War II.

The Department of Commerce advises that the mining machinery will be used for the mining of potash which it states is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of potassium fertilizers. While potash is used basically for fertilizers, it also has important uses in the chemical field, including the manufacture of gunpowder, drugs, glass, detergents, dyes, textiles, and other products.

Just last year the Congress in a near unanimous action voted to strengthen the Export Control Act. A major purpose of the amendments to the act was to require the administration to place greater emphasis on economic factors in considering applications to ship goods and information to the Soviet bloc. This was done over strong objections from the State Department, who, according to the debate, "begged and pleaded" the conferees on the bill to drop the section proposing to require denial of licenses in those cases where proposed exports would make a significant contribution not only to the military but also to the economic potential of bloc nations which would prove detrimental to the security and welfare of the United States.

Is it claimed by the Commerce Department that this mining machinery would not contribute to the economic potential of the U.S.S.R.? Certainly not. In fact, the Department says in its letter to me, which I received this morning:

In view of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union.

The Department goes on to state that the decision to issue the license was because potassium fertilizer can be characterized as "peaceful goods."

What is not stated of course is the fact that potash has important chemical uses, including the manufacture of gunpowder, nor the fact that it is no trick at all for the Soviets to turn so-called peaceful goods into items of oppression and control, or into products to export or dump as part of the U.S.S.R. economic offensive.

And certainly it is generally known and understood that products and goods of all kinds which build up the economy and economic potential of a nation make that nation stronger in a military sense. It is for this very reason that the Export Control Act was amended to make it clear that prohibitions on sending goods were to be applied even though they could not be clearly characterized as contributing directly to the military potential of the U.S.S.R.

In my opinion there can be no other conclusion than that this action is directly contrary to what the Congress specifically said last year should not be done.

When reports of this license application appeared, indicating that the question was at that time pending before the Department of State, I wrote to the State Department asking whether such an application for this mining machinery was pending and expressing the opinion that if so the license application should be denied because of the significance of such export to the economic and military potential of the U.S.S.R. I should add here that though the Export Control Act is administered by the Commerce Department, the Department of State plays a highly significant role in establishing policies followed in administering the act.

I am setting forth the reply received from the State Department, indicating that my letter had been forwarded to the Department of Commerce. Set forth below also is the letter I received from the Office of Export Control of the Department of Commerce advising that my letter to the State Department had been received, and a copy of the letter received today in response to my request to the Office of Export Control to be advised as soon as a decision was made concerning the application.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 24, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter of July 16, concerning a report that the U.S.S.R. is interested in placing an order for automated mining machinery valued at \$10 million with a firm in Pittsburgh. Certain export license applications for such machinery have been received by the Department of Commerce and are currently under consideration. I am sending your letter to Mr. F. D. Hockersmith, Director, Office of Export Control, Department of Commerce, for a report on the status of those cases since the matter falls within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Mr. Hockersmith's telephone number is code 112, extension 4293.

You will hear directly from the Department of Commerce on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,

Washington, D.C., August 2, 1963.

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: As you have been informed by the Assistant Secretary of State in his letter to you of July 24, 1963, your letter of July 16, addressed to Secretary Rusk has been referred to this office for reply. Your letter inquired as to the status of a reported pending license application concerning the proposed exportation by a Pittsburgh firm of mining machinery to the U.S.S.R.

Such an application is presently pending in the Department of Commerce. Your view that this application should be denied will be brought to the attention of Dr. Jack Behrman upon his return. I am sure that it will receive careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON E. SWEENEY,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,

Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: In your letter of August 15 to Mr. Sweeney of this office, you asked to be advised as soon as a decision was made with regard to the proposed exportation by a Pittsburgh firm of mining machinery to the U.S.S.R. The Department has just decided to authorize the export to which you refer. It is anticipated that the approval will be announced in the daily License List of August 21, 1963.

The machinery in question, which involves several export license applications, is for the mining of potash which is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of potassium fertilizers. While the Soviet Union is far short of its goals in the production of potassium fertilizers for its own indigenous use, nevertheless it is also an exporter of such fertilizers.

The case was one of considerable interest. In view of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. Accordingly, the question of whether such a contribution would be detrimental to the U.S. security and welfare had to be pursued. It was studied in great detail and, of course, advice was sought from other interested U.S. Government departments and from industry. Our decision to license was heavily weighted by the fact that potassium fertilizer can best be characterized as "peaceful goods." Increased use throughout the world of potassium fertilizer will undoubtedly increase food production. It is our conviction that increased food production throughout the world, thereby relieving hunger and human suffering, is consistent with and in furtherance of U.S. overall objectives.

Sincerely yours,

FORREST D. HOCKERSMITH,
Director.

I firmly believe that this license approval should be withdrawn by the Department of Commerce and hope that the Congress and the public will express themselves to the Department concerning whether or not they believe this proposed export is in the best interest of our security and welfare.

I want to add that while the license to ship \$10 million worth of highly automated mining machinery to the Soviet Union is one of the most serious examples that has come to my attention, it is by no means the only example of issuance of a license which should cause concern.

In July, the Department of Commerce issued a license to ship to East Germany a quantity of precision control instruments which it was stated were for use in "air conditioning." Upon inquiring, I was advised that the instruments were to be used for temperature and humidity control on various types of ships and vessels under construction in East German shipyards. It was claimed the instruments in question were "unsophisticated controls for space heating and air conditioning, which do not meet any of the current strategic criteria," whatever that may mean. On further checking, I found the license was for a total of 380 instruments that would be used in the construction of a number of vessels that were going to the U.S.S.R. Included are a passenger ship for 750 people, a passenger ship for 300 persons, 6 fishing vessels, 7 motor freighters, and a scientific research vessel, all to go to the U.S.S.R. It has also been confirmed that the very instruments in question have applications aboard naval ships as controls for cooling electronic and other military equipment.

On August 12, the Department of Commerce granted a license authorizing shipment of technical data to the U.S.S.R. This data, the Department of Commerce states, is to be used in connection with installation and operation of oil-water separator equipment at the Gujarat refinery in India being constructed by the Indian Government in collaboration with the U.S.S.R. This refinery is part of a company in the public sector of the Indian economy, meaning it is owned by the Government.

There of course continues to be many other export licenses granted to authorize shipment of such items as petroleum drilling equipment to Yugoslavia, electronic and construction equipment to Yugoslavia, and many other items to the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries.

In addition to the significance of allowing the shipment such as the automated mining equipment to the U.S.S.R. and its meaning to a buildup of the Soviet economic potential, granting a license such as this has other far-reaching significance. If such a shipment is allowed it would set a precedent, practically opening the gates for any item which conceivably could be claimed to be of less or equal significance in building up the Soviet economy and thus their overall strength as a nation. Further attempts would undoubtedly be made to secure public acceptance and acquiescence to shipping even greater amounts and different kinds of strategic goods and information which could build up the economic and military potential of the Soviet bloc.

At that point, should that happen, our export control program would be all but meaningless, an empty shell. Though

it seems clear that there are those who wish to see this become a reality, I am equally sure that far the greater majority of Americans are in complete disagreement with this goal and believe it is contrary to our security and welfare.

I have today written to the Department of Commerce urging that the Department reverse the decision to grant the license to ship the \$10 million in mining machinery to the U.S.S.R.

It is also becoming increasingly clear that it is imperative that the House recreate the House Select Committee on Export Control to maintain a continuing study of all activities in this field. I introduced a resolution for this purpose at the opening of this session and urge that it be taken up and approved.

Present practices and policies followed in the administering of the Export Control Act must have immediate attention. Decisions being made on proposed exports to the Soviet bloc give appearances of being reached on the basis of political expediency and on policies which are contrary to the best interest of our welfare and security.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF AUGUST 26, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. 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. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman, Monday is District Day. There are three bills, as follows:

CONTINUING RESOLUTION—APPROPRIATIONS

H.R. 7399, use of the Capitol and Keith Theaters as municipal theaters.

H.R. 7440, voluntary admission of patients to the District Training School.

H.R. 7497, annual statements of life insurance companies.

There are six printing authorization resolutions from the Committee on House Administration, as follows:

First. House Resolution 474, report on the increase in resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Second. House Resolution 475, report on proposed increase of \$1 billion in authorized capital of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Third. House Resolution 415, U.S. defense policies in 1962.

Fourth. House Concurrent Resolution 203, "The Federal Government and Education."

Fifth. House Concurrent Resolution 212, excerpts from Library of Congress compilation on 1963-64 national debate topic of education.

Sixth. Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, excerpts from Library of Congress

compilation on 1963-64 national debate topic of medicare.

House Resolution 444, authorizing \$7,000 for the ad hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

For Tuesday: H.R. 7544, maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963.

This will come in under a modified open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate.

S. 1007, marketing area of Bonneville Power Administration. This carries an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 6225, providing for the rehabilitation of Guam. This carries an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

May I take this time, if the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, to advise Members that legislation involving the railroad issue may well be up next week and very probably on Wednesday. We, of course, hope that this matter can be settled by industry and labor negotiations.

I know that all Members join me in urging that this matter be disposed of by the parties so that it will not have to become the problem of the Congress in the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is, of course, made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program can be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE VARIOUS REPORTS, THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight tomorrow night to file various reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. BONNER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

U.S. ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY APPEALS FOR ACTION TO AID NEGROES

Mr. ROONEY of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the National Catholic Welfare Conference released a pastoral letter, drafted by Roman Catholic bishops of the United States which reads as follows:

TEXT OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS' LETTER ON RACE

Nearly 5 years ago, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States proclaimed with one voice our moral judgment on racial discrimination and segregation. This judgment of November 1958, simply reaffirmed the Catholic position already made explicit in a much earlier statement in 1943. In the present crisis, we wish to repeat those moral principles and to offer some pastoral suggestions for a Catholic approach to racial harmony.

We insist that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. . . . Discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color, and as such injurious to human rights, regardless of personal qualities or achievements, cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity."

We reaffirm that segregation implies that people of one race are not fit to associate with another "by sole fact of race and regardless of individual qualities. . . . We cannot reconcile such a judgment with the Christian view of man's nature and rights." These principles apply to all forms of discrimination and segregation based on prejudice. In our immediate and urgent concern for the rights of Negroes, we do not overlook the disabilities visited upon other racial and national groups.

It is our strict duty in conscience to respect the basic human rights of every person. Our beloved Pontiff of blessed memory, Pope John XXIII, stated this fact in his encyclical Peace on Earth. He proclaimed that, "in human society, to one man's right there corresponds a duty in other persons: the duty, namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question." He not only condemned racial discrimination but asserted that "he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim these rights as marks of his dignity."

Respect for personal rights is not only a matter of individual moral duty; it is also a matter for civic action. Pope John stated: "The chief concern of civil authorities must . . . be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties."

We know that public authority is obliged to help correct the evils of unjust discrimination practiced against any group or class. We also recognize that every minority group in America seeking its lawful rights has the obligation of respecting the lawful rights of others. On this point, Pope John wrote:

"Since men are social by nature they are meant to live with others and to work for one another's welfare. A well-ordered human society requires that men recognize and observe their mutual rights and duties. It also demands that each contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are ever more sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled."

These truths being understood, no Catholic with a good Christian conscience can fail to recognize the rights of all citizens to vote. Moreover, we must provide for all, equal opportunity for employment, full participation in our public and private educational facilities, proper housing, and adequate welfare assistance when needed.

But more than justice is involved. There is also the divine command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Our present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, at the beginning of his pontificate, reminds us that "Revelation teaches us to love all men, whatever their condition, for they have all been redeemed by the same Saviour; and it obliges us to offer to those who have least, the means of arriving in dignity at a more human life."

It is clear that the racial question confronts the conscience of every man, no matter what his degree of direct or indirect involvement. Indeed, the conscience of the Nation is on trial. The most crucial test of love of God is love of neighbor. In the words of the beloved apostle: "If anyone says I love God and hates his brother, he is a liar. For how can he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, love God whom he does not see?"

We can show our Christian charity by a quiet and courageous determination to make the quest for racial harmony a matter of personal involvement. We must go beyond slogans and generalizations about color, and realize that all of us are human beings, men, women, and children, all sharing the same human nature and dignity, with the same desires, hopes, and feelings. We should try to know and understand one another.

To do this we must meet and talk openly and sincerely and calmly about our natural problems and concerns. There are many ways in which such meetings can come about peacefully and naturally and fruitfully. For example those in the same type of work can readily discuss the problems caused by racial barriers. Physicians of one race can talk with those of another. So can businessmen, teachers, lawyers, secretaries, farmers, clerks, and other workers. Parish and diocesan societies, political gatherings, and civic and neighborhood associations can be common meeting grounds.

Our important task is to break down the barriers that have caused such grievous misunderstandings in the past. Where barriers have existed for many decades deep misunderstandings have all too often arisen. These should be faced, not in a spirit of debate, but with a desire to open doors of understanding.

It is only by open and free exchange of ideas that we can understand the rights and obligations that prevail on both sides. Such knowledge is the prelude to action that will remove the artificial barriers of race. We must act to remove obstacles that impede the rights and opportunities of our Negro brethren. We should do our part to see that voting, jobs, housing, education, and public facilities are freely available to every American.

We can do this in our own area of work, in our neighborhood, in our community.

We may act through various lay organizations of the church, as well as with civic groups of every type. In many parts of the Nation there are interracial committees representing the major religious faiths as well as the important aspects of civic life. We bless and endorse such efforts to secure interracial harmony and to implement it in everyday affairs.

But civic action will be more fruitful, and its results more lasting, if all our citizens openly and explicitly proclaim the religious basis of racial justice and love. Accordingly, we repeat simply: Love one another, for this is the law of God. Revere in every man his human dignity, for this is a gift of God.

United, as men and women of every faith and race, we can heal the ancient wounds of division. Thus our Nation will reflect its true greatness, a greatness founded on the moral principle that all men are free and equal under God.

In all these endeavors, we must remember that they labor in vain, who seek to work without Almighty God. Our daily prayer for guidance will give us that confidence and courage we need to seek racial justice and harmony in our land. Above all, it is our prayer that the love of God may infuse our thoughts and actions, so that we may revere in every man the image of the eternal God.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM IS INCREDIBLE

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the situation that has been permitted to develop in Vietnam is incredible and the worst indictment yet of U.S. foreign policy and the military assistance program.

In that Asian nation, where American servicemen are being killed almost every day, allegedly to preserve its freedom from communism, Vietnamese troops and so-called combat police, trained, armed, and in fact paid through U.S. assistance programs, are engaged in ruthless religious persecution—the desecration of places of worship—the shooting of uncounted Vietnamese and the mass arrests of hundreds and perhaps thousands because of their religious beliefs.

This situation did not develop overnight. Both President Kennedy and the State Department have long been aware of the corrupt dictatorship of the Diem government, but both the President and the State Department procrastinated.

I insist this Government immediately take whatever action is necessary to restore freedom in that nation.

THE LATE ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. REID of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Eric Johnston's death at age 66 is a

tragic loss to the United States. He was a man of parts. He served the country with distinction in many assignments and in a variety of capacities. He was a dynamic president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for four terms and a creative businessman in his own right.

Eric was warmhearted and gay. He made friends wherever he went. Few men in public life had his ability to communicate in simple terms the things that are essential to our way of life. He was articulate in speech and affirmative in action. He was a skilled negotiator who held fast to basic principles—the values of capitalism, competition, and individual initiative—and to the fundamental strengths of American character and human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, in world affairs Eric Johnston served three Presidents and was a strong and effective supporter of meaningful foreign aid in the U.S. interest. He long was a student of Soviet affairs and served our Government in various connections therewith.

Under President Eisenhower in 1953 he was a special envoy to the Near East with the rank of Ambassador—he developed the Johnston plan for the joint use of the Jordan River Basin. In principle and on the equities it was largely agreed to. It foundered more on the political plane—than on the fairness of the plan to the several riparian nations.

It is my hope that one day all the nations in the area will see the overall merits of the Johnston plan and work to implement it—rather than expend energy in attacking it.

Finally, I would like to extend the condolences of this House and myself to Mrs. Johnston and to the family; and to say that truly America has lost one of its finest citizens and warmest advocates.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 23, 1963]

ERIC JOHNSTON DIES—AIDED THREE PRESIDENTS

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Eric A. Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, died here tonight at George Washington University Hospital. He was 66 years old.

Mr. Johnston, who had served three U.S. Presidents in various posts, had entered the hospital on June 17 after suffering a stroke. He became gradually weaker and had been in critical condition for a month.

A former president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, he had also long been a spokesman for American business. He was head of several large business concerns.

Mr. Johnston handled various Government assignments for former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. He once went to the Middle East as a special envoy for former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He lived here, where he had his headquarters. There are other headquarters of the Motion Picture Association in New York and Hollywood. Mr. Johnston administered the motion picture industry's moral code of self-censorship for 18 years.

He is survived by his widow, the former Ina Harriet Hughes, and two daughters, Mrs. William Carlin Fix and Mrs. Herbert Butler, both of Spokane, Wash.

AN EBULLIENT EXTROVERT

Eric Allen Johnston was an ebullient extrovert who started as a door-to-door salesman of vacuum cleaners and wound up as

America's most eloquent advocate of free enterprise.

At his first encounter with Mr. Johnston, President Franklin D. Roosevelt exclaimed, "My God, Eric, how did they ever elect you president of the chamber?"

And Stalin, after hearing Mr. Johnston compare some fairly liberal theories of capitalism with the rigid collectivism of the Soviet Union, said with a snort of laughter, "I'm the capitalist; you're the Communist."

Mr. Johnston came to national prominence in 1942 when a mild revolt in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made him its president and the spokesman for more than 600,000 businessmen. The chamber was under the control of men who believed they were fighting a last-ditch defense of the American way of life against the socialistic New Deal.

It was not a planned palace revolution but a spontaneous boiling up of discontent that put Mr. Johnston into power. He promptly shocked the board of directors by calling at the White House. President Roosevelt was agreeably surprised by the youthful opinions of his visitor.

Traditionalists in the chamber were horrified by a Johnston admonition delivered at the annual convention:

"The new capitalism, as I see it, is shedding the last traces of its nostalgic memory of unbridled individualism. Only the willfully blind can fail to see that the old-style capitalism of a primitive, free-shooting period is gone forever. The capitalism which thrived on low wages and maximum profits for minimum turnover, which rejected collective bargaining and fought against justified public regulation of the competitive system, is a thing of the past."

MEETING WITH LABOR

Mr. Johnston shook the ultraconservatives by taking a major step toward a rapprochement with labor. He arranged White House conferences of representatives of labor and management and was influential in bringing about labor's no-strike pledge of World War II.

Labor leaders liked his liberal employment policies. In his own companies in Spokane (household and electrical appliances and construction material) Mr. Johnston had introduced a profit-sharing plan: one-quarter of the net profits, before taxes and dividends, was distributed among the workers.

"I am assuredly no Alger hero," Eric Johnston once wrote of his career. But there were similarities to the Horatio Alger rags-to-riches formula. Young Eric was brought up in what he called genteel poverty. He succeeded, he said, thanks to "the familiar American mixture of robust striving, bold risks, self-assurance, and good luck."

His ancestors fought in the Revolution and his grandfather was a successful lawyer in Washington. But his father, Bertram Allen, who ran a drugstore in the Capital, was not lucky in business. Shortly after Eric was born in Washington on December 21, 1896, the family moved West for the elder Johnstons' health, settling in Marysville, Mont., a mining village near Helena.

A year later the family moved on to Spokane, where Bertram Johnston opened a drugstore, which eventually failed. Soon afterward he died of tuberculosis. Mrs. Johnston got a job as an attendant in a physician's office and Eric sold newspapers. An uncle who was a lawyer in Seattle urged him to study law. While attending the University of Washington, the youth earned expenses by working as a longshoreman.

LIEUTENANT IN MARINES

But Eric was never to practice law. In 1917, with the Nation at war, he was one of six seniors recommended by the university president at the request of the Marine Corps, which was seeking officer material. As a

second lieutenant, Mr. Johnston was a bayonet instructor at Quantico, Va., and Mare Island in San Francisco Bay. In 1918 he was detailed to the legation guard at Peiping, where he later served as an assistant naval attaché.

One day, in a native quarter of Peiping, Lieutenant Johnston was severely beaten on the head by an assailant. He suffered a skull fracture, and his recovery was impeded by sinus complications. After a year in various Naval hospitals, he was invalided out of the service.

Returning to Spokane, Mr. Johnston sold vacuum cleaners from door to door. The Alger theme now became dominant. He was so successful that in 1923 he and a friend bought a hole-in-a-wall vacuum-cleaner company and renamed it the Brown-Johnston Co. It became one of the largest distributors of household appliances in the Northwest. During the early 1930's Mr. Johnston organized the Columbia Electrical & Manufacturing Co., which became a leading manufacturer of electrical appliances in the area.

He discovered he was a born businessman. He had a particular flair for delegating responsibility, and this gave him time to plan further business deals. In 1933 he took over the bankrupt Washington Brick & Lime Co., as trustee for the creditors. Ten years later he turned the company back to its owners. It had paid off its entire indebtedness, had \$150,000 in the bank and was thriving. Subsequently Mr. Johnston bought into the company and became chairman. He also became president of the Wayne-Burnaby Co., an electrical contracting concern that tackled multimillion dollar jobs.

OLD GUARD OUSTED

His connection with the chamber of commerce began in 1933, when he served on its committee on taxation. He became a director in 1934 and a vice president in 1941. The chamber was then under control of the old guard.

A revolt led by westerners stirred the chamber in 1942, and the insurgents united behind Mr. Johnston, who was elected for a 1-year term.

Apparently the old guard was quickly converted to his vigorous administration. He was reelected three times.

Tall, slim, and muscular, with pale blue eyes that kept a steely quality even when he was laughing, Mr. Johnston was hailed as "the first breath of fresh air to blow through the chamber in 20 years."

He soon became the most articulate defender of business. "I plead guilty to being a Kiwanian, sharing all the sins of extrovert good fellowship, self-improvement and community spirit which the so-called intellectuals love to lampoon," he once told an audience.

Soon the Roosevelt administration was sending him abroad as a sort of salesman for free enterprise and good neighborliness. He went to South America early in 1943 as chairman of a U.S. Commission on Inter-American Development.

GUEST OF THE RUSSIANS

In the spring of 1944 Mr. Johnston was invited to Russia as an official guest of the Soviet Union. He made a 35,000-mile tour of the Soviet Republics and was one of the first foreigners allowed to inspect the gigantic industrial development behind the Urals in Siberia.

On his return he made some uncannily accurate predictions:

"When peace is again restored, Russia and the United States will possess the greater share of the world's military and industrial power.

"The destiny of the world, in large measure, will depend upon the understanding and cooperation that will exist between Russia and the United States."

Mr. Johnston's ability as a conciliator was recognized by the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations.

He served on the advisory board of the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Committee for Economic Development, the Management-Labor Committee of the War Manpower Commission, the Committee for Drafting Federal Employees, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Committee, the advisory committee of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the advisory board of the Mutual Security Agency.

In 1945, Mr. Johnston succeeded Will H. Hays as director of the Motion Picture Association of America with headquarters in Washington. This trade organization acts as a self-regulating policymaker for the motion-picture industry.

Censorship was one of Mr. Johnston's concerns. The industry's production code often came under severe attack, and Mr. Johnston had to defend the production code authority, the industry's self-censoring body. He argued that "if our movies were half as bad as some people complain, there would be censorship laws in all States and cities."

As President Dwight D. Eisenhower's special envoy to the Middle East, Mr. Johnston devised a plan in 1955 under which Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel would share the waters of the Jordan River. But the Arabs rejected the plan on the ground that to participate would mean recognizing Israel.

Mr. Johnston tried to break into politics in 1940. He was Republican candidate for Senator from Washington but was defeated. He was awarded the Medal for Merit in 1947.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Aug. 23, 1963]

ERIC JOHNSTON

WASHINGTON.—Eric A. Johnston, 66, movie czar, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and a globetrotting public servant for three Presidents, died here late yesterday.

Mr. Johnston, who was president of the Motion Picture Association of America, had entered George Washington University Hospital on June 17 after suffering a stroke. He had become gradually weaker from the effects of cerebral thrombosis.

SUCINCT

Eric Allen Johnston was once characterized as "the symbol of enlightened capitalism and progressive free enterprise."

The seeming contradiction in the modifiers was, in fact, a prime example of one of the phenomena of the middle decades of the 20th century. He was a self-made man who grasped the fact that Government and labor must play important roles in the Nation's economy, that this economy is inextricably intertwined with that of the rest of the world.

OUTSPOKEN

No firmer evidence of this could be advanced than Mr. Johnston's seeking, and obtaining an appointment with President Roosevelt in 1942 soon after he had been elected president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, youngest man ever to hold that post.

"How in the world," asked Mr. Roosevelt after a few minutes of conversation, "did they ever elect you?"

What Mr. Johnston was trying to do at that time was heal the breach between business and the administration. His success as a conciliator is attested by the fact that, though a lifelong Republican, he received important assignments by both President Roosevelt and Truman as well as President Eisenhower.

But conciliation to him had its limits. He scoffed at the substitution of "free enterprise" for "capitalism" and used the latter word persistently during a long conver-

sation with Josef Stalin at the Kremlin in 1944. He was equally outspoken about his political affiliation, using it to good effect during that same visit to Russia.

Leaving Moscow, he went on to Novosibirsk and met Mikhail Kulagin, a Siberian Communist party chief. The latter offered him an ornate box filled with precious stones. There was the following exchange:

SHARP

Mr. Johnston: "Why, this is a fortune. I can't take this."

Mr. Kulagin (angrily): "It is from the people of Siberia. If you don't take it you will be insulting them."

Mr. Johnston: "You are a member of the Communist Party, subject to the discipline of the party?"

Mr. Kulagin: "Naturally."

Mr. Johnston: "Well, Mr. Kulagin, I am a member of the Republican Party. By its order, I am not permitted to accept your magnificent gift."

FIGHTER

The Communist leader understood at once and accepted the return of the box.

Mr. Johnston did not always see eye-to-eye with his Republican brethren, however. He was a firm and highly vocal supporter of foreign aid. He not only felt that the European Common Market posed no threat to the American economy but that this country might well join it. As czar of the movie industry, he fought for a freer exchange of films between the nations arrayed on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain.

"The great challenge before the American businessman today is to find new ways to diffuse the benefits of capitalism among more people," he once said. "I am not talking about sharing the wealth. I am talking about new wealth to share."

Mr. Johnston was born in Washington, D.C., on December 21, 1896. But his father suffered from tuberculosis and the family moved first to Montana and then to Spokane, Wash., while he was still a baby. After his father died, he had to go to work at odd jobs while still in school.

"Money means a great deal to me," he said in later years "because I saw so little of it as a boy."

He worked his way through the University of Washington, graduating from there with a law degree in 1917. One of his jobs was longshoreman on the Seattle docks; another was college librarian. During summers, he worked in the wheatfields as a binder.

His graduation coincided with the U.S. entry into World War I. Commissioned in the Marines, he served until 1922 when he was discharged because of a head injury suffered in Peiping as a member of the U.S. Legation guard.

Doctors told him that he should stay out of doors as much as possible. So he returned to Spokane and got a job selling vacuum cleaners.

Adding the larger part of his commissions to money he had saved while in the Marines, he was able to buy into the company, which became one of the largest distributors of household appliances in the Northwest. He formed other companies, both manufacturing and selling, that were equally successful.

GENEROUS

Labor had a reserved liking for him because he urged liberal employment practices. In his own companies, a quarter of the net profits, before taxes and dividends, were distributed among the workers in a profit-sharing program.

His election to the presidency of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the ensuing meeting with F.D.R. set his feet on paths far removed from his immediate business interests. He served on numerous boards and committees during World War II and Presi-

dent Truman called upon him for similar duties when the war was over.

On September 9, 1945, he accepted the post of president of the Motion Picture Association of America and remained in that job, except for interruptions by calls from the White House, during the years that followed. MPAA is a self-regulating policymaking trade organization for the movie industry. Its membership includes most of the major producers.

Mr. Johnston said when he accepted the \$100,000 to \$125,000 a year position that he was "attracted to the motion picture industry because it offers unlimited opportunities to work for peace and prosperity at home and abroad."

CRYPTIC

Since at least half of the industry's gross revenue comes from foreign showings the job also offered him unlimited opportunities for globetrotting. One such trip was to the Soviet Union in 1958 where he continued his indefatigable efforts to arrange an exchange of American and Russian films.

A 5-hour talk with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev gave him a chance to compare the Red leader with Stalin whom he had seen 14 years earlier. His somewhat cryptic analysis: "Khrushchev is diametrically opposed to Stalin in everything except philosophy." He did not expand this statement.

One of the movie problems that occupied much of Mr. Johnston's time he was not abroad was that of censorship. The industry has its own production code but it is subject to recurrent criticism by church and other groups. When such criticism became extremely loud in 1955, he said "if our movies were half as bad as some people complain there would be censorship laws in all States and cities. . . . The goal of producers is to make pictures reasonably accepted by reasonable people."

DEDICATED

Among the interruptions of his work as MPAA president was a call from President Eisenhower in 1953 to go to the Middle East as the President's personal representative with the rank of ambassador. Object: To get agreement between Israel and her Arab neighbors on a plan to develop the Jordan Valley by irrigation and a power network. He made some progress at the time but nothing came of the idea.

Of medium height, Mr. Johnston always looked lean and fit. He never seemed worried, was at ease in all sorts of company. He made one venture into politics, in 1940, but was defeated as Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate from his home State.

He held 14 honorary degrees but never did get to practice law and was essentially a businessman all his life.

"America wants an America where little men can compete . . . chance to take a chance . . . a people's capitalism," he declared. "Beaten paths are for beaten men."

—RALPH CHAPMAN.

IS USDA LAWFULLY IN NEWS SERVICE BUSINESS?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, of the Committee on Agriculture, to call a public hearing to get the facts on the market news service inaugurated Au-

gust 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Serious questions are involved.

Did the Department of Agriculture have statutory authority to get into the business of disseminating news in competition with private news distribution firms?

If so, can Government lawfully assume an expanding role in news dissemination, perhaps leading to Government domination and control of news services?

The rules under which the news service is established permit the Department to cancel subscribers without notice or reason. This will permit Government to retaliate against newspapers and radio and television stations which criticize Government programs and policies.

This looks like a foot-in-the-door for subtle but effective censorship by Government.

Here is the text of my letter to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]:

AUGUST 23, 1963.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Newspaper Publishers Association filed a petition July 22 with the Federal Communications Commission asking for suspension of the market news service inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

There is serious question whether the U.S. Government has statutory authority to enter into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies.

Deeply involved is the broad principle of a free press and the danger of censorship implicit in the Department's news service rules.

The service can be terminated by the USDA. The Department reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who "abuse" the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable.

According to the ANPA this raises the possibility of censorship in its most odious form.

As newspaper publisher myself, I am especially concerned lest this become the first step toward an expanding role of Government in controlling the distribution of news.

I believe it would be in the public interest to ask responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture to appear before the Committee on Agriculture in public hearings to get the facts.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Here is the text of a statement on this issue by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, dated July 25, 1963:

ANPA PETITIONS FCC TO SUSPEND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT MARKET NEWS SERVICE

ANPA filed a petition July 22 with the Federal Communications Commission asking for suspension of the market news service to be inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Specifically, petition calls for suspension or rejection of the new A.T. & T. tariff which establishes the service. All contracts for the service must be between the subscriber and A.T. & T., subject to Agriculture Department approval.

ANPA petition argues there is no statutory authority permitting the U.S. Government to enter the business of collecting and disseminating news, in competition with private news agencies. ANPA also maintains that

the Government would be permitted to exercise censorship "in one of its most odious forms," since the Agriculture Department could deny the service to a subscriber at any time for alleged "misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment such cancellation is desirable."

Petition was also filed in this matter July 22 by P.A.M. News Corp. (Ridder newspapers).

Text of ANPA petition follows:
 "The American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA), 750 Third Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., pursuant to the provisions of 1,463 of the rules, hereby petitions the Commission to suspend and set for hearing or reject seventh revised page 41 of A.T. & T. Tariff FCC No. 208, published to become effective August 1, 1963.

"In support whereof, petitioner states:
 "1. The above-named page, effective August 1, 1963, was filed under A.T. & T. Transmittal No. 7576, dated July 1, 1963, which states:

"This filing is being made in compliance with the decision and orders of the Federal Communications Commission adopted January 28, 1963, FCC 63-66 (34 FCC 217) and May 27, 1963, FCC 63-491 (34 FCC 1094) in dockets Nos. 11645 and 11646."

"2. However, this particular tariff page was not filed to comply with any decision or order of the Commission but was filed to establish for the first time an entirely new type of service not heretofore furnished.

"3. On May 20 and July 10, 1963, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced the establishment of a New Market News Service and a copy of these two announcements are attached hereto as attachments A and B. Also, the Department of Agriculture recently issued a bulletin describing the new service more fully and a copy of this bulletin (AMS 510) entitled 'A New Market News Service' is attached as attachment C. It is this New Market News Service that the new A.T. & T. tariff page purports to establish although this fact is not disclosed in the A.T. & T. transmittal letter as should have been done under the Commission's rules (sec. 61.33).

"4. Petitioner requests that this new tariff page be suspended or rejected.

"5. This is a new venture of the U.S. Government into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies. Petitioner knows of no statutory authority by which the U.S. Department of Agriculture may expend Federal tax funds for this purpose.

"6. The highly improper nature of the new service is characterized by the following conditions imposed upon the service:

SERVICE CAN BE TERMINATED BY USDA

The new service is available to all who want it, and no application need be made to USDA to receive service. However, USDA reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable. (See p. 4 of attachment C.)

"7. This provision would permit U.S. Government censorship in one of its most odious forms. Any newspaper seeking to subscribe to this new service could be denied service for any reason. Any newspaper already subscribing could have its service canceled without notice or reason. Editorials written by a newspaper that the Department of Agriculture didn't like would, under the above-quoted provision be grounds for denial or cancellation of service.

"8. Thus, this news service has transcendent importance. If it is not halted now, it could lead to further ambitious attempts by this and other U.S. Government agencies to expand and enter into competition with private news agencies. An expansion of this concept would result in a government-controlled news service such as presently exists in some other countries including the Soviet

Union, where the so-called news service Tass is government owned and operated.

"9. The tariff violates sections 201, 202, and 214 of the act and section 61.69(b) of the rules reading as follows:

"(b) When tariffs or supplements are issued on less than statutory notice, under permission, decision, order or regulation of the Commission, strict compliance with all conditions named therein and all rules and regulations of the Commission not expressly waived will be required; otherwise they will be rejected."

Wherefore petitioner requests the Commission either to suspend or reject the tariff page referred to above.

Here is a comment on this problem as it appeared in the August 19 Journal of Commerce:

THE AMERICAN TASS

(By Eric Ridder)

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Service (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports, and (seemingly for the enlightenment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The Service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayers' money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up "an American Tass" (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had been already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (the PAM News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire service to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the Commission."

So the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the

subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A.T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not mishandle the news. Billings and collections would be up to A.T. & T. itself. The Government sincerely hoped that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, cancelled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire service. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during elections years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not quite qualify as constructive news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mis-handling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news) it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their excontemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all-too familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

TOO TRUE TO BE GOOD

To some readers the American Tass (see above) may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of PAM News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayer's expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A.T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since PAM, a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators, and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result is intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspapers Publishers' Association and PAM took the issue to FCC the Commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the Commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigants time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follows pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM News Corp. and the decision of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A.T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the Department of Agriculture says in one paragraph:

"According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph:

"Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs:

"The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiality of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service."

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time-consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catchall reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catchall" reservation is? A sentence in the next paragraph:

"Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence:

"In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service?

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services says as follows:

"The PAM News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the PAM News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, business firms, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in the American Tass, I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaw's plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

FAILURE OF THE HOUSE TO PASS AIRTIGHT BAN ON AID TO COUNTRIES TRADING WITH CUBA, AS PROPOSED IN THE CRAMER AMENDMENT, WILL COME BACK TO HAUNT THE CONGRESS BE- CAUSE THE AMENDMENT PASSED LEAVES A GAPING LOOPHOLE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the misrepresented effect of the amendment banning aid to countries trading with Cuba, written into the foreign aid bill, H.R. 7885, just passed by the House, and because of the manner in which my amendment, putting teeth into this foreign aid ban was defeated by a tie vote of 162 to 162, and then only after the chairman in a seldom precedented action voted to create the teller tie, I believe it my duty to clarify the record.

The amendment as passed is a meaningless, halfhearted attempt to give the public the impression that Congress is insisting on stopping aid to countries that trade with Cuba when this is not the case on the record.

The House had an opportunity to cut off aid to countries trading with Cuba by adopting my amendment to the Fascell-Rogers amendment.

In order to put the issue in focus, I reprint hereafter the Fascell-Rogers amendment as passed and my amendment which failed by a tie vote.

The Fascell-Rogers amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 10, strike out "graph:" and insert in lieu thereof "graphs:".

Page 14, line 10, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days

after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

My amendment added this sentence to the Fascell-Rogers amendment:

The restrictions contained in this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act or in any other provision of law.

It is obvious from a careful analysis of the action of the House in refusing my amendment and passing the watered-down aid ban amendment of Fascell-Rogers, that the House in effect did nothing that is not already accomplished under present law.

Under present law, the President has discretion to cut off or withhold aid to any country if he determines it to be "in the national interest"—for whatever reason he and the State Department decide. This is inherent in the aid program. It is specifically spelled out under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Section 614 specifically provides:

The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this Act—when the President determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States.

Thus, it is obvious that the President can waive the provisions of the Fascell-Rogers amendment and permit aid to go to countries when he cares to so exercise that discretion.

As a matter of fact, that is the loophole that has resulted in 50 percent of the ships going to Cuba to continue to be free world ships. The President used section 614 to get around the amendment—similar to the Fascell-Rogers amendment, passed in the fiscal 1962 foreign aid appropriations bill—to even permit Greece to ship oil to Cuba.

Thus, my amendment was to make the aid ban on countries trading with Cuba mandatory, because the experience under the 1962 ban—similar to the Fascell-Rogers ban—proved that the President and the State Department would exercise their discretion to waive that amendment under section 614 in a manner that defeated the purpose of the amendment.

My amendment would have removed the discretion contained in section 614 and thus make such a ban airtight. This is the only way to stop trading with Cuba by friendly foreign aid recipient nations.

I think the House missed its only real opportunity to cut off such trade when it failed to pass my amendment. I shall be

watching with special interest the trading that continues between Cuba and foreign aid recipients in 1963 and 1964 under the watered-down Fascell-Rogers amendment, which I believe will be the final and clinching proof of my position.

WHERE ARE COMMUNISTS ON THE RUN?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the entire debate on the Foreign Assistance Act and the one major argument given time and time again was that we needed to pass this bill in order to prevent the spread of communism. The argument was substantiated even by the suggestion that we now have the Communists on the run. Had not there been so much talk on the bill which I feared might make the debate on this \$4½ billion bill—a most serious matter for the taxpayers who must pay for it—a circus rather than the important consideration it is, I would have asked time during the debate to ask for some evidence to substantiate the argument.

I might ask just where are the Communists on the run?

In Cuba, with missiles in place to protect the Communist government of Castro from those who, loving freedom, want to take back the country stolen from them?

In Cuba where there is in process the building of a submarine base?

In Cuba which has been turned into a Western Hemisphere base for subversion schools and propaganda mills, munition depots and radar monitoring stations?

In Venezuela where terrorism and sabotage are on the increase?

In British Guiana where the first Communist toehold on the Latin American Continent is forming?

In Laos where Averell Harriman's troika regime is pulling the country straight down the drain for a Communist takeover?

In Korea where the "truce" is broken from time to time?

In Berlin where the wall is daily beefed up and Communist guards still shoot unarmed civilians?

On the high seas where our military forces trace the movement of freedom fighters to head them off before touching their native soil they desire to reclaim?

In Russia and East Europe where thousands of Congolese and other Africans are being trained for the next round of rebellion in Africa?

In Yemen where Soviet engineers are rolling out an airstrip on a staging point for Africa and points west?

In Africa's Golden Horn where Soviet experts are building a new port for Soviet trawlers, submarines, and warships?

In the United States where Gus Hall and his tribes infiltrate the campuses of our Nation's universities and the Communist Party announces, as top priority, its effort to increase racial turmoil and violence both North and South?

In Haiti where the pot is boiling with increased ferocity?

All this after spending nearly \$110 billion in 18 years for foreign aid to fight communism.

The argument that we need the foreign aid program to combat communism would have more merit if part of the money that has been requested had not gone into the support of Communist countries which are part of the bloc against which we are waging the cold war.

It would have more merit if our present foreign policy was not one of accommodation and appeasement, for the purpose—using the President's own words—"to make the world safe for diversity," which simply means to make the world safe for communism—coexistence on an equal basis.

It would have more merit if our military policy was not one which is built on the premise that in order to keep the peace we must have a nuclear stalemate, for example, disarm ourselves down to the level of the enemy.

The argument would have more merit if we had not abandoned the Monroe Doctrine and helped dig the grave in which we buried it.

I make one other observation. The argument that we must be humanitarian and thus continue this multibillion-dollar gift business, lacks respect for the will of the people as to how their money for aid should be spent.

In the hearing before the subcommittee a representative of a large church body—I will not mention either his name or the name of the denomination in whose behalf he allegedly appeared since I am sure he did not appear for this lobby purpose as a result of the direct vote of the members of its respective denomination—testified upon questioning that the giving of his denomination for foreign aid—foreign mission—averaged out to \$1.50 per member per year. This is what people voluntarily gave. This bill represented a request for foreign aid amounting to \$100 for every family of four—not a voluntary but a mandatory gift which they would be forced to give because the Government would tax them for it. Can we justify forcing our citizens to participate in a giving for foreign aid purposes and this to the tune of \$25 a year for every member of the family, large or small?

ONE-MILLIONTH CARLOAD OF LETTUCE SHIPPED FROM SALINAS VALLEY, CALIF.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this week the Salinas Valley shipped its millionth carload—railroad carload—of head lettuce. This is a lot of lettuce. It means a lot of things to many people. It is only one of many fresh fruit and vegetable crops grown in, and shipped from the Salinas Valley. It has helped to provide a bountiful sustenance for many persons throughout the United States—most of the produce is shipped to the Eastern States. It has provided many good jobs for many thousands of persons of all skill levels, callings, trades, and professions throughout the United States. It has contributed more to the raising of the standard of living of as many people as any other industry.

The obligation of helping to feed the United States, and much of the world, will continue. We are proud of our record. We are anxious to discharge our obligation even better.

Needless to say the abrupt discontinuance of the bracero method for providing the necessary supplemental labor to harvest crops will cause chaos and disruption to this small but important and productive industry.

I share the following newspaper article from the Salinas Californian with my colleagues primarily to acquaint them with the importance of this industry to the residents of every congressional district in the United States.

MILESTONE IN LETTUCE IS REACHED

The one-millionth carload of lettuce rolled out of the Salinas Valley this morning, bedecked with bunting and loaded with produce representing some 400 Salinas Valley growers.

Each of the lettuce cartons is carefully wrapped in foil, and bound for New York where it will be sold in a special auction, with the proceeds going to the American Red Cross.

The iceberg lettuce was donated by members of the Growers Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, which represents growers in the Monterey-Santa Cruz-San Benito County areas.

The millionth car was launched on its way by Charles Paul, director of the California Department of Agriculture; members of the California State Legislature, and other dignitaries, including Pamela Gamble, last year's Miss California.

IMPORTANT MILESTONE

At the brief but historic ceremony, the shipment of the millionth car was hailed as an important milestone by J. J. Crosetti, president of the Grower-Shipper Association.

Crosetti said: "The Salinas Valley today typifies the important role which all of California's agricultural areas play in the lives of every man, woman, and child in the United States."

He added that, "from California's comparatively limited valleys and foothills, containing less than 3 percent of the Nation's farms, our State's growers provide over 42 percent of the Nation's fruits and nuts; 43 percent of the Nation's vegetables and over 25 percent of the entire Nation's supply of food."

FIRST SHIPMENT RECALLED

Today's 1,000,000th carload in the ultra-modern PFE mechanical reefer was a far cry from the first shipment of iced lettuce which left the Salinas Valley in 1921. A shipment which ended in disaster when the car ran out of ice before it reached its destination.

The very chore of icing that first car gave birth to an anecdote still going around Salinas. It is said the growers' order for

10 cakes of ice was doubted by the owner of the local iceplant. He thought the order must have meant 10 pounds, and insisted upon seeing the car before delivering the ice.

Within a few years, however, there were no doubts about the demands on ice production. Before the advent of mechanical vacuum coolers, Salinas made and used more ice than the city of New York.

NEW RECORD SET

By 1937, the district shipped 26,000 cars to set a new record for shipments from one district in one season. By the early fifties, these shipments had grown to 40,000 cars a year.

Although the area is a major producer of other vegetables, having shipped to date over 150,000 cars of mixed vegetables with no less than 50 different varieties in a single car, lettuce is still king. And though today, shipments from Salinas must share the market with many new growing areas, the Salad Bowl of the World still accounts for 40 percent of the Nation's lettuce with about 85 percent of its shipments going out of State.

Jack Blas, executive vice president of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association, summarized it all very nicely as he watched the millionth carload move out of the railroad yards on its way to New York.

"That carload represents more than the 999,999 cars which have preceded it," he said. "It represents the economy of this area, the economy of California's millions of jobs and the major source of food for even more millions of Americans. It symbolizes something that all of us should be very proud to be a part of. For it represents California agriculture which * * * even in this world of rockets and space technology * * * is still our No. 1 industry."

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a major struggle has developed on the question of once again extending Public Law 78, which permits Mexican nationals to enter this country to perform agricultural labor on a seasonal basis.

Long before coming here, I felt that the bracero program was wrong—the moral concept was wrong, and the impact it had on American agricultural workers was wrong.

My efforts against extension of the bracero law began with the hearings on H.R. 2009, a bill that this House defeated on May 29 by a vote of 154 to 178. Shortly thereafter, the Senate was given S. 1703, a bill exactly like H.R. 2009, except that it provided for a 1-year extension of Public Law 78. This month, that bill passed the Senate, but only after it had been amended so that domestic workers are guaranteed the same conditions as Mexican nationals. The House will get S. 1703, but without that amendment. I hope that this House will again defeat extension of Public Law 78, despite the heavy lobbying effort now being exerted in its behalf. For this law is a shameful piece of legislation, a blight on our conscience—it is a disgrace which we have once rejected, and are now called

upon to reject again. Let us confirm our judgment that no good can come from a law which is unjust.

TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it has been an amazing thing to watch the complete smear and distortion job which has been done by liberal news media on the Young Republican National Convention which was held in San Francisco, June 25-28, 1963. It is of course to be expected because there are bad tidings at home for the pseudoliberal element in contemporary politics. Harbingers of change are evident everywhere and the liberals just cannot get used to it, whether they be liberals in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. In truth, it is amazing to see how similar the tactics are for those who profess to be Republicans and their liberal counterparts in the other party. You can read what Governor Rockefeller, the ADA, the official Democratic newspaper, Drew Pearson, former Young Republican Chairman Len Nadasdy, and the AFL-CIO are saying without changing the copy. It carries the same tune all of the way through.

Charges have been hurled which need to be answered. The record should be set straight. To be fair, it must be admitted that the non-Republican liberal community has received grist for their propaganda mills through the irresponsible statements of GOP spokesmen who should know better such as the Governor of New York and former Chairman Nadasdy. It has been alleged that radicals took over the Young Republican movement. The tactics of these unknown radicals have been depicted as roughshod, totalitarian, Birch inspired and controlled, fantastic—well, just about every extreme adjective which can be imagined. Pleas of unity have scattered to the winds. This buttresses the opinions I have had for many years. As long as the minority liberal faction in the Republican Party can either run things or have disproportionate voice, unity is fine. If the overwhelming conservative majority ever appears to exert its rightful voice and looks like it might have its say, unity goes to the winds and the liberal element attacks its own with all of the passion of the opposition party.

Chairman Donald "Buz" Lukens, our new YR National Chairman, has been singled out for particular attack. Of course, he was not supposed to win and it did create a traumatic experience for those who were preparing to toast the supposed winner. Chairman Nadasdy, in fact, told reporters he was "in a state of shock." In Nadasdy's case, it can't be said that his shock moved him to make unfortunate utterances on the spur of the moment which he would now regret. In his particular case, he had been using the old scare technique line even before the convention so his regrettable and untrue charges in the post-convention period were out of the same cloth. Newspaper reports from his na-

tive State of Minnesota carried his "grave" warnings about the dangers ahead at San Francisco. He told reporters that he feared a takeover by the forces of the far right in San Francisco. In the same tar brush style of his apparent mentor, Governor Rockefeller, he of course never bothered to define what he meant by radical right, name the people who presented the supposed threat or responsibly state the case.

Parroting this line in advance of the San Francisco convention was a little known Kiplinger-like newsletter published by Bundy Clarke, former Young Republican leader in the District of Columbia. Clarke was ousted from power by "Buz" Lukens before the latter's election as Young Republican head which might account for some of his flavoring of his reports. Loosely called Political Intelligence, the Clarke publication has sought to label the conservative group in Young Republican national politics as the "syndicate" and the Nadasdy faction as the "gangbusters." This "good guys" and "bad guys" technique is a shallow perversion of the truth, too blatant to receive serious consideration.

An interesting side note is the fact that Nadasdy should receive one of his greatest accolades from a very liberal Representative from his own State, DONALD M. FRASER, the man who beat our great Walter Judd. In the July 9 daily RECORD on pages A4269-A4270, Representative FRASER stated:

Mr. Nadasdy's comparison of these tactics with those pursued by the Communists is valid * * *. It is unfortunate that Senator GOLDWATER should appear to be the beneficiary of the activity of these extremists. * * * I wish to commend Mr. Nadasdy for his expressed determination to alert the people to the dangers of the Birch Society and the radical right.

I have included this entire article in the appendix to these remarks. The article appeared in the July 7, 1963, Minneapolis Tribune and is "politics by epithet" at its very worst. Read some of the vague insinuations which Nadasdy made:

But, he said, Lukens' supporters used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful.

At the center of the confusion were members of the John Birch Society and the radical right, Nadasdy said.

During the coming year, I want to try to alert the people, and especially the Republicans, as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right, which is to subvert the Republican Party and to seize control, rather than just nominate a presidential candidate.

I have been in politics for a long time. I do not recall anyone making smears as bad as these. Nadasdy owes the Republican Party one of two things: First, an apology, or, second, documentation and evidence which can support his charge. The latter he cannot do. Consider the absurdity of his further allegation from the Minneapolis Tribune article:

John Birchers at the Young Republican convention were mostly from California,

Illinois, and Iowa, with a scattering from other States, Nadasdy said.

He of course is throwing the words "John Birch" around as something synonymous with evil. While I personally believe that the John Birch Society has been distorted out of proportion and does not pose a threat—especially when considered in the light of the ADA and other leftwing organizations which are a true threat and have a position of power in the Kennedy administration—a threat to either the country or the Republican Party, this is not the point here. He is using the charge as a scare word and smear and must therefore be considered in that light.

This is not only a reprehensible charge—it is, I am sure, an unfounded lie. To smear the Young Republicans from these great States is an injustice the likes of which is unknown in the annals of Young Republican history. I personally know most of the Iowa and Illinois Young Republican delegates in particular, and I find it hard to believe that a person could be so irresponsible as to brand them with such accusations. Can he name one—just one—John Birch member from any of these States? I doubt it. There were well over 1,000 delegates there, I would guess, and the impression is given that the Birchers and the radical right controlled things so he should be able to name scores of them if it were an honest statement. I doubt if it were an honest answer.

It was my pleasure to attend the Young Republican National Convention. This made the sixth biennial convention which I have attended. The convention was indeed a rollicking affair. There was pandemonium, there was plenty of enthusiasm and at times it was noisy and boisterous. What is new about this? Observation: Anyone who would say the shouting was one-sided or from an imaginary radical right is not telling you the truth. Both sides had their share of levity, dilatory tactics, groans and shouts of protest—all the things that go into this American institution we call a political convention. I saw delegates shouting, for example, who were properly at a microphone trying to get attention of the Chair to change their votes or make a point of order. They were repeatedly overlooked by the Chair. I saw the Chair act most irresponsibly in several instances. On one occasion, the convention seemed to be getting out of hand and he issued an order that guests be ejected from the room despite the fact that the guest section was serene by comparison. I saw the huge New York delegation in its little ploy to gain time at the end of the ballot when all appeared to be lost. They asked for a poll of the delegation which took at least 5 minutes and didn't change a vote—nobody expected it to. I saw pandemonium break loose, and properly so, when after the first ballot results were announced, Chairman Nadasdy erroneously proclaimed that Chuck McDevitt had been elected chairman when constitutionally he had not. Is not that the type of thing that might just encourage a few people to shout et cetera? I saw the tumult as the Young Republican favorite, BARRY GOLDWATER, addressed an

admiring throng. I saw a lot of things but one thing I did not see—these stealthy, dangerous, and diabolical people Nadasdy and Rockefeller have alluded to who supposedly are trying to ruin our great party, these radical rightists and John Birchers who are posing such a threat. Where were they, Mr. Nadasdy and Mr. Rockefeller? Are you honest or responsible enough to tell us?

As is typical at Young Republican conventions, it is impossible to say that conservatives defeated liberals. Just about everybody there was a conservative. Chuck McDevitt, a capable and honorable Young Republican from Idaho, had good conservative credentials. While his major support came from the more liberal wing of the Republican Party such as New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey delegations, he had such conservatives behind him as the majority of the Texas delegation. Try to find liberals among the Young Republicans in Texas if you want a real job. Personalities, likes and dislikes, regional coalitions, old feuds, and so forth, had as much to do with the results as anything. It is true that the winner had endorsed Senator GOLDWATER for the Presidency but this was not decisive in my opinion. Many delegates with whom I spoke were convinced that both candidates would be for GOLDWATER and the loser, Chuck McDevitt, was not against the Senator despite his basic New York support. One thing is certain, he would not have been caught dead being openly for Nelson Rockefeller. This would have been the kiss of death and he knew it.

Two other distinguished Congressmen were present and they, too, have expressed amazement over the Drew Pearson-Rockefeller-Nadasdy charges. I include their statements at this point:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM E. BROCK, OF TENNESSEE

It was my pleasure to attend the recent Young Republican National Federation convention in San Francisco as a guest and participant in the official program.

Unfortunately, several big city newspapers, the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education, certain journalists, and some self-seeking politicians have condemned the Young Republicans. These dedicated young Americans have been accused of being "fogies," coming from the "radical right lunatic fringe," being guilty of using "Fascist tactics" and acting "just like the Communists."

Unlike most of those who have seen fit to criticize the convention, I was there. So was my distinguished colleague and past national chairman of the Young Republicans, JOHN ASHBROOK. We feel it is time to set the record straight on some of these inaccurate statements.

The fact of the matter is that the whole tone of the convention was conservative. Apologists for the present administration can find little contentment in viewing the deliberations of such a conservative body, and they have resorted to smearing the whole 600,000-member federation.

In San Francisco young people were taking a keen interest in practical politics. No longer are today's youth apathetic about affairs of state; no longer are they satisfied to let others do their thinking for them. They desperately want to participate in the body politic. This is healthy. And being part of today's political process, they are training to be leaders of tomorrow. This is wholesome. Too often the outcome of political conventions is decided in the backrooms

by party bosses. In San Francisco the elections were decided on the floor of the convention. This, too, is good.

True, emotions ran high. Pressures and counterpressures were delivered with gusto. One could sense the excitement and enthusiasm of the event just by entering the convention hall and viewing the banners, badges, and balloons. The battle was hard-fought, but men with wounded pride, muck-rakers and ambitious politicians do the country a disservice, I believe, by trying to dampen the interest of young people in politics.

As for the Young Republicans, I predict they will be leading the great phalanx of united Republicans, armed with principle on their side, marching toward victory at the polls next year. For myself, I'm proud to be a member of the Young GOP.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ED FOREMAN OF TEXAS

I was pleased to have been invited to appear on the program and speak before the Young Republican Convention held at San Francisco during June. The enthusiasm, the determination and dedication exhibited by these fine young people was an encouraging ray of optimism. Young folks from all over America were gathered to express their concern over our national, and in fact international, deplorable and disgusting state of affairs.

True, as with all young political groups, the meeting was lively indeed, but definitely not dangerous, radical or uncontrollable as has been indicated by some of the lesser informed. My own State of Texas delegation was a typical group—all responsible, sound conservatives—they split down the middle on their vote for the Young Republican presidential candidates. We need more young people in America today, like those who met in San Francisco, who are willing to devote a part of their efforts and energies to helping extend the cause of freedom and blunt the spearhead of socialism and communism.

Then, too, note carefully the observations of other Young Republicans who also are offended at the smear technique being used against them. They were there. These are their comments:

AUGUST 16, 1963.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
State of New York, Executive Chamber,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER: Having been a delegate to the recent National Convention of the Young Republican Federation, I was very interested in your July 14, 1963, observations relating to that convention, particularly where you noted:

"But every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed, and operating through the tactics of ruthless roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

Be assured that, as an objective observer of this convention, I quite agree. The extremist group spent over twice as much money at the convention; were extremely well organized (electing four of the top five officers of the federation); were involved in such irresponsible activities as cutting the opposition's private telephone lines, and in attempting to obtain passage of divisive resolutions relating to unimportant aspects of our party's national organization.

I am delighted by your concern, since the group I described was financed and organized by the New York delegation. I trust your expressed concern will result in a housecleaning in the New York Federation of Young Republicans.

Very truly yours,

WILLARD D. DOVER.
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

[From the Oregonian, July 6, 1963]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. BELL, CHAIRMAN,
YOUNG REPUBLICAN FEDERATION OF OREGON

To the Editor:

The attack by Rowland Evans, New York Herald Tribune correspondent, on the National Young Republican Federation convention this past week was unwarranted. Evans, typical of the individual who believes all views other than his own to be extreme, put together a real "mish-mash" of facts when he attempted to review the events that occurred at the convention in San Francisco.

Evans would have the people believe that the key issue of the Young Republican convention was one of the "moderates" versus the "extremists" and which philosophy was going to prevail. Actually the issue was justice versus injustice. Thank God that men of principle stood and made themselves heard and counted regardless of philosophy in order that justice could prevail.

The ruthless parliamentary tactics used by outgoing Chairman of the National Federation Leonard Nadasdy will be long remembered by this writer. This man used his position of power while chairing the convention to rule again and again in favor of his 1961 campaign manager, Charles McDevitt from Boise, Idaho. On the first ballot, he even declared McDevitt elected and then had to rescind this ruling because his candidate did not have a majority of the total delegates present.

The Oregon delegation went to the convention uncommitted, determined to do what was best for the Republican Party and the State we represented. As moderate Republicans, it did not take us long to see through the shoddy veil of deceit that the then national chairman was trying to draw over the eyes of the delegates present.

Many of the so-called conservative States such as Texas, Georgia, Wyoming, Arkansas, and Colorado voted consistently with New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and other liberal Eastern States.

On the other hand, the majority of the delegates from the supposedly liberal States of Michigan, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin were lined up behind the new national chairman, Donald E. Lukens, of Washington, D.C.

When reviewed in this light, Columnist Evans' conclusion that this was a battle between the moderates and extremists certainly does not hold water. According to Evans, outgoing Chairman Nadasdy, in trying to bring order to the proceedings, muttered to himself, "This is incredible." Observing from the floor Chairman Nadasdy's entire handling of the convention, I concur, this was incredible. Incredible that an officer of a highly respected national organization would indulge in such shenanigans.

Incredible that the tone of the convention was set by the fact that the Nadasdy organization hired private police to be present and also insisted upon reinforcements in the form of members of the San Francisco police. This was a vain attempt to intimidate the delegates. Such extremely unusual action was incongruous with the high calibre of individuals who represented their States as delegates which included Congressmen, Judges, State legislators, attorneys, etc.

Strangely enough, the police were absent at the precise moment that the national YR secretary, Carolyn Manchester from Portland, Maine, needed them to protect her from the irrational outburst of Chairman Nadasdy. In an effort to stop her from announcing the official vote, which elected Lukens the winner and defeated the chairman's candidate, McDevitt, she was violently shoved away from the microphone by Nadasdy before she could announce the results.

This type of delaying tactic brought out into the open the unethical conduct that was already a key controversy of the convention. I, for one, with many other young Americans,

do not believe chivalry is dead. This action on the part of the national chairman clarified the real issue at stake.

The charge that the rightest-controlled California delegation set the tune of the convention was again ridiculous. Robert Gaston, chairman of California YR's in his race for the national chairmanship, remained in only on the first ballot and received a total of nine votes outside of his own State. If this indicates support of a so-called extremist California group from over 1,400 delegates and alternates, I fail to see it.

Do not mistake what this means. No one of clear conscience will say that politics is all good, but let every man of sound principle say a silent prayer of thanks that there are still men who can't be bought, threatened, or cajoled into giving up these principles we all hold to be true.

ROBERT D. BELL,

Chairman, Young Republican Federation of Oregon.

STATEMENT BY JACK A. QUILICO, CHAIRMAN,
THE MONTANA YOUNG REPUBLICANS

The remarks of Leonard Nadasdy, former national chairman of the Young Republicans, as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, No. 103, for Tuesday, July 9, 1963, represent an enlightening account of the recent Young Republican National Convention held in San Francisco. Reading Mr. Nadasdy's account, I am at somewhat of a loss as to just what convention he was attending. I was at the convention and sat in the sessions that were chaired by Mr. Nadasdy. I must candidly admit that that was an unusual experience indeed, to sit there and watch the parliamentary maneuvering that Mr. Nadasdy engaged in in his vain attempt to hand the election to his former campaign manager of the position of national chairman.

Mr. Nadasdy states: "The whole thing has been very disillusioning for me." This is probably the only undistorted thing that Mr. Nadasdy stated in the entire interview. Disillusioning was the fact, that control was firmly wrested from the machine that Mr. Nadasdy had built to perpetuate the liberal philosophy that he and his followers zealously sought to instill with another regime of the same order.

It adds to the dwindling stature of Mr. Nadasdy when he states: "Lukens supporters used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful." Now that is saying quite a bit and as is usual lately in such outbursts from hurt and scared liberals, they make a shotgun blast of charges and care less who gets hit. To set the record straight in this regard, the Montana delegates, of which I was chairman, take great exception when being accused of using Communist techniques to gain their ends. Quite frankly, Mr. Nadasdy takes a lot upon himself when he goes around accusing sovereign States who were at the convention of using such tactics. This in the light of the most ungentlemanly act that I have ever seen and which Mr. Nadasdy himself took in the most unprincipled action of using physical action, which resembled a slap at Miss Carolyn Manchester who was trying to read the tally of States' votes which she was required to do as national secretary. Mr. Nadasdy states: "Their purpose was to completely ensnarl the convention and confuse everyone. All this accomplished by screaming and hollering." After the incident with Miss Manchester, which left her near hysteria, there was indeed screaming and hollering as there are still quite a few men who do not take kindly to having women treated in the manner that Miss Manchester received from Mr. Nadasdy.

As to ensnarl the convention and causing confusion, Mr. Nadasdy might well look back upon his own sad chairmanship and

reflect upon the use and misuse of regularly established procedure which he employed only to one end, the defeat of the conservative candidate. It was sad indeed to see any pretense of fairplay disappear completely when the vote got close in the national chairmanship race.

What is also regrettable is the fact that this national was the first time that many Young Republicans had ever been to a national and the impression left with them is still disbelief at the dictatorial and autocratic use in the manner that the Chair under Mr. Nadasdy was used. And should there be disbelief in this, there were several U.S. Congressmen who were in attendance and can substantiate the statements made here.

As to causing dissension and disunity among the Republican ranks, Mr. Nadasdy would do well to contemplate his own utterances which certainly do nothing to bring unity into play, and in fact play that dangerous game of the opposition to wit: "If you don't play the game my way, then you can't play."

This, Mr. Nadasdy, is a bad game to play and is also a bunch of sour grapes on your part. The Republican Party has always been proud of the fact that within their party framework they could include many points of view, which is not the case with the opposition. It would seem very narrow on your part to try and exclude those with conservative leanings and in fact to go to the point that you would stop at nothing to prevent them having a voice in the say of their party which by the way belongs to them just as much as it belongs to you.

You do dishonor to the Young Republican organization when you falsely preach that "Birchism" and "radicalism" was an issue at the national convention. It was no more an issue than the fact that Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. To falsely label the great conservative element which exists in the Republican Party as extremists is to merely be a dupe of the opposition and sow the seeds for a Republican defeat at the polls come next November. There is no taint to believe in conservatism and I proudly stand up and ask to be counted as a conservative. And it is quite probable that only within the conservative movement will the Republicans be able to counter in November and retire what has made a mockery of our domestic front, made shambles of our foreign policy, and so lowered the prestige of the United States abroad that the present administration is unlikely to have a poll taken knowing full well the results of such a poll.

It would do well for you, Mr. Nadasdy, to take your talents and apply them in the direction that any nominal Republican should do; namely, working for the Republican victory in 1964 and letting all citizens know and hear the promise-all give-nothing New Frontier.

Indeed, the State chairman of Nadasdy's own Minnesota felt constrained to set the record straight when he got home and read the distorted reports of the proceedings at San Francisco. He told reporters that, in his judgment, there was no takeover by the far right. In fact, he dismissed calmly the Nadasdy charges. I insert an article on his interview at this point:

[From St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press,
July 7, 1963]

YOUNG REPUBLICAN TAKEOVER—NADASDY
DISPUTED
(By Gene Newhall)

The Young Republican National Federation convention's election as chairman of a Goldwater-for-President backer did not signify takeover of the Young Republicans

by the far right, Martin Kellogg, 448 Woodlawn Avenue, Minnesota Young Republican chairman, said Saturday.

He took more lightly than did Leonard Nadasdy, Wayzata, outgoing national Young Republican chairman, the aggressive tactics of Young Republican delegates identified with the arch-conservative John Birch Society.

Nadasdy came back fuming to Minnesota from the San Francisco convention, which wound up after an all-night final session a week ago. He got off a letter to WILLIAM MILLER, senior Republican Party national chairman, warning that the Birchite tactics might disrupt the GOP presidential nominating convention a year from now in San Francisco.

Kellogg, who also attended with Minnesota's 15 delegates and 8 alternates, had been to one previous Young Republican national convention. He felt at the San Francisco session "a strong battle going on, with a strong conservative force, but no takeover of the organization."

Besides electing Donald (Buz) Lukens, Washington, D.C., a United Nations foe and Goldwater backer whom Nadasdy opposed, the convention elected to other offices people whom Nadasdy supported, Kellogg pointed out.

The national chairman of the drive to draft Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, for President voted for Lukens' opponent in the tightly drawn Young Republicans election, Kellogg added.

He noted, as had Nadasdy, that some delegations to the national Young Republicans convention are appointed by their State chairmen, not elected.

And the "unit rule," by which some State delegations failed to allow individual members to vote their personal choices if those differed from the majority of the delegation, "was a significant factor," Kellogg thought.

The shift to the full California delegation to Lukens was crucial in his victory by a two-vote margin on the second ballot over Charles McDevitt, Boise, Idaho, State legislator, who on the first ballot had been two votes short of election as national chairman. The Californians abandoned their own third-place candidate to push Lukens from second to first place.

It was a "long, rancorous" convention, Kellogg conceded, so tied up in parliamentary procedure that it never got to resolutions.

Kellogg noted one particularly positive element in the distracted convention: It awarded the Minnesota Young Republican League the prize for "the outstanding State organization," recognizing especially the Minnesota Young Republican League campaign to help elect a conservative majority in the State house and senate.

A great deal of noise has been made concerning the California Young Republicans. It is alleged that they are radically oriented if not Birch inspired. Let me say from my own observations and firsthand opportunity to chat with many of them that they indeed are determined, philosophically intent Young Republicans. Extremists? Of course not. Many of them had never been to a convention before and were frankly astounded at the wheeling and dealing that almost naturally transpires at meetings such as the one in San Francisco. That they were somewhat intransigent in their views could not be denied but since when is there anything wrong with that? I personally respected their high-principled stance though at times I did think they should have been a little more realistic. Anyone who would paint them as

radical or a threat to the party is way off base, in my judgment.

A final point on California. Those who lost are particularly critical of this State. They forget one thing: When the chips were down and the heat was on they were trying harder than anyone else to get California's votes. Ask them about the offers they made to California to secure their big bloc of votes. When they didn't get them, they suddenly found grave consequences to the fact that California Young Republicans supported Buz Lukens. Had they received the California votes, everything would have been all right, I suppose.

ROLE OF ROCKEFELLER

I find particularly appalling and reprehensible the attempt of Governor Rockefeller to smear the good name of the Young Republicans in the United States. It certainly would be safe to say of the San Francisco convention that he was not a popular favorite, indeed he was barely considered as a serious contender insofar as I could judge the temper of the delegates. This hardly gives him any justification, however, for besmirching their good name. Governor Rockefeller has evidenced a tendency that I have long felt was a tenet of the so-called liberal wing of the Republican Party. By his vicious and at the same time vague attack on Republican conservatives he is saying, in effect, "it will be me or someone like me or no one." In truth, it appears that he would sooner see the incumbent re-elected than support Senator GOLDWATER or any conservative. According to the New York Times, the Governor has supposedly received a secret report on the convention from New York Young Republicans. I am sure they could not have given him the information on which he based his smear attack.

In particular, his tactics are quite transparent. When he appeared to be ahead in the presidential race, his first plea was for unity. With his star on the wane—and let me say that I never have believed he was ahead except in the imagination of the Madison Avenue artists—he now attacks in a rule or ruin fashion. A close examination of his July 14, 1963, statement is necessary to determine the nature of his charges.

He starts out with the self-serving declaration that he has "been working to put the party in a position to face the challenge of the 1964 election as a strong and united fighting force." Maybe he has—but then he thought he was in front. He proceeded to state:

In making this effort toward unity for principle, it was my deep conviction that the activities of the radical right, while deeply disturbing in many ways, would represent an inconsequential influence on the Republican Party.

Here he displays the age-old strategy which he repeats throughout his strange pronouncement—create a straw man, make it a "threat," "subversive," "dangerous," "irresponsible" and so forth, then get out your sword, mount your charger and go forward to give the dragon battle. Do not forget the press releases at each skirmish. Just whom or what group is

he talking about? He is not honest or forthright enough to name them. Judged by his vitriolic scatter gun attack, it could well mean anyone in the Republican Party to the right of Governor Rockefeller and that would be about 80 to 90 percent of us.

In referring to the Young Republican National convention in San Francisco, he magnanimously says that "no one could fail to be deeply disturbed by the proceedings" because, he relates:

Every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed and operating through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism.

This unfounded lie is made even more blatant by his vicious attack in which he alleges:

The leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe—every bit as dangerous to American principles and American institutions as the radical left—who successfully engineered this disgraceful subversion of a great and responsible auxiliary of the Republican Party are the same people who are now moving to subvert the Republican Party itself.

In this big lie technique, Governor Rockefeller has shown himself to be completely out of touch with reality. I would frankly like to know who "the leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe are who had anything—I repeat, anything—to do with the YRNP convention let alone "dominate" it? Can he name them? Of course, not. He lacks the moral and philosophical honesty to define his terms, name these supposed bogeymen who do not exist and, in the end, he will not retract this big lie in the hopes that if it is repeated enough times there will be those unsuspecting Republicans who will take it for the truth. With this set of credentials it is absolutely fantastic that he should later state that "political success cannot be divorced from political morality."

Any party should be big enough to encompass diverse thought and a variety of people. It is possible for anyone to say he is a Democrat or Republican and he is accepted as such. However, when a person in leadership position manifests such irresponsibility it is our duty as party members to point out that such a person has traveled into a never-never land where day is night and right is left. The most significant thing about the plight of Nelson Rockefeller is that few responsible Republicans are willing to come to his defense. He has so obliterated any vestige of responsibility that he stands virtually alone. To his credit, Senator GOLDWATER has refused to be drawn into debating such baseless charges. As an active young Republican, still within age limits, I share the resentment of others like myself who know these charges are not true and know of the damage that they will ultimately do. It is regrettable that our organization should be attacked so wrongfully and only because I am sure that Governor Rockefeller will not be honest enough to retract his misstatements do I

add any further fuel to this controversy which is the dying legacy of a blighted aspirant for the Presidency.

As wrong as Governor Rockefeller has been on his appraisal of the Young Republicans and their San Francisco convention, he has been right on one thing. His charges have been picked up by the propaganda mills of the left who are using it to attack the Republican Party. I am including the Drew Pearson article of July 19, 1963 in the appendix to these remarks. His innuendoes and smears are legion, most of which were prompted by the Nadasdy-Rockefeller sour grapes. The Democrat, official newspaper of the Democratic National Committee, had a field day in its July 22, 1963 edition in which it reprinted with marked emphasis the Minneapolis Tribune article which headlines "Mob Rule Tactics Cited—YGOP Convention Shocked Exleader." The New York Times could report, as if it were objective and honest, in its July 31, 1963 paper:

In some parts of the West, the John Birch Society has created intraparty problems for the Republicans that are draining energies that might otherwise be directed toward lining up support for different candidates. In Idaho, for example, Charles McDevitt, a young Idaho lawyer, was scheduled to become president of the Young Republican Federation at the group's convention held in June. But he was beaten out by Donald Lukens, a rightwinger. "Many of the young Republicans are disillusioned and a lot of the older ones are sobered by what happened," said an observer in Boise.

Take the unfounded charge and sooner or later you have it converted into a fact. This technique often works. Even Life magazine picked up the charge and treated it as a fact, which it is not. In its July 26, 1963, issue, this magazine carried an editorial "Time To Hear From GOLDWATER" in which it further compounded the big lie into a factual observation. Life said:

Rockefeller was especially disturbed by the success of extremists in turning the Young Republican convention in San Francisco into a virtual Goldwater-for-President rally. He charged that they operated "through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

Note again the statement "Rockefeller was especially disturbed by the success of extremists." You start with an unfounded charge and soon it is factual. Rockefeller gave no evidence of extremism in San Francisco, no names were given but soon you have reports that these unknown people were "successful." Neat little tactic, is it not?

CONCLUSION

On the encouraging side: Most people have not fallen for this line. There are enough voices who speak in calm, deliberate terms to present the facts. Governor Rockefeller's unfounded charges, regardless of how often repeated, will not improve his stock or damage the reputation of Senator GOLDWATER. The Young Republicans will survive, too, and go on to even more effective political action. It is a shame, however, that in the process that they should be smeared and so much ammunition should be given to the opposition.

If the news media were looking for some real extremism, they could have found some in another political meeting in the West. On August 18, Young Democrats from 13 Western States met at Berkeley, Calif., and adopted resolutions. Among them were statements:

That the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba;

That a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations;

That the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam;

That the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished; and

That the McCarran Internal Security Act be repealed.

Yes, there is extremism all around us. As a Republican I am proud that it is almost exclusively found on the left and not on the right.

I include with these remarks an article by Stan Evans which appeared in National Review, a report by a Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—publication, the statement of Governor Rockefeller and the articles referred to before. This, then, is the record. Let us set it straight.

[From the National Review, Aug. 13, 1963]
GOLDWATER, ROCKEFELLER, AND THE YOUNG REPUBLICANS

(By M. Stanton Evans)

The Young Republicans of America, meeting at Boston's Hotel Statler in June 1961, chose Herbert Warburton of Delaware as their national chairman. Because Warburton represented what was to develop as the "Eisenhower wing" of the party, and because his opponent was strongly backed by elements close to the late Senator Robert Taft, the result was prophetic of what was to happen a year later in the senior party.

In 1959, when there was again some question as to who would be the next GOP nominee, a similar clash occurred. Ned Cushing of Kansas, a strong backer of Richard Nixon, was elected Young Republican chairman. The delegation from New York, trailing the tattered banner of Nelson Rockefeller, stood forlornly on the outside looking in. Once more the Young Republican convention prefigured that of the senior party; Rockefeller's weakness among the Young Republicans was, by year's end, equally apparent among their elders.

It has since become something of an axiom among GOP professionals that the Young Republican convention immediately prior to a presidential showdown is a good indicator of party sentiment. It was thus no surprise that this year's Young GOP conclave, held in San Francisco, June 25-28, should have attracted the interest of the press and of party regulars. In the normal course of things, their soundings would have been recorded and issued as a Republican summer book on presidential possibilities. But for a number of reasons, this year's convention achieved a notoriety surpassing any of its predecessors. It became, not simply an index to more important happenings in the GOP at large, but a major news event in its own right.

As usual, the convention featured a miniature version of the maneuvering underway in the senior party. The alignment of forces behind one of the candidates included BARRY GOLDWATER's Arizona and a constellation of the more conservative States; behind the other, Rockefeller's New York and the more liberal States. There were of course some areas of overlap, with a handful of conservatives backing the second candidate, and certain "moderates" backing the first. But in the main the lines were drawn clearly

enough, according to previous custom. There were, however, aspects of the convention setting it apart from those of years past:

1. The winning candidate, Donald E. (Buz) Lukens, 32, of Washington, D.C., openly endorsed Senator GOLDWATER for the Presidency. While such allegiances have hitherto been deduced from the nature of a candidate's backing, and were equally plain in this instance, it is unusual for a Young Republican chairman to put such preferences on record. In accordance with the Young GOP constitution, Lukens added that he would administer the affairs of his new office impartially, supporting all officially selected Republican candidates for office.

2. Lukens' opponent, Charles R. McDevitt, 31, of Boise, Idaho, labored to establish his own conservatism. Although backed by liberal delegations from New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, etc., McDevitt seemed well to the right of his supporters. As one newsman noted (with evident distaste), McDevitt proposed at a press conference "that the Government turn the veterans hospitals back to the States as one step in an economy plan that would permit the abolition of the income tax." Such was the public mien of the candidate backed by Rockefeller's delegation from New York—a seeming paradox which suggests the all-pervading conservatism of the Young Republicans.

3. Even had there been no contest for chairman, the drift of the convention would have been unmistakable. The New York Times observed: "The only Republican Presidential possibility with any following visible here is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. And that following overwhelms like a herd of buffalo. Only his badges are sold and only support of him is talked of in the lobby of the Sheraton-Palace Hotel." The Young Republicans turned out in record numbers to hear GOLDWATER at his June 27 appearance in San Francisco. A Presidential preference poll among the delegates showed a margin of eight to one, GOLDWATER over Rockefeller. A "Statement of Principles" adopted by the Young Republicans, modeled on a GOLDWATER suggestion to the 1960 senior convention, was strongly conservative, and the delegates handily defeated New York-led efforts to liberalize it.

THAT SUPREME BETRAYAL

These items in and of themselves add up to an event of newsworthy dimensions. But their cumulative effect led to yet another development of still greater import, escalating what had been a set-to among junior politicians into a full-fledged casus belli of national politics. On Sunday, July 14, Governor Rockefeller, having had 2 weeks to reflect upon matters, issued a cry of distress. The conservative triumph, he charged, was an act of disgraceful subversion. In a world which needs love and understanding, he added tenderly, the victors of San Francisco offered only hate and distrust. They were, come to think of it, members of the radical right lunatic fringe—extremists enmeshed in cynical expediency. They were, in short, guilty of that supreme betrayal—non-support of Nelson Rockefeller.

To this noble effusion, Rockefeller added a charge of foul play. "Every objective observer in San Francisco," he said, "has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well-financed, and operating through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

To a reporter who was on the scene, Rockefeller's angry words suggest that the Governor must have had some other convention in mind. Certainly nothing he said resembles what innumerable eyewitnesses report as having taken place at the Sheraton-Palace. Some of the charges could hardly be serious; the accusation that the conservatives were

"well financed," for example, need not—considering the source—be accorded sober examination. The charge of "ruthless, roughshod intimidation" is undoubtedly intended for serious reception, but the evidence to support it is equally scarce. One searches Rockefeller's statement for documentation, but no specifics are given.

Perhaps the Governor took the word of the outgoing Young Republican chairman, Leonard Nadasdy, of Minnesota. Nadasdy, professing himself in a state of shock, devised a postconvention analysis similar to Nelson Rockefeller's. In an interview with the St. Paul Pioneer-Press, Nadasdy denounced the backers of Lukens, saying "they were using the exact same techniques as the Communists." In the Minneapolis Tribune, he added that "this radical element is just like the Communists. They drive the good people away." Nadasdy's allegations were repeated in a column by Drew Pearson, not usually considered a confidant of Republicans, who changed the accusation of Communist tactics to Fascist.

SMEAR TACTICS

Many press accounts of the convention describe Nadasdy and other anti-Lukens elements as moderates. Somehow it is difficult to reconcile the concept of moderation with statements such as Nadasdy's or Rockefeller's. Smearing one's opposition as lunatic, totalitarian, just like the Communists, practitioners of subversion and hate, etc., is not the hallmark of the moderate man. Nor is it the kind of rhetoric we are accustomed to associate with objective discourse. It is instead precisely the sort of thing we expect from those who have been thwarted in partisan objectives, and who have no compunction about blackguarding opponents in the angry aftermath.

Rockefeller's wounded self-interest is too obvious a component of his remarks to need much elaboration. Nadasdy, portrayed by Pearson as an impartial observer, had a stake in the convention less apparent to the casual reader but equally real. Far from being a detached official voicing Olympian horror at mortal vulgarity, he was a bitter-end supporter of the defeated candidate, McDevitt. McDevitt had been Nadasdy's campaign manager in the 1961 Young Republican convention in Minneapolis. For the past 2 years, he served as Nadasdy's chief appointee on the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation. Prior to this year's contest, Nadasdy gave it as his opinion that McDevitt would be the winner. Presiding over the convention, he did everything within his power to prove his clairvoyance, and insure McDevitt's election. This fact was obvious to anyone at the press table but was unreported in several dispatches pulsating with horror over a rightist terror.

Many reports of the convention, for example, quote Nadasdy's plaint that the screaming and hollering of the delegates was like a nightmare. What is not mentioned is why there was screaming and hollering—namely, the tactics Nadasdy employed throughout the convention to carry it for the liberal faction. As early as Wednesday, June 26, in the contest for national college chairman of the Young Republicans, there was a foretaste of the McDevitt-Lukens wrangle. Nadasdy had plunged into the campaign of liberal-backed candidate Ward White, of Cornell Law School, against conservative Jerry Dickson (immediate past president of the University of Kansas student body) by attempting to control the makeup of the college credentials committee. Officials of the campus group rebelled, with the result that conflicting credentials reports were placed before the assembled college delegates; on two divisions as to which credentials would be accepted, the conservatives won. At that point, certain

of defeat, the liberal faction walked out, holding a rump meeting at which Nadasdy presided until a temporary chairman could be chosen.

THE CREDENTIALS GAMBIT

Nadasdy's role in the college election was but a mild augury of his behavior during the convention proper. Peter G. Kohler, chairman of the Wisconsin delegation to the convention, says Nadasdy's strategy became apparent when the report of the credentials committee was presented to the convention. "Nadasdy violated protocol and departed from the published convention program," Kohler says, "by presenting the report of the credentials committee prior to adopting the rules of the convention. The purpose of this maneuver lay in the fact that there were contested credentials, and it was hoped these credentials could be jammed through the convention while the floor was relatively empty. Further, should these credentials have been challenged, no rules had been adopted giving procedure under which to operate. This would give the Chair, and the general counsels, a free hand in manipulating any contest. By catching the opposition unaware, the credentials were passed without contest and the session adjourned."

On the following day, Thursday, June 27, the credentials gambit assumed major importance. A dispute arose as to who should be allowed to vote in the New Jersey caucus. According to an agreement reached by the New Jersey State Young Republicans organization April 19, both delegates and alternates were to vote in caucus at San Francisco to determine the sentiment of the delegation. When it developed this arrangement would produce a conservative majority, the agreement was rescinded—without, according to the conservative argument, correct recourse to parliamentary procedure. The question was therefore brought to the floor of the convention, where Nadasdy ruled the liberal delegates whose status was being challenged could cast New Jersey's vote on the matter. It was not, he said, a question of credentials (the credentials having been eased through the preceding day), and therefore the contested delegation could vote on its own seating. He then declared his ruling "unappealable." That determined the fate of the New Jersey conservatives, and sealed up the delegation for McDevitt. The question of whether the liberal delegates could cast New Jersey's vote was thus decided—by letting the liberal delegates cast New Jersey's vote. New Jersey National Committeeman Richard Flechner, a leader of the conservative forces, says: "The Chair was upheld by 10 votes, including the 21 unit votes of New Jersey in favor of the Chair. It is one of the few instances in our political history that a delegation to any convention could reserve the right to vote on its own seating."

It was this parliamentary novelty, accompanied by much switching off of microphones and playing of the National Anthem, which first aroused conservative ire and led to angry protest on the floor. In the Pearson-Nadasdy account, however, the episode emerges as a pat case of Nadasdy attempting to hold off a horde of maniacs obstructing the "orderly" conduct of the convention. Peter Kohler says: "I assume that when Nadasdy says he desires an 'orderly conducted convention' he means a convention where he rules supreme and he wins."

With New Jersey secure for the liberal forces, the key issue of the convention became the unit rule: Whether unit votes—allowing the majority of a delegation to vote a State's entire delegate strength—could be imposed by a single vote of the delegation, or whether they had to be mandated in advance by the State organization. According to the rules of the Young Republican Convention, the practice of the State group is binding, and unit votes are valid only as

they conform to such practice. Attempting to garner additional votes for McDevitt during Friday's balloting, Nadasdy decreed that unit rules were binding even when there was no home-State authorization for them. Massachusetts Chairman Richard Mastrangelo, siding with the Rockefeller forces, attempted the unheard-of procedure of imposing a unit rule between rollcalls. Nadasdy ruled it permissible.

LIBERAL STEAMROLLER

When Lukens backers attempted to protest these rulings, they were refused recognition. When they approached the microphones to speak on an issue, they were sometimes physically prevented from doing so. In cases where they succeeded in breaking through the cordons of "moderates," the mikes, centrally controlled by Nadasdy, were switched off. Thus universally thwarted, the conservatives not unnaturally denounced the rulings of the chair, shouted to make themselves heard, accused Nadasdy of trying to railroad the convention, etc. The alternative would have been to lie down and let the Nadasdy-New York-McDevitt machine roll over them. The cause and effect relationship of liberal steamroller to conservative anger was obvious to anyone who sat through the balloting; no visiting journalist could have missed what was going on, since one of the most hotly contested microphones was directly in front of the press table. Yet horror stories about the convention make no reference to Nadasdy's tactics.

Contrary to the Rockefeller-Nadasdy assertion, protest from the floor was not the work of "rightwing extremists." Robert D. Bell, chairman of the Oregon Young Republicans (the Oregon GOP is headed by middle-of-the-road Gov. Mark Hatfield) gives the following synopsis of Nadasdy's conduct:

The ruthless parliamentary tactics used by outgoing chairman of the national federation, Leonard Nadasdy, will long be remembered by this writer. This man used his position of power while chairing the convention to rule again and again in favor of his 1961 campaign manager, Charles McDevitt from Boise, Idaho. On the first ballot, he even declared McDevitt elected and then had to rescind this ruling because his candidate did not have a majority of the total delegates present. (Reportedly) Nadasdy, in trying to bring order to the proceedings, muttered to himself, "this is incredible." Observing from the floor Chairman Nadasdy's entire handling of the convention, I concur, this was incredible. Incredible that an officer of a highly respected national organization would indulge in such shenanigans. Incredible that the tone of the convention was set by the fact that the Nadasdy organization hired private police to be present and also insisted upon reinforcements in the form of members of the San Francisco police. This was a vain attempt to intimidate the delegates.

With the convention machinery arrayed against them, the Lukens forces found communications a particularly difficult problem. The difficulty was intensified on the eve of the final balloting, when Lukens headquarters personnel found their phone lines had been cut. (New Jersey conservatives had similarly found their headquarters room broken into and the wires on their mimeograph equipment severed.) On the floor of the convention, the job of coordinating strategy among pro-Lukens delegations assumed Herculean proportions. Large groups of liberal delegates, sergeants-at-arms, and private police (dubbed "rent-a-cops" by conservatives) stepped in at one time or another to prevent Lukens workers from moving about the floor. In contrast, says Young Republicans leader Al Deckard of Indiana, McDevitt supporters had complete freedom of movement. "At times," Deckard asserts, "there seemed to be as many McDevitt sup-

porters from outside our State sitting with our delegation as there were people from Indiana. They were completely commingled with our delegates. Lukens workers, on the other hand, time and time again were singled out and forced to leave the floor. The sergeants-at-arms were definitely partial to the McDevitt forces, and they were about the only people who could gain access to a microphone without using force. The machinery of the convention was completely one sided."

It would be possible, if space allowed, to quote scores of similar complaints. One midwestern delegate says he was approached by a Nadasdy subaltern accompanied by two policemen and three sergeants at arms and asked "whether I would leave the floor quietly." He adds that only by seeking out his State chairman, who was able to produce on the spot written proof of the challenged delegate's legal status on the floor, was he allowed to remain. "In the absence of this proof," he says, "I would have been ejected from the floor." In a scene enacted directly in front of the press table, Massachusetts National Committeeman Michael Robbins was physically restrained by a group of liberals trying to keep him from getting to a microphone. Richard Plechner of New Jersey says that when he approached the Chair to question a point of procedure, after having been refused recognition a half-dozen times, he received a similar reception. Groups of New York delegates roamed the floor in search of Lukens backers suitable for election. Says Peter Kohler: "The only violence I saw close to the Wisconsin delegation was caused by New York delegates, a couple of whom threw some knees or punches in their assignments to 'cover' the opposition and to block the floor organization and movements of the leaders of the opposition." Another midwesterner adds: "Two or three sergeants at arms (appointed by the Nadasdy-controlled convention machinery) continually followed Lukens' floor manager, prior to and during the balloting for chairman, endeavoring to make him leave the aisles and convention floor. It was pointed out to them that the floor manager for McDevitt and Art Richardson (a New York Young Republican leader) were effectively conducting the floor communications for McDevitt and they were being given complete freedom of movement."

As these remarks indicate, a frequent theme of the delegates is the key role played by the partisans of Governor Rockefeller. "The dictatorial tactics," says Michael Robbins, "were all on the Rockefeller side." Indiana Delegate Don Cope adds that "the New York people were allowed to go anywhere they wanted, but Lukens supporters were harassed by sergeants-at-arms whenever they stepped into the aisles. New York delegates surrounded the microphones, trying to keep conservatives from reaching them." Joseph T. Murphy of the Massachusetts delegation gives a virtually identical summary of the New York delegation's performance:

"Mr. Rockefeller said he was deeply disturbed by the 'ruthless, roughshod intimidation and tactics of totalitarianism' at the convention. What was not stated, of course, was that these tactics were utilized primarily by the 41-member New York delegation working in conjunction with the outgoing chairman to prevent the election of a pro-Goldwater chairman. Gangs of New Yorkers surrounded the floor microphones to prevent by physical means legitimate delegates from speaking. These tactics so incensed the delegates that they refused on numerous occasions to allow the chairman to proceed until he sent the New York delegation to its seats and ultimately caused sufficient resentment among uncommitted delegates to swing the election to the preconvention underdog."

The recurring mention of New York's performance makes the Rockefeller pique understandable; clearly, New York prestige and influence had been engaged in behalf

of McDevitt's candidacy, and the loss was a painful setback in both categories. From the foregoing, it would appear that if the Governor is truly concerned about improving Young Republican manners, he might have a fatherly talk with some of his own proteges.

TRAGI-COMIC EFFORTS

The end of the first rollcall, despite all these exertions, found McDevitt short of a majority. California Chairman Robert Gaston, who had run as a favorite son candidate, demanded recognition to change his State's vote to Lukens. Nadasdy refused to recognize Gaston, instead announcing McDevitt had been elected. Pandemonium ensued. At last admitting his mistake, Nadasdy proceeded immediately to a second rollcall, still without recognizing California. This time the balloting ended with Lukens in possession of a clear majority. But Nadasdy, who had announced the results of the first ballot with lightning speed, would not give the totals. The ballot was dragged out interminably as State after State was called on for possible changes in its vote (the identical privilege denied to California on the preceding go-round), and as New York staged a tragi-comic polling and repolling of its delegation which changed nothing. During the stall, McDevitt supporters scoured the room for additional votes. After some of this by-play had gone on to no effect except to produce new votes for Lukens, Young Republican Secretary Carolyn Manchester tried to read the tally. Oregon Chairman Bell gives this account of what happened at that point:

"Strangely enough, the police were absent at the precise moment that the national secretary, Carolyn Manchester, from Portland, Maine, needed them to protect her from the irrational outburst of Chairman Nadasdy, in an effort to stop her from announcing the official vote which elected Lukens the winner and defeated the chairman's candidate, McDevitt. She was violently shoved away from the microphone by Nadasdy before she could read the results."

Deckard of Indiana says Nadasdy wrenched Miss Manchester's hand away from the microphone and covered it to prevent her words from being audible. Here, indeed, was the crowning act of "moderation." It was not until several minutes later, after further delay of the game, that Miss Manchester was able to complete her duties as secretary, and declare that Lukens had been elected. The liberals and the Rockefeller forces had tried just about everything, and it wasn't enough. There was obviously nothing to do with the people they had failed to intimidate but smear them as "lunatics."

One ironic aspect of the voting, which is also a good measure of who was in fact using ruthless tactics at the convention: On the second rollcall, a number of votes cast for McDevitt the first time around switched to Lukens. One would imagine that, had the Lukens forces been using Communist or Fascist methods, their iniquities would have lost them some votes. Instead, it was Nadasdy's behavior which alienated people formerly on his side. Significantly, the vote changes came from States like Michigan, Rhode Island, and Maine—hardly hotbeds of rightwing extremism. These were not proconservative votes, but simply votes in favor of elementary fairplay. They were lost to McDevitt because of the performance of his patron in the chair.

In sum, it was obvious to anyone on the scene that there was no intimidation being practiced by conservatives; the iron boot was on the other foot. In fact, with the convention machinery so completely in their hands, it is amazing the Nadasdy-New York-McDevitt forces lost. They had come into power only 2 years before; their organization should have been young, resilient, ca-

pable of maintaining its dominant position. And they certainly were not hesitant to make use of the advantages they possessed. But in the decisive hour their strategy sagged and fell apart. Obviously, there was something more happening in San Francisco than the collision of two political organizations. The truth is that the groundswell of conservatism, reflected in the overwhelming preference of the delegates for Senator GOLDWATER, was simply not to be contained by the techniques of machine politics.

YAF REPORT

The following is a special article published in Washington Report one of the many publications of Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., the Nation's leading conservative youth political action organization. A large number of the delegates at the San Francisco convention were members of YAF.

The report follows:

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SPECIAL REPORT—"A VICTORY FOR CONSERVATISM"

As everyone knows by now the National Young Republican Convention held in San Francisco in late June produced the election of Donald "Buz" Lukens of Washington, D.C., as national chairman of the Young Republicans.

From the outset it was clear that this was a conservative Young Republican convention. Both candidates for national chairman, Lukens and McDevitt, worked diligently to establish that each was the most conservative. Lukens, 32-year-old minority clerk of the House Committee on Rules, and Charles McDevitt, 31-year-old State legislator from Boise, Idaho, took stands which were almost identical, and strongly conservative. The only difference between the candidates was in their backing. With some exceptions Lukens got the strong Goldwater States and McDevitt got the Rockefeller States, lead by the New York delegation. While McDevitt took the traditional stand of refusing to endorse any prospective candidate for the Presidency in 1964, Lukens was not so formal. Addressing the New Jersey caucus early in the week he came out solidly for GOLDWATER, though he pledged that if elected chairman he would not use his office to favor any candidate.

WE WANT BARRY

The highpoint of the Young Republican convention was the speech given by Senator GOLDWATER on the evening of June 27. Speaking before more than 3,000 Young Republicans at Longshoreman's Hall (home base of Harry Bridges) the Arizona Senator let go with all guns at the failures of the Kennedy clan. He was repeatedly interrupted with thunderous applause and almost mobbed by enthusiastic supporters after his speech. This Young Republican demonstration of support for GOLDWATER bore out the results of various polls conducted during the convention which showed that GOLDWATER was favored for the nomination by more than 80 percent of the Young Republican delegates.

THE CHAIR RULES

With the convention votes closely divided and all possible pressure being applied by outgoing Young Republican National Chairman Len Nadasdy, of Minnesota, it looked as if McDevitt would win. National Young Americans for Freedom Chairman Bob Bauman had previously looked into McDevitt's background and was assured by reliable sources that McDevitt was a sound conservative, even though his Rockefeller-Eastern backing made him suspect politically. In a brief talk with McDevitt, Bauman discovered that the would-be Young Republican chairman was not for GOLDWATER ("I am not for GOLDWATER or anyone else"). Despite contrary indications McDevitt denied that he

was against Young Americans for Freedom but he stated emphatically he would not accept a YAF endorsement in his race for chairman. (Lukens has been a member of YAF since early 1962.)

If any one factor served to make up the minds of undecided delegates it was blatantly partial manner in which Young Republican National Chairman Len Nadasdy presided over the convention sessions. Elected Young Republican national chairman in 1961 at the Minneapolis convention (McDevitt was his campaign manager) Nadasdy billed himself as a "moderate" Nixon man. Few people thought he was capable of the hard nosed parliamentary dictatorship he attempted at San Francisco. Beginning with a dispute over the rules governing the New Jersey delegation and ending with the false announcement that McDevitt had been elected after the first ballot for chairman, Nadasdy left behind him a trail of ridiculous rulings and crass partiality which shocked delegates and observers.

At every turn Nadasdy ignored pro-Lukens delegates who sought recognition from the floor and he would not allow their microphones to be turned on. When the McDevitt strategy demanded it, or when Lukens sentiment seemed to be growing on the floor, Nadasdy ordered music played on a booming electric organ which served to drown any protests against his high-handed conduct. (The organist who so willingly drowned out the voices of duly elected Young Republican delegates was I. Lee Potter, of Virginia.) At one point Nadasdy allowed such a parliamentary farce to develop that the vice chairman of the California delegation formally apologized to the convention for the rulings being given by the Nadasdy-appointed parliamentarian, Harry Keaton, also a Californian.

DELEGATES SHOUTED "RAILROAD RAILROAD"

The final abuse of the convention came when Nadasdy announced that McDevitt had been elected at the end of the first rollcall, when in fact he was two votes short of a majority. This power play backfired and the resultant protest from the delegates caused Nadasdy to back down and allow a second ballot, but only after much stalling during which McDevitt backers vainly searched for needed votes.

Unable to be recognized by the chairman at any other time, many State chairmen took the opportunity when announcing their State votes to also denounce the chair for its conduct. When the second rollcall was over Lukens had been elected with a vote of 318 to 305 for McDevitt. One of the decisive boosts for "Buz" was the heavy hand of Nadasdy.

LAUGHING MATTER

One of the comic relief sidelights of the convention was the presence of legmen for Advance, the leftist GOP publication. Few could ignore the ubiquitous presence of sad-faced Bruce Chapman, perennial Harvard boy and Advance publisher, dismayed at what he saw and not sure what was to be done about it. In a feeble attempt at saving a few Young Republican souls from conservatism an Advance table was set up in the Palace Hotel lobby where a few liberal hearties tried to sell their little magazine. In short order the table and the boys disappeared and were not heard from again. Chapman distinguished himself, however, by getting laughed out of a New Jersey Young Republican caucus which was being filmed by CBS news. His offense? Several of the New Jersey delegates recognized him.

TRADITIONAL REPUBLICANS

Despite the hatchet job done on the Young Republican Convention by the liberal press, aided by the cry of extremism raised by ex-chairman Nadasdy and Governor Rockefeller, the truth is that there were no "right-wing extremists" at San Francisco. There were indeed hundreds of young conserva-

tives, many of them members of Young Americans for Freedom and readers of National Review and Human Events. But these are young people who have risen in Young Republican ranks during the past 2 years as part of the very real "wave of conservatism" and certainly not by any sinister design. Their views are the traditional views held by all responsible conservatives in the GOP. These young conservatives are not extremists, unless the principles of the Constitution are extreme. They are sick of the present liberal administration in Washington and just as sick of some "Republicans" who are no better than a diluted version of the New Frontiersman.

EXTREMISTS ON THE LEFT

The most disgusting result of the Young Republican Convention has been the smear job done on the new national chairman, Buz Lukens, conservative Republicans in general, and even against Senator GOLDWATER himself. Ex-Young Republican Chairman Nadasdy lead the parade of those making statements bearing little relation to what really happened at San Francisco. In an interview with the Minneapolis Tribune (which was later quoted as an authority by Nelson Rockefeller) Nadasdy wailed that he was in "a state of shock" over what had happened. He said that the Lukens supporters "used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and furor." All this he blamed on "the radical right."

NADASDY ATTACKS GOLDWATER

Warming to the attack, Nadasdy then went after Senator GOLDWATER. Claiming that he had appealed to the Senator to "restore order" at the convention by calming down the delegates with his speech, Nadasdy alleged that GOLDWATER had betrayed him: "He apparently forgot what he said to me." All he did was to pour gasoline on the flames." This wholly untrue charge was immediately picked up by Drew Pearson and used in his nationally syndicated column to discredit Senator GOLDWATER. Liberal Democrat Congressman DON FRAZIER (who defeated Walter Judd in 1962) found Nadasdy's remarks so tasteful to him that he had them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to see. The national chairman of the Young Democrats, Allan Howe, echoed Nadasdy almost word for word.

THE LARGER GOAL

Whenever a liberal Republican beats out a conservative he immediately calls for "unity." What we are now seeing on a national scale is the reverse side of that coin. A Goldwater victory in the Young Republicans and other signs of growing conservative strength has produced a suicidal desire on the part of the liberal GOP to destroy the party if they cannot rule it. The Republican Party is greater than this clamoring clack and will succeed in spite of them.

Young Republican Chairman Buz Lukens told the Nation that his election was a clear victory for conservatism. With every ounce of effort and determination we can muster in this fight, Young Americans for Freedom will work to allow BARRY GOLDWATER to make that same statement—on election night, 1964.

FASCIST TACTICS AT GOP CONVENTION (By Drew Pearson)

NEW YORK.—Behind the tough statement issued by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller against Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and his right wing crusade were some alarming reports regarding Fascist tactics used by Goldwaterites at the recent Young Republicans' convention in San Francisco.

At that convention mob rule broke out, right-wingers tried to seize the gavel of the moderate president, and police had to be called in to restore order when playing the national anthem failed to keep the Gold-

waterites standing at attention so they would not rush the rostrum.

The Senator himself, addressing the convention, did nothing to calm the radical right or disassociate himself from the John Birchites behind the Fascist tactics.

"I had told him about the rioting that occurred earlier in the day and asked for his aid in calming the situation," Leonard Nadasdy, retiring president of the Young Republicans told this column. "He promised to try to calm the crowd. But the only mention he made of the situation was to comment about the great spirit of the delegates. It was like pouring gasoline on the flames."

Nadasdy has been president of the Young Republicans for 2 years. The organization has a membership of around half a million and traditionally follows a policy of steering clear of intraparty battles. When Nadasdy tried to continue that policy, rightwing Republicans shouted: "Go back to Russia."

He was trying at that time to enforce a provision in the Young Republicans' constitution that State delegates only may vote in the election of officers, not the alternates. The GOLDWATER backers and the radical right wanted alternatives included under a unit rule provision in order to elect David Lukens, the GOLDWATER candidate.

When Nadasdy ruled this out of order, pandemonium broke loose.

"Several members of the California delegation tried to rush the rostrum in order to take the gavel away," Nadasdy told this column, "but fortunately members of the Pennsylvania and New York delegations, located in front of the rostrum, held them off."

"There were fist fights on the floor," he said. "I've never seen such violence at a political affair. Their goal was to completely confuse everybody. There was screaming and hollering. It was like a nightmare."

Opposing Lukens for the Young GOP presidency was Charles McDevitt of Boise, Idaho, who followed the traditional policy of taking no stand for Goldwater, Rockefeller, Romney, or any other candidate.

Lukens was from Washington, D.C., had been carefully picked by the Goldwater crowd, and campaigned on a John Birch platform, though he states he is not a member. He is for the abolition of the income tax, favors U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations, wants to subjugate the U.S. Supreme Court by adopting a higher court of State justices.

"After observing his first platform," said retiring President Nadasdy, "he seemed to be saying exactly what the Birchites wanted him to say."

Two Republican Congressmen came to San Francisco to help the radical right and the Goldwaterites, Nadasdy said—W. E. (BILL) BROCK, the Chattanooga candy manufacturer who was elected with John Birch support; and JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio. "They spent a great deal of time working behind the scenes to elect the Goldwater candidate," Nadasdy said, "even though it is an accepted fact that regular party members stay out of our elections."

"I want to alert the Republicans as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right; namely, to subvert the Republican Party and seize control," said the retiring president. "The radical right is just like the Communists. They drive good people away."

Word of these rightwing tactics which got back to Governor Rockefeller was one of the reasons he issued his warning blast against Senator GOLDWATER and his operations.

YOUNG GOP CONVENTION SHOCKED EX-LEADER

(Extension of remarks of Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 9, 1963)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting interview was published in the Minneapolis

Tribune of July 7. Leonard Nadasdy, former national chairman of the Young Republican Federation, reported on the recent Young Republican Convention in San Francisco.

The tactics of those identified by Mr. Nadasdy as "members of the John Birch Society and the radical right" have no place in a responsible political party, either in the junior or senior division. According to the article, these members showed intolerance for the views of others and contempt for the democratic procedures essential to a responsible political organization.

Mr. Nadasdy's comparison of these tactics with those pursued by the Communists is valid. In Minnesota many years ago we experienced these same tactics from a group in our own political party, that time from the left, and successfully defeated them.

It is unfortunate that Senator GOLDWATER should appear to be the beneficiary of the activity of these extremists. They offer nothing constructive on the American scene, and are evidently embracing the tactics of those whom they profess to oppose.

Complacency will not suffice to meet the threat posed by these extremists. I wish to commend Mr. Nadasdy for his expressed determination to alert the people to the dangers of the Birch Society and the radical right.

The interview follows:

"MOB RULE TACTICS CITED—YOUNG GOP CONVENTION SHOCKED EX-LEADER

"(By Mercer Cross)

"Leonard Nadasdy said Saturday he is 'still in a state of shock' because of the Young Republican National Federation convention in San Francisco, Calif.

"The whole thing has been very disillusioning for me," said the immediate past president of the 500,000-member federation.

"Narrowly elected to succeed Nadasdy for the next 2 years was Donald Lukens, 32, Washington, D.C., who campaigned as a supporter of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, for President.

"Defeated was Charles McDevitt, 30, Boise, Idaho, who took no stand on a GOP presidential candidate. McDevitt had the unanimous support of the 15-member Minnesota delegation.

"McDevitt had the edge going into the Young GOP convention, said Nadasdy, 32, a General Mills public relations man who lives in Plymouth.

"But, he said, Lukens' supporters 'used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful.'

"Their purpose, said Nadasdy, 'was to completely ensnarl the convention and confuse everyone. All this was accomplished by screaming and hollering.'

"At the center of the confusion were members of the John Birch Society and the radical right, Nadasdy said.

"Two years ago the Minnesotan was elected chairman as a member of the Young Republicans' moderate faction. As convention chairman this year, he said:

"Rightwing delegates shouted at him to 'go back to Russia.'

"They made a couple of rushes at the podium to take the gavel away from me.

"There were fist fights on the floor.'

"At one point the national anthem had to be played to make the delegates sit down, and police were summoned to keep order.

"Radicals distributed scurrilous printed matter attacking Nadasdy.

"McDevitt's hotel room was broken into and campaign literature, two typewriters, and some briefcases were stolen.

"I've never seen such violence at a Young Republican affair," said Nadasdy. "It was like a nightmare to be there."

"GOLDWATER appeared at a rally the first night of the convention.

"Nadasdy said he appealed to the Senator to help restore order. GOLDWATER said he

would try to calm down the delegates and would say he supported no candidate for Young GOP chairman, Nadasdy reported.

"He apparently forgot what he said to me," said Nadasdy. "All this did was to pour gasoline on the flames."

"The Minnesotan made this prediction concerning GOLDWATER:

"Unless the Senator starts getting some sane, conservative people around him, he's going to have a very difficult time getting the nomination and being elected."

"Nadasdy said he has set out on this personal mission:

"During the coming year I want to try to alert the people, and especially the Republicans, as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right, which is to subvert the Republican Party and to seize control, rather than just nominate a presidential candidate."

"Particularly in Minnesota, where Birchers are scarce, said Nadasdy, 'It really worries me. I'm just afraid people aren't going to see the danger. I think we're complacent.'

"The radicals are 'not reasonable,' he said. 'They know what they're doing. They know where they're going. They're extremely dangerous. They're after power for power's sake.'

"And the significance to the senior party?

"The significance," said Nadasdy, 'is a word of warning that the national convention in San Francisco next year is going to be one of the toughest ones the party's ever had.'

"Far-righters spent much time and money to elect their man to lead the Young Republicans," said Nadasdy, 'and they'll spend 10 times as much to take over the senior party.'

"It's a question whether the party's going to allow mob rule or whether they're going to see an orderly conducted convention."

"As for Lukens, the new Young Republican chairman. 'He is not a Bircher, but he certainly began to say everything they wanted him to say,' said Nadasdy.

"Lukens campaigned for abolition of the Federal income tax, U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations and a 'court of the union' higher than the U.S. Supreme Court.

"I'm very concerned about what's going to happen to the organization," said Nadasdy. 'Only time will tell. I just want to see if Lukens can stand up to the people who elected him.'

"John Birchers at the Young Republican convention were mostly from California, Illinois, and Iowa, with a scattering from other States, Nadasdy said.

"These people are a minority. They don't even represent one-fourth of the people in our party," he added."

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, JULY 14, 1963

Over the past months, many leaders of the Republican Party, myself included, have been working to put the party in a position to face the challenge of the 1964 election as a strong and united fighting force.

A minority party must be united for principle to provide the effective opposition and constructive alternatives that our country sorely needs. It must be united for principle and reach beyond its own boundaries to win. It must be united for principle to command broad support.

The paralysis of government that we are witnessing today in Washington stems from the fact that the Democratic Party is not united for principle, but in effect is two parties of opportunism proceeding in opposite directions.

In making this effort toward unity for principle, it was my conviction that the activities of the radical right, while deeply disturbing in many ways, would represent an inconsequential influence on the Republican Party.

It was my conviction that despite differences in emphasis among the party's responsible elements, there was an overwhelming consensus within the party on the fundamental articles of Republican faith.

In broadest terms, these articles of faith are:

1. Unswerving dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and the extension of freedom throughout the world through a firm, resolute, and positive foreign policy.

2. Equality of opportunity for a better life for all Americans regardless of economic status, geographic location, race, creed, color, or national origin.

3. Faith in our Federal system of government as the best assurance of freedom and equal opportunity and as the only hope of keeping democratic government close to the people and responsive to their will.

4. Faith in the private enterprise system as the dynamic, creative base for social progress in a free society and of freedom of individual initiative without which men cannot be really free or equal.

5. Faith in the fundamental importance of fiscal integrity in government as the indispensable political base for economic growth and the vitally needed expansion of job opportunities.

6. Faith in our heritage of freedom of speech and of information and in the right and need of the people to know all the facts on the issues confronting them as essential to the preservation of a free society.

While as a party and as a people, we have been keenly aware of the grave threat to these principles posed by international communism, I have now come to the conclusion that many of us have been taking too lightly the growing danger to these very same principles through subversion from the radical right.

I am now convinced that, unless the vast majority of Republicans who subscribe to these principles, are aroused from present inaction—whether this inaction stems from complacency, from fear or from a fantastically shortsighted opportunism—the Republican Party is in real danger of subversion by a radical, well-financed and highly disciplined minority.

For it has now become crystal clear that the vociferous and well-drilled extremist elements boring within the party utterly reject these fundamental principles of our heritage. They are, in fact, embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform and its candidates on their own terms—terms that are wholly alien to the sound and honest conservatism that has firmly based the Republican Party in the best of a century's traditions, wholly alien to the sound and honest Republican liberalism that has kept the party abreast of human needs in a changing world, wholly alien to the broad middle course that accommodates the mainstream of Republican principle.

This cannot be allowed to happen. The continuing commitment of the Republican Party to its historic principles, including its fundamental dedication to equality of opportunity for all men, cannot and must not be betrayed. No temptation of political gain through cynical expediency can be permitted to becloud our commitment to principle and purpose.

No one could fail to be deeply disturbed by the proceedings at the recent Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco. I am completely confident that the overwhelming majority of Young Republicans of this country respond today, as they always have, to the idealism of the party's tradition. I am confident that they want it to continue to be a positive and responsible party serving the best interests of all the people.

But every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed and operating

through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, this cannot be brushed off as irresponsibility. For youth is responsible. The leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe—every bit as dangerous to American principles and American institutions as the radical left—who successfully engineered this disgraceful subversion of a great and responsible auxiliary of the Republican Party are the same people who are now moving to subvert the Republican Party itself. They claim initial success and predict ultimate victory for their efforts.

These people have no program for the Republican Party or the American people except distrust, disunity and the ultimate destruction of the confidence of the people in themselves. They are purveyors of hate and distrust in a time when, as never before, the need of the world is for love and understanding.

They have no concern with and offer no solution for the problems of chronic unemployment, of education and training, of housing, of racial injustice and strife, of all the other problems which must have answers if our democratic ideals are to be translated into loving reality.

And in the political sphere, they offer something equally sinister.

Completely incredible as it is to me, it is now being seriously proposed to the Republican Party that as a strategy for victory in 1964, that it write off the Negro and other minority groups, it deliberately write off the great industrial States of the North (representing nearly 50 percent of the country's population), that it write off the big cities, and that it direct its appeal primarily to the electoral votes of the South, plus the West and a scattering of other States.

The transparent purpose behind this plan is to erect political power on the outlawed and immoral base of segregation and to transform the Republican Party from a national party of all the people to a sectional party for some of the people.

No such plan ever has, or ever will succeed. It cannot stand the light of day. It will be rejected out of hand by the Republican Party. It will be rejected by the Nation. It will be rejected by the South.

The South has long pointed out that the racial problem is not a sectional problem, but a national problem. I know that there is southern leadership that wants to participate in a national solution.

A program based on racism or sectionalism would in and of itself not only defeat the Republican Party in 1964, but would destroy it altogether.

The Republican Party is the party of Lincoln. It was founded to make men free and equal in opportunity. It is the party of all men, the only truly national party in America. For that party to turn its back on its heritage and its birthright would be an act of political immorality rarely equaled in human history.

No cloak of so-called States rights can conceal the real purpose behind this strategy. The political rights of States are clear within the Federal system and their realization depends importantly upon the exercise of States responsibilities within that system. But a century ago, a great war decided for all time that in the area of human dignity, States rights must forever yield to the rights of the individual. And so in this area, the invocation of States rights can only be regarded as a pretext.

For the Republican Party, political success cannot be divorced from political morality and the fact is that the party's dedication to the equality of all men is still, and must more than ever before, be its guide to leadership and to victory.

Far from abandoning this dedication, the whole burden of the distinguished 1961 re-

port by Chairman Bliss, of Ohio, was that both the party's greatest challenge and its brightest opportunity lay in its willingness to deal with the great urban problems confronting our Nation, and the people of the cities, especially the minority groups.

The path to victory is not in running away from the people of this country. The path to victory is in seeking out the people in the areas where they live, in accepting the responsibilities of leadership in the solution of their problems and demonstrating to them, as the Republican Party has in many areas, that in it is to be found the will, the sincerity, the competence, and the drive to make this a better land for all its people.

The issue that confronts the Republican Party today is the gravest in its history.

I have no doubt whatever that responsibility, moderation, and sound progress continue to be the spiritual allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the Republicans of this country.

But a complacent majority, or a fearful one, or a majority misled to betrayal of its principles in pursuit of political fantasies will be as surely subverted by militant extremism as such majorities always have been throughout all history.

No Republican can stand by idly in the face of this threat. No Republican can stand aloof from issue that it presents. One must be either for or against these forces. The time for temporizing is over.

Some in the party have already spoken out against this threat. This is a responsibility for all of us. I for one will do everything in my power, working with others to counter the influence of these forces and to defeat their purposes.

For the future of this great Nation lies not in the unprincipled extremism of the radical right any more than it lies in the unprincipled opportunism that has captured the Democratic Party.

It lies in the fiscally responsible, humanely principled mainstream of American thought and leadership that the party of Abraham Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt, of Robert Taft has always represented and will continue to represent.

It is said that in the next presidential election, the voters should be given a choice. I agree.

There must be an alternative to a faltering administration that has suffered a Communist military base to be established 90 miles off our shores—the most visible symbol, but by no means the only one of a general deterioration in our national security and our posture of leadership before the world.

There must be an alternative to an administration that is floundering in its fiscal management, that has been unable to settle on a program, let alone effect a solution, for our stagnant economy and our millions of unemployed.

There must be an alternative for an administration that by inaction has plunged our country into the most soul-searing racial strife of our history.

There must be an alternative. But, in the sound instincts of the American people, that alternative will never be found in a party of extremism, a party of sectionalism, a party of racism, a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign for their support.

Such an alternative is not a choice but a mockery.

The choice that must be provided to the American people is to be found only in a party of responsible Republicanism, truly faithful to its Lincolnian heritage, truly national in scope, concerned with the opportunity and well-being of every individual citizen and thus commanding the confidence of the country as a whole. Last but not least, it must be responsibly and constructively concerned with the strengthening of this country's leadership of the free world.

The choice as to whether such a party shall be presented to the electorate is a choice for all Republicans. In the days between now and the Republican Convention, where the final decision will be made, that choice and these issues must be submitted to them. I have no doubt as to the outcome. And I have no doubt that out of this process will come the kind of moral strength, the strength of principle, that is needed to win and that is needed to govern.

The Republican Party stands today at the crossroads of its destiny. Its destiny is to save the Nation by first saving itself.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 19, 1963]

POLITICS BY EPIPHET

We see that the political commentators are interpreting Governor Rockefeller's long political statement this week as a broadside against Senator GOLDWATER and those who support him for the Republican nomination.

Governor Rockefeller has lent some support for this interpretation, for although in castigating the radical right he mentioned no names, he did remark at a later press conference that he feared Senator GOLDWATER might be captured by his own followers, whatever that means.

Even so, we are reluctant to believe the Governor meant to make a personal attack on the Senator. If so, the statement doesn't speak very well for the Governor and it isn't going to do his party much good.

Not that there was anything exceptional in the general political sentiments Mr. Rockefeller expressed. In listing his articles of faith he said he was dedicated to freedom, equality of opportunity, the Federal system of government, the free enterprise system, the importance of fiscal integrity, and to our heritage of free speech.

We would hardly expect anyone to quarrel with these sentiments. They are also Senator GOLDWATER's, and in the Democratic Party they could be embraced equally by Senator BYRD and President Kennedy. In fact, in Governor Rockefeller's stated philosophy there is very little to distinguish his politics from those of the President.

But this was not all the Governor said. He then went on to cry that these principles are in danger from a "highly disciplined minority" who are out to subvert the Republican Party are who are so strong they constitute a present danger to the Republic as well. The implication is that these powerful people do not believe in freedom, equality of opportunity or any of those other things Mr. Rockefeller listed among his articles of faith.

Moreover, the Governor sees them as no trivial conspirators. "They are embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform and its candidates." Already these people—he calls them the "lunatic fringe"—have supposedly subverted the Young Republicans.

Now we have no doubt that the country has its lunatic fringes at both ends of the political spectrum. But the Governor is not just making a commentary; he is making an indictment loaded with words like conspiracy, subversion, and racism.

This is surely a serious indictment, and just as surely calls for a bill of particulars as to what these subversive ideas are, what national leaders are espousing them, and how it happens that this minority is in a position to subvert against its will one of our two great political parties.

No such bill of particulars is forthcoming. Other than showing enthusiasm for Senator GOLDWATER, what did the Young Republicans advocate that is subversive? Which of Mr. Rockefeller's six articles of faith do these plotters plot against? Who are these oh-so-powerful conspirators? You are left to guess.

Personally we find it difficult to believe that Governor Rockefeller really intended his

statement to sound the way it seems to. For unfortunately it sounds too much like one of those demagogic speeches of familiar memory in which the orator cries that "they" are organized to take over the country and subvert our freedoms. In such speeches the "they" are never specified. "They" are simply left to hang over the landscape, brooding, ominous, and frightening.

This is always a shoddy way to carry on the public debate. For what divides this country is not its articles of faith; there is universal dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and heritage. The difference is over how best to preserve them. Those who rally to Senator GOLDWATER, just as those who rally to Governor Rockefeller, have their reasons and it is no service to the public discussion to conduct it by epithet.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TALCOTT, for 1 week on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for Friday, August 23, 1963, on account of official business.

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. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY), for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SECREST and to include a report of the Projects Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 26, 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:

1148. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 10, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on an interim report on Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Ill., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 18, 1957, and August 20, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

1149. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1150. A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under section 2672 by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1151. A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2732(f) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1152. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 12, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Des Moines River at Ottumwa, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1950; 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. BONNER: Committee of conference. S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 700). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7497. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7399. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7440. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 704). 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. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6260. A bill for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; with amendment (Rept. No. 703). 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. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8224. A bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to the surface owners of land of certain mineral interests reserved to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8225. A bill to provide for the sale of the undisposed of lots in the townsite of Pocatello, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 8227. 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.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 8228. A bill designating the corn tassel the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.R. 8229. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to access to and exit from certain portions of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 8230. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 8231. A bill to close ports of the United States to certain vessels while engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8232. A bill to amend title I, "Tariff Schedules of the United States, of the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962," to correct certain inequities in the classification and duty provided for certain aluminum products, television picture tubes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 8233. A bill regulating the purchase of electric power by the Department of Defense and its agencies and prescribing procedures therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 8234. A bill to supplement the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution with a National Transportation Museum in order to make a complete history of transportation available for the benefit of the people of the United States, and to provide space for a National Visitor and Student Center in order to assist the 7 million people who visit the Nation's Capital each year; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroads and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Point Reyes National Seashore, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8235. A bill for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 8236. A bill for the relief of Felippo and Giuseppe Raccuglia and minor children, Antonio and Tommaso Raccuglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8237. A bill for the relief of Dr. Keun Ho Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 8238. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8239. A bill for the relief of S. S. Rolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1963

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

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

Our Father, God, in this searching moment we would that the bewildering voices of the world about us and the clamor of wordy arguments be hushed. In the solemn sense of Thy presence, our arrogance is rebuked and our pride of opinion is mocked, as we confess that, at best, we but grope in the darkness; that our knowledge is partial, and our judgments fallible.

We would yield ourselves to Thee as we are, with all our failure, our ignorance, and our self-will, and yet with all the climbing aspirations of our better natures.

Break down the narrow barriers of our minds that shut us out from fellowship and understanding with any of Thy children. Teach us to value beauty of heart or strength of brain in any strand of our common humanity, that we may become workers together with Thee in binding the races of mankind into the perfect unity that will belt the earth with good will when Thy radiant kingdom comes.

In the name of Christ Jesus, our Lord, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 20, 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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 20, 1963:

S. 874. An act to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

On August 22, 1963:

S. 1032. An act to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended.

REPORT ON FOOD-FOR-PEACE
PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 18th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period January 1 through June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 21, 1963.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CHELF, of Kentucky, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HAYS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DENTON, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. WESTLAND, Mr. LINDSAY, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, members of the U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6996) to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Admin-

istration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HECHLER, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Johan Berczeller;

H.R. 1742. An act for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;

H.R. 1874. An act for the relief of Eugene Ahrends;

H.R. 2228. An act for the relief of the estate of Raffaello Busoni;

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2925. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 2928. An act for the relief of Maria Cavaris;

H.R. 5583. An act for the relief of Brig. Gen. Fred C. Gray;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension funds as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; and

H.R. 7491. An act for the relief of William L. Berryman.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.;

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vaghars-hag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;
 H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carte Gallitto;
 H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;
 H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;
 H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);
 H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;
 H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski;
 H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;
 H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Glazikis;
 H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes;
 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; and
 S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulis, retired.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joan Berczeller;
 H.R. 1742. An act for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.;
 H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;
 H.R. 1874. An act for the relief of Eugene Ahrends;
 H.R. 2228. An act for the relief of the estate of Raffaello Busoni;
 H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;
 H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;
 H.R. 2925. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;
 H.R. 2928. An act for the relief of Maria Cavaris;
 H.R. 5583. An act for the relief of Brigadier General Fred C. Gray;
 H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;
 H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; and
 H.R. 7491. An act for the relief of William L. Berryman.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consider-

ation of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

George L. Mehren, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Phillip M. Griebel, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard;

David Statler Black, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission; and

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. 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.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, heretofore the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has objected to the holding of any committee meetings when the Senate is in session. However, I discussed this matter with him a moment ago, in the Committee on the Judiciary, and this request does have his consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency authorized the Subcommittee on Stabilization to conduct hearings outside Washington, D.C., on the so-called Douglas truth-in-lending bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has scheduled hearings for today in Pittsburgh and tomorrow in Louisville. I ask unanimous consent that that subcommittee may continue with its hearings while the Senate is in session.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the request refer to today?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF RAIL DISPUTE BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps this is as good a time as any to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], whether it is proposed that, if the rail dispute bill is forthcoming from the Commerce Committee, it be made the order of business?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. My distinguished colleague, the majority leader, has so informed me that if the bill is forthcoming from the Commerce Committee, and is filed during the adjournment of the Senate, it will be the order of business; and it is hoped that it can be considered on Monday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILROAD AT LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER, FLORIDA

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant

to law, on the construction of a railroad at the Launch Operations Center, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Army National Guard construction authorization program, for the year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 24 OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, TO LIBERALIZE CONDITIONS OF CERTAIN LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Supersonic Transport Development, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a request for proposals for the development of a commercial supersonic transport (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON NEED FOR MORE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT ACTION IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PHARMACIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for more effective management action to reduce costs by filling private physicians' prescriptions in Veterans' Administration pharmacies, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY DEPOT HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary depot handling and transportation costs of supply items, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONCESSION CONTRACT AT STATUE OF LIBERTY NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Evelyn Hill, Inc., Statue of Liberty National Monument (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, during fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MRS. ANNETTE M. RASOR AND DR. ROBERT W. RASOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W.

Rasor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims under the Military Personnel Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON PETITIONS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions according the beneficiaries first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALTERATION, RECONSTRUCTION, OR RELOCATION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY AND RAILROAD BRIDGES BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation 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 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Ann Slusher, of Tulsa, Okla., favoring the enactment of the President's civil rights legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H.R. 4638. An act to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President (Rept. No. 448).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 277. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year (Rept. No. 450).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1936. A bill authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906 (Rept. No. 451);

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock (Rept. No. 453);

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyanot River at Barboursville, W. Va. (Rept. No. 455);

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill. (Rept. No. 454); and

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir (Rept. No. 456).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1756. A bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act (Rept. No. 452).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation (Rept. No. 457).

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937, TO ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 449)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that supplemental views may be filed by midnight Monday, August 26, and that the report be printed, together with the supplemental views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, together with the supplemental views.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we worked long and hard on this dairy bill. The committee voted to report it by the resounding vote of 11 to 4.

The bill will reduce the cost of the farm programs. I believe that over the years the bill will reduce that cost significantly, and also will increase dairy farm income. In my opinion, the bill will have the strong support of dairy farmers throughout the country; in fact, I think we can show that the dairy farmers approve and support the bill. I am convinced that dairy farmers in every State will favor it.

I hope the Senate will consider the bill in the very near future.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 458)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together

with the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report and minority views will be printed, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILROAD AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 459)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report and supplemental views will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2068. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2069. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Carrara Vassle;

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Nina Maria Carmela Fiore;

S. 2072. A bill for the relief of Olinda Di Carlo; and

S. 2073. A bill for the relief of Roza Feuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. GORE):

S. 2074. 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.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2075. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the United States Government are free from undue prejudice and preference; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2076. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal

Reserve Banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2077. A bill to regulate in the District of Columbia rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds, and for certain forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

RESOLUTIONS

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR BURDICK

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 187) assigning Mr. BURDICK to the Committee on the Judiciary, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was considered and agreed to.

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

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 188) assigning Mr. PROXMIRE to the Committee on Appropriations, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was considered and agreed to.

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

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR METCALF

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 189) assigning Mr. METCALF to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was considered and agreed to.

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

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE AMBASSADOR AND THE PROBLEM OF COORDINATION"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 190); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate Document the committee print of the Committee on Government Operations, of the Eighty-eighth Congress entitled "The Ambassador and the Problem of Coordination" (a study submitted by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations); and that there be printed six thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PEARSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 191) to authorize certain studies by the Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSE TAX

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed with management and employees in the affected industries of hotels, restaurants, and nightclubs the problems created by that portion of last year's tax bill relating to the disallowance of certain entertainment expenses. I am convinced that the measure which was enacted last year is a self-defeating one as far as bringing in revenue to the U.S. Treasury is concerned. The law, which has depressed many businesses and, in fact, ruined some, will cause fewer rather than more taxes to be collected.

In an effort to bring some order out of the chaos created by last year's entertainment expense statute, the industries which have been vitally affected have proposed a bill which I now introduce in the Senate. I believe this bill would go a long way toward creating a stability in the industries dependent upon the spending of money by businessmen for entertainment and certain travel purposes, while, at the same time, the measure would provide the necessary protection against abuses that have existed in this area. I plan to offer this bill as an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee to the omnibus tax bill when it is sent to that committee from the House of Representatives.

I now send to the desk the bill, and an explanation of it, and ask that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week through the close of business on Friday, August 30, so that anyone wishing to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana, and the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2068) to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 274, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The proposed amendment would repeal the limitation of existing law (sec. 274 (b) and (c)) on deductibility of expenses for gifts and combination business and travel, and would establish more reasonable and understandable rules for limiting deductibility of expenses, and for the substantiation thereof, as more fully explained below.

Proposed paragraph (a) (1) would establish two standards for determining the deductibility of expenses for entertainment, amusement or recreation, both of which

would have to be met (in addition to the ordinary and necessary requirement) before any such amounts would be deductible:

1. The expenditure, in addition to being an ordinary and necessary business expense, would have to be reasonably designed to further the taxpayer's trade or business. This would not only establish the standard of reasonableness, which is a criterion for other business-expense deductions (such as salaries and wages) but would also require that the expenditure, under all the circumstances of the case, be of such amount and nature as might be expected to further the taxpayer's trade or business. This would rule out expenditures which were lavish and extravagant in amount as well as those which bear only a vague relationship to business purposes.

2. the expenditure could not be for the primary purpose of satisfying the personal, family, or living expenses of the taxpayer or his representative, nor of the recipient of the entertainment, amusement or recreation. This is the element of entertainment expenses to which most of Treasury's objections have been levied. Under the proposed amendment, even though an expenditure were ordinary and necessary and might even be designed to further the taxpayer's trade or business, if it were primarily for satisfying the personal, family, or living expenses of the taxpayer or his representative, or of the recipient of the entertainment, it would not be deductible. And, as is the case of all deductions from gross income, the burden would be on the taxpayer to establish that the expenditure was not for the primary purpose of satisfying such personal, family, or living expenses.

Paragraph (a)(2) would establish similar standards for deductibility of expenses of maintaining or operating an entertainment facility. Maintenance and operating expenses of these facilities are the type of expenditures at which present law is directed, and not unrelated uses, such as a business meal at a country club. The troublesome "primary use" standard of existing law would be eliminated, and a taxpayer would be permitted to deduct expenses to the extent they meet the standards.

Proposed subsection (b) would establish more equitable and more flexible rules for substantiation of travel and entertainment expenses. Precise specifications of elements of recordkeeping would be eliminated from the statute and left to regulations, thus affording more reasonable flexibility in prescribing the nature of records or evidence required in particular circumstances. In the case of reimbursed expenses of an employee, the substantiation requirement would be met if the employee is required to account, and does so account, to his employer. Regulations could, of course, as indeed they did before enactment of section 274, specify what would be deemed an adequate accounting to an employer.

The proposed amendment would render unnecessary the nine exceptions to the disallowance rules, and with them, of course, the uncertainty and confusion surrounding these exceptions. The proposed amendment would abandon the "directly related to" and the "associated with" standards of existing law, concerning which there is abject and total confusion.

TURN PUBLIC SEARCHLIGHT ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require fuller and more prompt reporting of campaign spending in Federal elections.

American politics has rushed headlong into an era of big campaign spending. Multimillion dollar presidential campaigns and hundred thousand dollar senatorial campaigns are a sure 1964 affliction.

Every candidate for Federal office who faces a contest and has a chance to win next year must have these huge sums spent in his behalf. The immense expense of modern communication media makes this certain.

Laws regulating campaign spending in Federal elections, however, are still back in the preradio days. They are pitifully inadequate for the expensive marvels of a television era.

They are based on the outmoded idea that campaigning is conducted mostly on courthouse steps with speeches before several thousand enthralled listeners, and that the only cost is for the oats and hay for the candidate's horse that brought him into town.

In 1964 those most interested in the elections, including many with a special antipublic interest, will, as in the past, contribute most of the huge sums that will help determine who wins.

Let us make no mistake about it: In every close election, big money is likely to play a decisive part in determining the winner.

My bill does not restrict, impede, or limit contributions. It does throw the cleansing searchlight of public scrutiny on campaign money. It will make it possible for the first time for the voter to know and know before he votes just what interest groups are contributing how much to each candidate.

In general, my bill follows the recommendations made by Professor Alexander Heard in his excellent study of campaign spending for President Kennedy.

Among the bill's new provisions are two proposals not offered in previous similar legislation: The first would cut off all campaign contributions 5 days before the election takes place.

The second would require committees or individuals receiving contributions exceeding \$100 to report the name, address and occupation of contributors within 24 hours after receipt of the contribution.

Reports would be open to public inspection. Provision is made in the bill for criminal penalties upon its violation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2069) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, an anomalous situation exists today in our transportation system whereby the sovereign government is free to achieve what the law itself prohibits its citizens from doing. I refer specifically to section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which au-

thorizes the Federal Government to negotiate freight rates with carriers free of all controls and restraints applicable to private shippers. It simultaneously denies the right of any person to obtain redress from these rates. Today I introduce a bill to amend this statute as a means of eliminating the inequities created through the application of one set of rules for the Government and another for private shippers.

Section 22 has come down to us from 1887 with a bilateral association with the land-grant railroads. It is in no way connected nor was it ever intended to be connected with our defense program. It was included in the original act to regulate commerce for a very simple reason: To allow non-land-grant railroads to compete for Government traffic through equalization agreements with land-grant railroads without violating any other sections of the act.

Repeal of the free or reduced rate provisions of section 22 would not stop Government shipping agencies from receiving waivers from the ICC where matters of national security are concerned. The fact remains that the ability of the Government to move its troops and goods in times of national emergency does not hinge upon the existence of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, why in 1945, when the last of the land-grant acts were repealed removing any further obligation on the part of carriers to haul Government cargo at reduced rates, section 22 was not repealed also. When the Congress of that year relieved the railroads of their obligation to haul both military and nonmilitary traffic at low rates it should have logically repealed section 22 at the same time. In view of the fact that section 22 was allowed to remain intact, we can only assume that the import of this statute with its impending consequences was not recognized at the time.

Since 1945, the use of section 22 to secure reduced rates on Government freight has grown to astronomical proportions and the consequences have been correspondingly serious. The misuse of section 22 since 1945 has fostered discrimination in private industry which would not be tolerated by the ICC in cases involving commercial shippers. It has encouraged an arbitrary imposition of unequal rates and charges in many cases for substantially the same service. It has allowed concerns to completely bypass the equalizing influence of the ICC thereby offering low freight rates to Government purchasers of transportation, simultaneously with the levying of higher rates on private shippers.

Historically the purpose of most transportation regulation has been to prevent discrimination as created by section 22 which results in uneconomic consequences, detrimental to the sound financial structure of carriers and commercial health of industry. This free-for-all battle for Government cargo has caused rate wars and unwarranted competition which have been wasteful and ruinous to carriers, shippers and to the public. It is a fact that certain carriers dissipate their revenues to disastrously low levels

in the race to secure Government traffic. They are completely undeterred by the Interstate Commerce Act and the Commission, and can, if they wish, haul millions of tons of Federal cargo not only at rates below commercial charges but free of all charge regardless of the destructive impact upon the public interest.

My proposal to amend section 22 does not suggest there should be the slightest modification of our Government's sovereign right to economical and expeditious freight service in times of war and peace. On the contrary, I want to maintain our total transportation costs at the barest minimum possible. Also, I have and remain in full accord with our national transportation policy as expressed to the Congress by the President:

To maintain a transportation system which assures the availability of fast, safe, and economical transportation service without waste or discrimination.

The bill I introduce does not propose to abolish section 22 but rather it provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have the authority to remove any section 22 rate tendered to the Government which subjects any person or locality to unjust discrimination, undue or unreasonable prejudice, or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever. It would also provide that any agency or department of the Government which intends to use a section 22 rate negotiated with a carrier must file its intention with the ICC 15 days previous to the rate's acceptance. This will eliminate the unique and unfair element section 22 ratemaking which allows a supplier to establish his transportation cost factors without his competitors knowing of the freight rates involved. This type of secrecy in freight rate negotiations on Government traffic precludes equal competitive opportunities to bid for the same business. Current regulation requires that carriers file their section 22 rates with the Commission. However, from a practical standpoint the rate is entirely secret as it need not be filed until it is used and even then it may be retroactive.

The basic purpose of transportation legislation and the expressed intent of Congress are therefore being bypassed by the constantly expanding use of section 22. Indicative of the growing concern that encourages me to seek to correct this condition is the thoughtful expression of the distinguished mayor of the city of Detroit, the Honorable Jerome P. Cavanagh. His letter to me of August 6 is clear in its expression and responsible in its suggestion, characteristic of Mayor Cavanagh and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2075) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the U.S. Government are free from undue prejudice and preference, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

CITY OF DETROIT,
August 6, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: Under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, there is a provision for exemption from the Federal Government from Government regulation on the shipment of its goods. As a result of this provision, the port of Detroit has not been able to realize its full potential with respect to the shipment of defense goods.

Representative THOMAS ASHLEY has introduced H.R. 4298 which establishes a procedure to assure that no rate will be quoted on shipment of goods which results in unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage to any particular locality, port, port district, gateway region district or territory.

I know you have been very interested in this particular problem and I would appreciate it if you would consider introducing similar legislation in the Senate. The legislation merely establishes a fair and equitable procedure to avoid discrimination in the shipment of Government goods while at the same time it permits affected localities to challenge unfair rates. There is a provision which protects the national security.

I am enclosing remarks by Representative ASHLEY when the House bill was introduced on February 27, 1963.

Very truly yours,

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

EXTENSION OF CREDIT TO MEMBER BANKS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, AND OTHERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I send the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill introduced by request of the Federal Reserve Board to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letter addressed to me, of August 21, from Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System, requesting the introduction of the bill, together with an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2076) to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Board of Governors recommends the introduction and en-

actment of legislation that would, in effect, substitute for the present technical and restrictive requirements of the Federal Reserve Act relating to the eligibility of paper for discount or as security for advances by the Federal Reserve banks, a new provision broadly authorizing the Reserve Banks to make advances to their member banks on any security satisfactory to the Reserve banks, subject to limitations, restrictions, and regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors. A draft of a bill that would accomplish this objective is enclosed.

The original Federal Reserve Act authorized the Reserve banks to discount only certain types of paper arising out of actual commercial or agricultural transactions, subject to specified maturity limitation. The concept underlying this limited authority was that the liquidity of commercial banks could be assured only if the loans made by them were short-term and self-liquidating in character. Related to this concept was the assumption that the pledging of such discounted paper by the Reserve banks as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes would serve as the basis for an elastic currency; it was expected that the volume of currency would expand and contract directly in response to the varying credit needs of the economy, as reflected by the volume of short-term borrowing by commercial and agricultural enterprises.

The principle that Federal Reserve credit should be extended only on the basis of short-term, self-liquidating paper was departed from as early as 1916, during the First World War, when the law was amended to authorize the Reserve banks to make 15-day advances to member banks, not only on the security of eligible paper but also on the security of direct obligations of the United States. A more significant departure occurred in 1932, when Congress authorized the Reserve banks to make advances to member banks in exceptional and unusual circumstances on any security satisfactory to the Reserve banks, although at a penalty rate of interest. This authority, at first temporary, was made permanent in 1935, and it is no longer limited to exceptional and unusual circumstances, although such advances continue to carry a penalty rate of interest.

The concept that limitation of discounts to short-term, self-liquidating paper would serve automatically to regulate the volume of Federal Reserve notes in circulation has also been breached by amendments to the law and has been refuted by experience. In 1932, Congress authorized the issuance of Federal Reserve notes on the security of Government obligations in addition to eligible paper and gold. This authority was originally of a temporary nature, but it was made permanent in 1945. The volume of Federal Reserve notes today fluctuates with the changing demands of the economy without regard to the nature of the paper offered as collateral for Federal Reserve credit or pledged as security for Federal Reserve notes.

Each of these legislative changes took place during a period of economic stress that served to make clear the inadequacy of the original framework for Federal Reserve credit extension. The credit needs of American businessmen, farmers, and consumers were evolving in many ways that could not be adequately handled by the old instrument of short-term, commercial-type paper; and the rapid growth of both private and governmental economic activity generated credit requirements far in excess of those that could be supported by the relatively small volume of eligible paper.

Despite changes in the character of paper held by commercial banks and the repeated and necessary departures from the original concept that discounts should be based only on short-term, self-liquidating paper, the law

continues to impose unduly restrictive requirements as to the nature and maturity of the paper that may be discounted by the Reserve banks or offered as security for advances by the Reserve banks.

For many years, it has been generally recognized that the concept of an elastic currency based on short-term, self-liquidating paper is no longer in consonance with banking practice and the needs of the economy. It has long been apparent that the narrow requirements of the law regarding eligible paper serve no useful purpose and that it would be preferable to place emphasis on the soundness of the paper offered as security for advances and the appropriateness of the purposes for which member banks borrow. The 1-year paper of many bank customers that is not now eligible for discount may be as satisfactory collateral as the 90-day notes of other customers. Moreover, the nature of the collateral provides no assurance that the borrowing bank will use the proceeds for an appropriate purpose.

As long as member banks hold a large enough volume of Government securities, they need not, of course, be particularly concerned as to the eligibility for discount with the Reserve banks of customers' paper held by them. Since World War II, however, there has been a sharp net decline in the aggregate holdings of Government securities by member banks. If any substantial increase in economic activity should cause banks to reduce their holdings of Government securities in order to meet increased credit demands, many banks would be obliged to tender other kinds of collateral if they should seek to obtain Federal Reserve credit.

If such a situation should develop, the Reserve banks could accept technically ineligible paper as collateral for advances to their member banks only under section 10 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act at a rate of interest one-half of 1 percent above the regular discount rate. However, the necessity for distinguishing between eligible and ineligible paper would give rise to cumbersome administrative procedures that are not warranted by the exigencies of current banking conditions. In order to avoid these problems, it would clearly be preferable to move in advance and to revise and update the law so as to eliminate the existing restrictions with respect to eligible paper.

The Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks believe that such a revision of the law would be desirable so that the Reserve banks will always be in a position to perform promptly and efficiently one of their principal responsibilities—the extension of appropriate credit assistance to member banks to enable the latter to meet the legitimate credit needs of the economy.

Accordingly, the Board urges that legislation of the kind here proposed be given favorable consideration by your committee and by the Congress. In addition to the draft bill, there are enclosed a section-by-section explanation of the bill and a document showing the changes that would be made by the bill in provisions of present law.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, JR.,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILL REGARDING ADVANCES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

In general, the first section of this bill would confer upon the Federal Reserve banks broad authority to make advances on any satisfactory security; and the remaining sections of the bill are largely of a conforming nature.

Section 1: A new section 13A would be inserted in the Federal Reserve Act. It would authorize any Federal Reserve bank to make advances to any of its member banks on the note of the member bank secured to the

satisfaction of the Reserve bank, subject to such limitations, restrictions, and regulations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe. In making such advances, the Reserve bank would be required to give due regard to the "maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture" and to keep itself informed as to the character and amount of the loans and investments of its member banks, with a view to determining whether undue or inappropriate use is being made of bank credit for speculative purposes or for purposes inconsistent with the maintenance of sound credit conditions. These requirements are substantially the same as those now prescribed by the eighth paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act.

In addition to advances to member banks, the Reserve banks would be authorized to make advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of obligations of the United States, an authority similar to that now contained in the last paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, although the new authority, like that with respect to advances to member banks, would not specify any maturity limitation. As under present law, the authority to make advances to corporations would cover advances to nonmember banks.

Section 2: Because they would be superseded or rendered obsolete by the authority conferred by the new section 13A, the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act hereafter described would be repealed.

Section 10(a) of the act (12 U.S.C. 347a), enacted in 1932, authorizes advances to groups of five or more member banks. This authority has never been utilized and would be unnecessary in the light of the new authority.

Section 10(b) (12 U.S.C. 347b), containing authority for advances to member banks on any satisfactory security but at a one-half-of-1-percent penalty interest rate, would likewise be rendered unnecessary by the new legislation.

Section 11(b) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248 (b)), authorizing the Board of Governors to permit or require a Federal Reserve bank to rediscount the discounted paper of other Reserve banks, has not been used since 1933 and is of no practical importance today.

The 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 10th, and 13th paragraphs of section 13 of the act (12 U.S.C. 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 361, and 347c, respectively), contain the basic provisions of present law regarding discounts and advances by the Federal Reserve banks. These provisions limit eligible paper to paper "issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes, or the proceeds of which have been used, or are to be used, for such purposes"; provide emergency authority (never used) for the discounting of eligible paper for individuals, partnerships, and corporations; authorize the discounting of sight drafts in certain limited circumstances; authorize the discounting of bankers' acceptances and "dollar exchange" acceptances of the kinds described in paragraphs 7 and 12 of section 13; limit the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for a member bank; authorize advances (as distinguished from discounts) to member banks secured by Government obligations or eligible paper; provide for the regulation of discounts by the Board; authorize advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of Government obligations; authorize the discounting of agricultural paper, paper held by Federal intermediate credit banks, and paper of cooperative marketing associations; and provide that certain types of real estate loans by national banks shall be regarded as commercial paper for discount purposes. All of these provisions would either be superseded or covered by

the new section 13A added by section 1 of the present bill.

Section 3: The eighth paragraph of section 4 of the act (12 U.S.C. 301) presently requires each Federal Reserve bank to consider the maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture in extending credit to member banks, and to keep itself informed regarding undue uses of bank credit for speculative purposes; and the Board of Governors is authorized to suspend any member bank from access to Federal Reserve credit for any such undue use of bank credit. These provisions would be retained in substance in the new section 13A. Accordingly, the similar provisions of section 4 would be repealed, so that the eighth paragraph of that section would provide only—as it does now—that the board of directors of each Federal Reserve bank shall administer its affairs "fairly and impartially and without discrimination in favor of or against any member bank or banks."

Section 4: The 13th paragraph of section 9 of the act (12 U.S.C. 330) would be amended to repeal the proviso limiting the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for any member bank. This limitation, like the similar limitation in section 9 of the act, appears unnecessary in view of the fact that most State laws limit the amount of loans that may be made to one borrower by State banks, in terms similar to those applicable to national banks under section 5200 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 5: The last sentence of section 11(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)), regarding the addition to the discount rate of any tax paid by the Reserve banks on deficiencies in their reserves against Federal Reserve notes, would be modified to refer to the interest rate charged on advances under the new section 13A.

Section 6: The language of the last sentence of section 11(m) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(m)), regarding suspension of rediscount privileges for certain increases in loans secured by stock or bond collateral, would be conformed to refer to suspension of use of the credit facilities of the Federal Reserve banks.

Section 7: The provision of section 12 of the act (12 U.S.C. 262), authorizing the Federal Advisory Council to make recommendations in regard to discount rates and rediscount business, would be changed to refer to advances under the new section 13A and interest rates on such advances.

Section 8: The first paragraph of section 14 of the act (12 U.S.C. 353) would be amended to eliminate a reference to paper eligible for rediscount and, at the same time, to omit a reference to regulation of Federal Reserve bank open market operations by the Board of Governors, a function that has been subject to regulation since 1935 by the Federal Open Market Committee.

Section 9: A conforming change would be made in section 14(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 356) to eliminate a reference to paper arising out of commercial transactions, as hereinbefore defined.

Section 10: Section 14(d) of the act (12 U.S.C. 357), relating to the fixing of discount rates, would be amended to refer to interest rates under the new section 13A. At the same time, this provision would be broadened to authorize the fixing of different rates, not only for different classes of paper, but also according to such other basis or bases as may be deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of this provision. The amended provision would also include separate authority as to rates on advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations under subsection (c) of the new section 13A.

Section 11: The provision of section 16 of the act (12 U.S.C. 412) authorizing the use of paper acquired under section 13 as secu-

ity for Federal Reserve notes would be modified to refer to notes of member banks or others acquired under the provisions of [the new] section 13A of this act.

Section 12: The provision of section 19 of the act (12 U.S.C. 463), prohibiting member banks from acting as agents for nonmember banks in obtaining Federal Reserve discounts, without the Board's permission, would be conformed to refer to advances instead of discounts.

Section 13: A provision of section 23A of the act, relating to security for loans to affiliates of member banks, would be conformed to eliminate a reference to drafts eligible for rediscount.

Section 14: A provision of the act of July 21, 1932 (12 U.S.C. 1148), authorizing agricultural credit corporations to rediscount eligible paper with the Federal Reserve banks, would be repealed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE RATES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this is the model bill proposed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie over until a week from today for such additional cosponsors as may wish to join.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 2077) to regulate in the District of Columbia rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds, and for certain forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 187), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is relieved from service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, also on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 188), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] is relieved from service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, also on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 189), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is relieved from service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, many persons in different parts of our country were displaced from Yugoslavia as a part of, and as an aftermath of, World War II. In that operation, they lost their property. Subsequently, they came to this country and became citizens of the United States.

The United States concluded with the Yugoslav Government, an agreement whereby the Yugoslav claims settlement commission for the handling of specific claims was created. But it appears that it has taken the position, and our representatives also have taken the position, that since these persons were not citizens of the United States, no valid claim could have been preferred. Now they have become U.S. citizens; but they were dispossessed of their property.

This situation comes to mind in connection with the Foreign Assistance Act, which is Senate bill 1276, under which I am fairly sure that certain benefits—whether in the form of loans or in the form of grants—might be made available to Yugoslavia. It is a singular thing that out of the tax moneys of the people of this country, including those of the various claimants whose claims have been unsatisfied, we would propose such pay-

ments—not urge the Yugoslav Government to do something about these claims, but mandate them and, in fact, provide that there shall be no assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, unless and until the President determines that such Government has made an acceptable arrangement for the payment of claims arising out of the nationalization or other taking by such Government of property of persons who are now citizens of the United States, on the date of the enactment of this act.

In any case, such persons were not citizens of the United States on the date of the nationalization or taking of such nationalization or other taking occurred subsequent to July 19, 1948.

Mr. President, I have a more extended memorandum to submit in connection with this matter. In addition, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to Senate bill 1276, to be called up when that bill comes to the floor for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

BACKGROUND OF YUGOSLAV CLAIMS

All claims arising from the nationalization or other taking of property owned by American citizens in Yugoslavia between September 1, 1939, and July 19, 1948, are considered to have been fully settled by the payment made to the United States under the Pecuniary Claims Settlement Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia of July 19, 1948. These nationals with valid claims to compensation for the loss of property during the cited period were obliged to file claims with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission before the termination of the program on December 31, 1954.

The State Department reports that while it is sympathetic toward those unfortunate individuals who were not American citizens at the time their losses occurred, the United States, in accordance with the well-established principle of international law and practices, espouses private claims against another nation only where the claimant was a national of the United States at the time the claim arose. The Yugoslav Claims Settlement Agreement excludes from the settlement of claims individual nationals of the United States who did not possess such nationality at the time of the nationalization of their property.

Article 3 of the agreement provides that such claims are subject to compensation by the Yugoslav Government, either by direct negotiations between that Government and the respective claimants, or under compensation procedures prescribed by Yugoslav law. It is clear from this provision that there is no obligation on the part of the Yugoslav Government toward the United States with respect to so-called article 3 claimants. Similarly, there is no obligation on the part of the United States toward such claimants. The matter of payment of these claims is for settlement between the claimants and the Yugoslav Government.

The United States has not disinterested itself in the fate of such claimants, and it has urged the Yugoslav Government on different occasions to preserve the rights of claimants who were not American citizens at the time their losses occurred. The United States cannot do more than urge.

In May 1962 the State Department announced that the United States and Yugoslavia have agreed to begin negotiations with a view to settling claims of American citizens against Yugoslavia for the taking by Yugoslavia of their property under the nationalization law of December 1958, and other measures of the Yugoslav Government. The claims to be included in the negotiations are those which have arisen since July 19, 1948, the date of the last settlement between the two Governments.

When the amendments to the War Claims Act were before the Senate in the fall of 1962, a provision was included to include claimants who were not citizens of the United States at the time of their losses. This was eliminated in conference.

The Senate recessed, "with the understanding that in the event there remains a balance in the war claims fund after the payment in full of claims provided for under the bill, consideration would be given to legislation providing for payment to these categories of persons. The committee of the conference recommended that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should proceed to make an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved." (H. Rept. 2513, 87th Cong.)

WHY SHOULD THE U.S. AID PROGRAM BE PAYING DUTY ON THE PRODUCTS OF ITS LOANS AND GRANTS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate referral, an amendment to S. 1276, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

My amendment is simple. It is designed to correct what I consider an abuse which has occurred in some of the countries receiving foreign economic assistance grants and loans. In some of the countries, articles purchased in this country with U.S. dollars loaned or granted to those countries under our AID program, are subject to customs or other import duties when imported from the United States into those countries. In effect, those countries are diverting a portion of our aid dollars away from their economic development and into paying for the general operating expenses of the governments of those countries.

In effect, this is hidden partial underwriting of the budgets of those countries in a manner determined by them and not by the United States. If we are giving development grants or loans to a particular nation, every dollar of that grant or loan should be applied to the particular project aided. We should not permit a single dollar of it to be diverted, in this indirect manner, to any other uses decided upon by the government aided.

In order to give my colleagues an opportunity to join with me in this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, and lie at the desk until the close of business August 30, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 302. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended

by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) No loan or grant shall be made under any provision of this Act to any country, or to any recipient therein, unless such country shall have agreed to exempt from all customs duties or other import taxes levied by such country any articles procured in the United States or any of its territories with the proceeds of such loan or grant, including any amounts thereof loaned by the original recipient to borrowers within such country."

NO U.S. AID FOR GOVERNMENTS THAT WAGE OR WOULD WAGE AGGRESSIVE WAR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 1276, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

This too is a simple amendment. The amendment would cut off foreign economic assistance to any nation which is arming itself for aggression against any nation which we also are aiding.

We find in the Middle East an extremely explosive situation. Egypt is engaged in an arms race seeking to make itself militarily capable of carrying on an aggressive war with its neighbors. In fact, at this very moment, more than 28,000 Egyptian troops are fighting in Yemen, and have been kept there despite promises to the United States to remove them. While the United States under its aid program is pouring millions of dollars into Egypt to build up its economy and relieve its people's poverty the Egyptian Government is squandering millions in an aggressive war in another country. Yet we continue to give Egypt foreign economic assistance, thus freeing Egypt's normal resources for diversion into arms bartered from Communist nations.

But the situation is worse than this.

Because Egypt is arming itself, its neighbors against which it has openly made threats must divert much needed revenues from their economic development into arms. We are aiding Jordan with many millions. We have aided Israel substantially to assist in its economic development. Israel and Jordan would need far less if they were not forced by Egypt's arming of itself to do likewise.

The amendment which I am offering was adopted in the other body yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed at this point in my remarks and lie on the desk until the close of business on August 30, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18 insert the following new section:

"Sec. 302. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act."

TRANSFER OF EXECUTIVE POWER OF PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JACKSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF AGING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2000) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RAILROAD DISPUTE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] be added to the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102 submitted by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of August 8, 1963:

S. 2031. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to urban conservation and development, the provision and improvement of housing, the availability of mortgage credit, and for other purposes: Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PELL, and Mr. RUBINOFF.

Authority of August 15, 1963:

S. 2053. A bill to provide for the acquisition of rights-of-way for canals and ditches: Mr. BURDICK, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. MCGEE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 15, 1963, the names of Mr. INOUE and Mr. KEATING were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submitted on August 15, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—S. 810 AND S. 811

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that on September 17, 18, and 19, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on S. 810, a bill entitled "Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963," and S. 811, a bill entitled "Home Mortgage Corporation Act." The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. each day.

All persons wishing to testify should contact Mr. Carl A. S. Coan, staff director of the subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulis, retired.

TIGHTER REIN ON FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article appearing in the Evening Star of August 21 gives rise to the hope that President Kennedy, at long last, may be taking a second look at some of his economic advisers' theories that getting the economy moving is predicated upon continued deficit spending.

Staff writer Garnett Horner notes that the President, in a letter to Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, has promised a tighter rein on Federal spending in striving toward the long-range goal of a balanced budget. It is too bad that the President made the promise contingent upon approval of his tax-cutting program. He should have called for spending cuts first. But at best this is a long-overdue awakening by this administration to the peril of persistent deficit spending.

Every taxpayer welcomes the words of the President as set out in the sixth paragraph of this article:

Tax reduction must also be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on

Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need.

In a letter to President Kennedy last March 19, six members of the Joint Economic Committee recommended this same step. I would like to quote from that letter:

We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures. We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth. In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

It is heartening that our Nation's leaders finally may have recognized this need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Kennedy Vows To Trim Spending After Tax Cut," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1963]

KENNEDY VOWS TO TRIM SPENDING AFTER TAX CUT

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Kennedy today promised a "tighter rein" on Federal spending in striving toward the long-range goal of a balanced budget after Congress approves his tax-cutting program.

The President warmly endorsed the two-step tax reduction and revision program voted by the House Ways and Means Committee in a letter to Chairman MILLS, and he emphasized that "it is most important now that the bill be enacted this year as rapidly as possible."

He wrote Mr. MILLS after telling his press conference late yesterday that the Nation's economy is "good" now, running slightly better than his experts estimated in January, but that the tax bill should be passed this year "if we are going to see 1964 another good year."

LISTS FIVE INTENTIONS

Seeking to reassure some Members of Congress who have called for cutting Government spending if taxes are reduced, the President outlined five "intentions" in his letter to Mr. MILLS:

1. "Our long-range goal remains a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy. It is clear that this goal cannot be achieved without a substantial tax reduction and the greater national income it will produce."

2. Tax reduction must also "be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

SMALLER DEFICIT SEEN

3. As the tax cut becomes fully effective "and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased tax revenues will be applied toward a reduction in the transitional deficits which accompany the initial cut in tax rates."

4. Assuming a loss of revenue of \$5 billion more in fiscal year 1965 than in fiscal 1964 under the tax-cutting program, the President said he expected his fiscal 1965 budget to call for a deficit of less than the \$9.2 billion forecast for fiscal 1964.

5. Any increase in the Federal debt resulting from transitional deficits "will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced."

Mr. Kennedy said the program voted by the House committee "will provide much needed jobs for our economy, increase our rate of economic growth, promote balance in our international payments and benefit the individual and corporate taxpayer."

CALLS ON BUSINESSMEN

In urging rapid passage, he said businessmen whose investment plans are keyed to this program should be certain that both steps will become fully effective by January 1, 1965. The committee-approved bill calls for tax cuts in two steps, the larger in 1964.

The President emphasized that the "surest way" to get away from budget deficits is quick passage of the tax reduction program because it will result in greater tax revenues to the Government as a result of increased national income spurred by tax reductions.

The President also wrote Chairman MILLS that he sees "no reason for placing any conditions or contingencies on the effectiveness of the second phase of the tax-reduction program."

THANKS CHAIRMAN

On the other hand, he said, any delay or contingent feature would substantially reduce effectiveness of the legislation in stimulating the economy, and this could lead to less revenue than expected.

He promised continued efforts to "improve governmental efficiency, promote economy, and prune expenditures."

The President said increases in the number of Government civilian workers are being held below the increases in workload. He noted that civilian expenditures for the 1963 fiscal year ended June 30 were reduced nearly \$2 billion below January estimates, and cuts in the fiscal 1964 budget have been recommended by him since it was submitted in January.

Expressing his appreciation to Chairman MILLS and all other members of the House Ways and Means Committee "for your long and constructive labors in formulating a new tax bill," Mr. Kennedy said, "I hope that you will find as strong bipartisan support for this tax reduction program on the House floor as you did in the Ways and Means Committee."

EXPRESSES CONFIDENCE

At his press conference, the President said he could not see why Congress could not stay in session long enough to pass both the tax and civil rights bills.

He also asserted confidently that America's balance-of-payments problem—arising from more dollars going abroad than are coming in—will be conquered "by one means or another."

When asked how the economy is going, Mr. Kennedy replied: "I would say good."

He added that Federal Reserve Board statistical comparison, using the 1957-59 base as 100, has risen to 127 now from 119 in January.

A reporter had asked the President about talk on Capitol Hill that it might be a good idea to postpone action on both the tax

and the civil-rights bills until the next session starting in January.

The President remarked that if the tax bill were started all over again in January, it might be May or June or July of next year before it got to a vote, and asked: "What would happen to the economy in the meanwhile?"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Payments Deficit at \$5 Billion High," Eileen Shanahan, published in the New York Times on August 20, 1963, and an article entitled "Floating the Dollar," by the distinguished columnist Harry J. Taylor, datelined London, and published in the Fort Dodge Messenger on August 2, 1963.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 20, 1963]

PAYMENTS DEFICIT AT \$5 BILLION HIGH

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit reached an annual rate of \$5,200 million in the second quarter of this year.

The deficit surpassed, by a thin margin, the previous records for a single quarter, set in the final quarters of 1961 and 1962.

Administration concern over the worsening balance-of-payments picture was made known by President Kennedy in a special message to Congress a month ago. The second-quarter figure, however, was far larger than he or any other official had indicated.

The increase in the deficit in the second quarter amounted to an annual rate of \$2 billion. Almost the entire increase was traceable to increased flows into foreign hands of American capital of all types, both short-term and long-term.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES

The balance of payments measures the difference between what Americans, including the Government, spend, lend, and invest abroad and what they take in from all foreign sources. The United States has run a deficit in its international balance of payments every year since 1957.

The second quarter figures for the balance of payments made public today by the Department of Commerce are preliminary estimates and contain little detail. They do not reveal the precise nature of the outflow.

It is not possible, for example, on the basis of the preliminary figures, to distinguish between American capital that went into foreign securities and that which represented so-called direct investment in the assets of companies operating overseas, either American or foreign-owned.

Nor was it possible to identify bank loans as a separate component of private capital outflow.

The key item in President Kennedy's new program for dealing with the balance-of-payments deficit is a tax ranging up to 15 percent on American purchases of long-term foreign securities from foreigners. It is designed to discourage such securities purchases and would not affect either direct investments or bank lending to foreigners.

Even the sketchy preliminary figures revealed clearly that increased purchases of foreign securities by Americans had contributed importantly to the increase in the deficit in the second quarter.

Statistics on newly issued foreign securities, which were available, showed that \$500 million of these had been sold to Americans in the second quarter. Nearly \$1 billion worth was sold in the first half of the year.

The first-half volume was "not much less than for the year 1962 as a whole," the Commerce Department said in releasing the figures, and was "almost double the amounts purchased in each of the years 1960 and 1961."

The House Ways and Means Committee will begin hearings tomorrow on the President's proposed foreign securities tax. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon will be the lead-off witness.

There were indications that the Commerce Department had been asked to rush the preliminary figures so that Mr. Dillon might discuss them and use the big jump in the deficit in the second quarter as an argument against congressional delay in approving the tax.

The one bright spot in the balance-of-payments report for the second quarter was the trend in U.S. foreign trade.

The balance of trade—the amount by which exports exceeded imports—rose by an annual rate of \$1,200 million in the second quarter.

The Commerce Department noted, however, that the dock strike of January had kept both exports and imports at lower than normal levels in the first quarter, and that this factor accounted for part of the improvement. Eliminating the effects of the dock strike from the figure would have reduced the second quarter improvement in the trade surplus to around \$400 million, the Department indicated.

Another negative factor in the second quarter balance of payments was the rise in Government grants and loans for foreign countries.

The second quarter balance-of-payments deficit exceeded the records established in the final quarters of 1961 and 1962 by only about \$100 million. In both of those quarters, freakish factors were thought to be at work, among them movements in bank funds that are peculiar to the final quarter of the year and the effects of special Canadian financial problems in both years.

The actual annual U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, for an entire year, reached a peak of \$3,800 million in 1960. It then declined to \$2,400 million in 1961, and to \$2,200 million in 1962.

A major portion of the improvement was, however, attributable to special arrangements the United States made with European governments—to make advance repayments on certain loans, to purchase equipment for their armed forces in this country and to buy some specially issued U.S. securities. These payments, which were recorded as income to the United States in the balance-of-payments figures, reduced the reported deficit.

In today's announcement of the second quarter balance-of-payments figures, the Commerce Department computed all back figures and the present ones as though no such special payments had occurred.

The change added \$100 million to the reported second-quarter deficit, putting it at an annual rate of \$5,300 million. But it also made the deficits of earlier years look larger, and therefore, the deterioration this year look less severe.

On the basis that the Government has now apparently decided to use, the 1960 deficit remains at \$3,900 million, but the 1961 deficit becomes \$3 billion and the 1962 deficit is \$3,600 million.

The deficit in the first quarter of this year, on the new basis that excludes special payments, becomes \$3,600 million instead of the \$3,200 million reported earlier.

FLOATING THE DOLLAR

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In contrast to his statements last week at home, President Kennedy gave the impres-

sion abroad on his recent trip that the United States is seeking an escape from balance-of-payments disciplines by pumping air into Western European currencies and floating the dollar off with them. The effect was, and remains, lethal.

This dodge away from discipline would take the form of a supranational credit-creating institution to ease the financing of the red-ink deficits in the U.S. balance of payments.

Competent European listeners like West German Economic Minister Erhard, who will succeed Chancellor Adenauer, were reportedly appalled. Moreover, President De Gaulle promptly received every detail about Mr. Kennedy's trial balloon.

Mr. Kennedy acknowledges that all free world currencies are anchored to the dollar. His current and past statements express all-out defense of the free convertibility of gold and the dollar as the cornerstones not only of U.S. monetary policy but of the entire international financial system.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly pledges they will remain so. But Fort Knox is gone with the wind now and Mr. Kennedy knows that Chancellor Adenauer and President De Gaulle between them control such a large call on our depleted gold that they could make his pledge meaningless any moment they chose.

Far from doing this, both have cooperated in supporting the dollar for their own nations' benefit and that of the free world as well as of the United States.

But if President Kennedy is going to keep up his overspending and thus force himself to fly the dollar off into the wild blue yonder they realize that the sooner they protect their central banks by calling for gold the better.

In the financial world news spreads at the speed of sound. His trial balloon traveled that fast over here. Nothing could be calculated to put a worse strain on international confidence in the dollar. The result is premonitory; it helps to create or intensify the very consequences it fears.

Informed European officials know time is running out on Mr. Kennedy for any possible orderly correction of the payments deficit and the discipline necessary for a balanced U.S. budget.

They view the present outlook in the light of his statements of the past. They know his several claims of improvement in the payments deficits comparing 1962 to 1960, were merely what the British here call "cooking the books."

In truth, the "improvement" was chiefly through unsustainable short-term gains such as extraordinary (requested) prepayments to Washington by foreign governments totaling \$700 million—\$250 million foreign exchange earnings through special U.S. Treasury borrowings in foreign currencies and \$470 million advance payments by West Germany and others over here for military equipment.

Also, exclusive of Government-financed exports, our trade surplus fell from \$2.8 billion in 1960 to \$2 billion last year and net private long-term capital outflow climbed from \$2.1 billion to \$2.5 billion. The "improvement" simply wasn't an improvement, as claimed, nor is the present description of the deterioration the full story.

Responsible men over here pay attention to the facts. They remain properly unimpressed by last week's change in the discount rate so long as budgetary fundamentals remain undisciplined.

As part of this approach, they see the New Frontiersmen still trying to bless their own "planned deficits." That's the kind of talk you'd expect from a banana republic, not the No. 1 nation in the world.

For Adenauer knows the importance of sound finance. He also knows the Presi-

dent's chief economic adviser, Walter W. Heller, is utterly discredited in Europe.

West Germany's remarkable recovery dates entirely from the Erhard currency reform (1948) that established a sound German mark. As Internal Finance Adviser to the U.S. Military Government in Germany in 1948 Heller opposed this. He pushed his Heller plan of "planned deficits" which President Kennedy has adopted for the United States today; completely repudiated by Adenauer and Erhard alike a full 15 years ago.

President de Gaulle also sees the importance of sound finance. It revitalized France.

Responsible European leaders cannot be expected to believe Mr. Kennedy is effectively grappling with America's crisis until he fires Dr. Heller and turns away from the Balkan-like economics such advisers represent.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, those articles point up the importance of doing something about our continuing deficit spending. They indicate to me that we are in danger of continued aggravation of our balance-of-payments deficit if we do not do something about it.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Columnist Roscoe Drummond, writing in the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette on August 6, calls attention to a situation of very alarming proportions. It involves probably the most respected agency in the U.S. Government—the Federal Bureau of Investigation—and its relationship to one of the most serious issues of today, the civil rights problem. Mr. Drummond expresses concern, which I feel we all should share, over extremists' attacks on the role of the FBI in dealing with civil rights violations. We cannot afford to involve this agency in the middle of this controversy. And Mr. Drummond rightfully points out that it is imperative that all of us must understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of its jurisdiction. He underscores that the FBI is not—repeat "not"—an enforcement agency but strictly an investigative agency. I believe this article should be read by everyone who has any desire to correctly assess past and coming events.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "FBI Rights Role Limited," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Aug. 6, 1963]

CRITICS DEMAND MORE ACTION: FBI RIGHTS ROLE LIMITED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Unless the role and record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in dealing with civil rights violations are widely understood, it is going to be unfairly caught in the middle of a hurtful controversy.

Already extremists on both sides are inaccurately accusing the FBI either of willfully encroaching upon the sovereignty of State

and local agencies or of willfully neglecting to do its duty under civil rights legislation. This kind of ill-considered, uninformed criticism of the FBI will not do anybody any good. It can only do harm.

It has already brought a strong rebuke from Director J. Edgar Hoover who, in the course of an article in the August issue of the Yale Political magazine, has written:

"There are highly vocal pressure groups who feel that the FBI should be obligated to step in wherever, in their opinion, a breakdown in law enforcement has occurred. When we have declined to exceed our jurisdiction in response to these demands, extremists among these elements have gone so far as to accuse the FBI of racism.

LIMITED SCOPE

"Persons such as these are no less bigoted in their thinking than those who parade around in white sheets demanding that the FBI 'stop prying into State and local affairs' and counseling witnesses to civil rights violations, 'don't tell FBI agents anything.'"

These words deserve to be pondered—and heeded.

The first necessity is to understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of its jurisdiction.

Its responsibilities are defined in the acts of Congress including the civil rights laws of 1957 and 1960. It has been given authority to investigate these eight categories of rights violations:

1. Involuntary servitude and slavery.
2. Any infringement on the right to vote for a candidate for Federal office.
3. Conspiracies to deprive any citizen of the free exercise of any right secured to him by the Constitution or Federal law.
4. The deprivation by persons acting under the color of law of any such rights.
5. Willful obstruction of any Federal court order—such as an order requiring a public school to desegregate.
6. Interstate flight to avoid prosecution for firing or bombing private, religious, or educational institutions, or to avoid testimony.

PROPERTY DAMAGE

7. Interstate transportation of any explosive with knowledge that it will be used for the foregoing purpose.
8. Use of any instrument of communication or commerce to threaten to damage private or public buildings.

These assigned duties give the FBI a wide responsibility in the area of civil rights which it has and will carry out without apology to anybody. But it needs to be understood that the FBI is not a national police force; it is a Federal police force concerned only with Federal law.

It is not an enforcement agency; it is strictly an investigative agency. It cannot and should not exceed its jurisdiction.

When no violation of Federal law has taken place, it cannot step in merely because there has been a breakdown of State or local law enforcement.

Civil rights cases are handled by special agents of the FBI who have completed advanced training courses which specifically qualify them to conduct such investigations.

In recent years the FBI has taken the initiative to provide civil rights training to law-enforcement agencies in all parts of the country; a total of 553 special civil rights schools were conducted for police officials.

From my observation, the FBI deserves the confidence of every responsible civil rights advocate.

BEEF AND VEAL IMPORTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today one of the greatest concerns to agriculture is the greatly increased importa-

tion of beef and veal which has more than doubled in the last 2 years.

The Livestock Feeder magazine has exercised real leadership in calling attention to this problem, and in trying to obtain action by the administration to alleviate it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter, dated April 3, 1963, to the Honorable Christian A. Herter; a reprint of an editorial in the April 1963, issue of the Livestock Feeder magazine; a letter to Mr. Irwin Hedges, agricultural trade specialist, Executive Office of the President, dated July 23, 1963; a news bulletin released August 8, 1963, by the National Livestock Feeders Association; a copy of a letter dated August 14, 1963, to the Honorable Christian A. Herter from the National Livestock Feeders Association; and a letter of August 19, 1963, addressed to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, by the National Livestock Feeders Association.

There being no objection, the letters and other documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, Omaha, Nebr., April 3, 1963.

To the Honorable Christian A. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations.

Re imports of meat and meat products and U.S. policy in foreign trade negotiations.

GENERAL TRADE NEGOTIATION POLICY

The National Livestock Feeders Association is gravely concerned with the general policy which has guided U.S. trade negotiations, and particularly, with the apparent employment of trade agreements as an international relations tool. This apparent use, in our opinion, has led to an utter disregard for the health and well-being of domestic industries and has divorced such agreements from a sound basis in economics. Governmental officials who participate in trade negotiations do, in effect, represent American business.

At the same time, the attitude of this association with respect to foreign trade is not one of isolationism. It is recognized that a volume of imports at some level between the extremes of complete prohibition and almost unrestricted entry (current situation on most meat) can be absorbed without measurable injury to the basic U.S. industry.

The creation of the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 resulted from a realization on the part of Congress of the necessity to separate the diplomatic functions of the State Department from foreign trade negotiations and agreements. This action was in harmony with the policy of the National Livestock Feeders Association and was encouraging to the association.

At the last annual business meeting, held on February 8, 1963, association officials were instructed by the membership to reemphasize efforts to stress the following in trade negotiations:

- (1) Equalization of tariff structures between the United States and other countries;
- (2) Encouragement of U.S. exports;
- (3) Stimulation of economic growth and improvement of the business climate in the United States;
- (4) Trade agreements which are truly reciprocal;

(5) Agreements based on economics, rather than using negotiations as a foreign relations tool; and

(6) Rule out negotiating on the basis of percentage increases or decreases in rates in cases where there is wide variation in existing rates.

CURRENT SITUATION WITH RESPECT TO LIVE-STOCK AND MEAT

Prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products by a significant amount. However, in the past 5 years the relationship has changed and the value of exports has been considerably lower than the value of imports. According to figures obtained from reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service, the dollar volume of exports of livestock and meat products by the United States in 1962 amounted to approximately \$320 million; whereas our imports amounted to \$670 million, plus around \$209 million of wool, making total imports of approximately \$879 million. In other words, in 1962 the United States imported 2½ times the dollar volume of her exports. This reversal in export-import balance has come about in the very short period of 5 years.

The swing from a net exporter to a net importer has come about primarily from the very significant increase in the importation of manufacturing (boneless) beef, veal and mutton. It was in 1948 that the import duties on these products were reduced 50 percent: Beef and veal (fresh, chilled or frozen), 6 cents per pound, to 3 cents per pound.

Mutton (fresh, chilled or frozen), 5 cents per pound, to 2½ cents per pound.

The figures in tables A and B show the very rapid buildup in the imports of boneless beef, veal and mutton and of the fresh or frozen products as a whole.

TABLE A¹.—Imports of boneless beef and veal (product weight basis)

[In millions of pounds]	
	Average
1951-55	18.2
1958	255.9
1959	469.2
1960	383.9
1961	527.5
1962	741.5

1961 as a percentage of 1951-55, 2,898 percent.

1962 as a percentage of 1951-55, 4,074 percent.

¹ Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

Imports of fresh or frozen beef and veal¹ (product weight basis)

[In millions of pounds]	
	Average
1951-55	59.9
1958	358.2
1959	524.5
1960	413.8
1961	569.2
1962	863.3

1961 as a percentage of 1951-55, 950 percent.

1962 as a percentage of 1951-55, 1,441 percent.

¹ Includes boneless beef and veal.

Percent in 1962 from:	
	Percent
Australia	51.5
New Zealand	24.7
Ireland	8.2
Mexico	6.5
Canada	2.2
Other countries	6.9
Total	100.0

TABLE B¹.—Imports of mutton, fresh or frozen² (product weight basis)

[In millions of pounds]	
	Average
1951-55	0.7
1958	17.2
1959	47.3
1960	37.3
1961	44.9
1962	65.0

1961 as a percent of 1951-55, 6,414 percent.
1962 as a percent of 1951-55, 9,286 percent.

Percent in 1962 from:	
	Percent
Australia	97.9
New Zealand	1.3
Other countries	.8
Total	100.0

¹ Source: U.S. FAS reports.

² Practically all of the mutton imported from 1958 on was in form of boneless product according to FAS reports.

The story of substantial increases in imports during 1962 is told in the following quotation from the February 18, 1963, issue of Foreign Agriculture (weekly magazine of the Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA):

"Imports of almost all major categories of livestock and meat products rose sharply during 1962.

"One of the most notable increases was in the imports of beef and veal, which rose 41 percent above the previous year to 971 million pounds and set a new record. Most of this meat was boneless beef from Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. Imports of mutton, mostly boneless, at 65 million pounds were nearly double the 1961 total."

It is often contended that imports of boneless product do not exert pressure on "block" (sold fresh) beef and veal, since this type of meat is used in the manufacture of processed products only. The fallacy of this argument is evident when two important facts are considered:

(1) Processed products constitute very real competition in the sale of fresh beef and veal. The availability of large quantities of imported manufacturing (boneless) beef and veal has resulted in a continuously larger proportion of processed products being offered consumers, in comparison to the volume of fresh cuts which come principally from carcasses grading USDA Good and Choice.

(2) Boning beef comes principally from old bulls and cows and from low grade steers and heifers. Without the very large volume of imports, there would be a substantial downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher grades for use as boneless beef. This provides price and supply movement stimuli to the fresh beef market.

The substantial increases in imports of all beef and veal from the countries of Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland are of particular significance, as seen in table C.

TABLE C.—Imports of all beef and veal, product weight basis

[In millions of pounds]		Australia	New Zealand	Ireland
Average, 1951-55		1.4	13.0	7.2
1958		16.9	182.0	23.7
1959		223.9	160.9	43.0
1960		144.7	130.7	43.6
1961		232.2	154.3	61.1
1962		444.7	213.6	70.7
1962 as a percent of 1951-55		31,764.0	1,643.0	982.0

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In the March 11, 1963, issue of Foreign Agriculture, the Foreign Agricultural Service stated: "Australian meat exports in 1962 set a new record with 831 million pounds. * * * approximately 60 percent of the exports were shipped to the United States.

"The United States received 70 percent of Australia's record shipments of beef, 48 percent of the mutton, 10.5 percent of the lamb."

The National Livestock Feeders Association submits that there is overwhelming justification in demanding action to curtail the phenomenal buildup in meat imports into the United States. Sharply lower price levels in the slaughter cattle market strongly indicate that imports have reached a volume which is definitely injurious to the domestic producer. Under the prevailing prices, many producers are losing from \$35 to \$50 per animal sold.

Imports of beef and veal are now approaching the 10-percent level of domestic production. In our opinion, a 5-percent level can be injurious to domestic producers; surely, a 10-percent level is depressing to the degree of being detrimental to the stability of the U.S. market. We have conferred with officials of the Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, on this subject.

The relationship between U.S. production and U.S. imports over the past 10 years is shown in tables D and E.

TABLE D.—U.S. production and imports of all beef and veal, carcass weight basis, last 10 years

Year	U.S. production (million pounds)	U.S. imports, carcass weight equivalent (million pounds)	U.S. imports as a percent of U.S. production
1953	13,953	271	1.9
1954	14,610	232	1.5
1955	15,147	229	1.5
1956	16,094	211	1.3
1957	15,728	395	2.5
1958	14,516	909	6.3
1959	14,588	1,063	7.2
1960	15,835	775	4.9
1961	16,341	1,037	6.3
1962	16,297	1,454	8.9

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

TABLE E.—U.S. production and imports of mutton, last 10 years

Year	U.S. production (million pounds)	U.S. imports¹ (million pounds)	U.S. imports as a percent of U.S. production
1953	73	1.3	1.8
1954	74	.3	.4
1955	76	.9	1.2
1956	74	.6	.8
1957	71	1.7	2.4
1958	69	17.2	24.9
1959	74	47.3	63.9
1960	77	37.3	48.4
1961	84	44.9	53.4
1962	81	65.0	80.2

¹ Excludes canned product.

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In addition to the substantial volume of meat imports, the timing of the buildup likewise is detrimental to domestic producers. As indicated in tables D and E, imports are generally on the upswing at the same time domestic production is being increased. A satisfactory price level in the United States for livestock provides stimulus for both the importer and the domestic producer to start the buildup of the supply

cycle and supplies from both sources tend to peak together, bringing injurious pressure on U.S. market prices.

IDEAL ANSWER TO IMPORT PROBLEM

In view of the coincidental increase of U.S. production and imports into this country, a system of flexible duties and import quotas tied inversely to domestic production would constitute an ideal method of handling meat imports. Such a system would provide for a measure of protection for U.S. growers and feeders and yet allow for trade with other countries.

ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE AVENUES OF PROCEDURE FOR IMPORT RELIEF

The National Livestock Feeders Association has studied and appraised the various avenues of procedure through which attempts may be made to bring relief from the injurious pressures of imports of beef, veal, and mutton.

Petition to the Tariff Commission: Petitioning the Tariff Commission for an investigation is both time consuming and expensive. Our observation has been that the rules of procedure followed by the Commission, particularly those pertaining to hearings which are an important part of any investigation, do not allow a just opportunity for domestic businessmen, associations, or individuals to present their case in a climate to which American citizens and taxpayers are entitled. Foreign nations who are exporting to the United States, as well as the importers, are permitted to appear before the Tariff Commission and even to cross-examine witnesses in what then amounts to an international court case with the injured domestic industry having to defend its position against the forces of the foreign nation or nations involved, the importers, and perhaps the U.S. Government.

Furthermore, the requirement to prove injury under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is an insurmountable obstacle to Agriculture. It is impossible to obtain thousands of financial statements from individual producers in support of the injury claim and, also, it is an impossible task with general farm units to separate out the particular enterprise involved, in the production of the specific product(s) or commodity(s) in question.

Appeal to the Office of Emergency Planning: Filing an appeal to the Office of Emergency Planning under the National Security amendment would present the same sort of obstacle in proving injury as would the Tariff Commission petition.

Special legislation: Legislation has already been introduced in this session of the Congress covering the importation of cattle, beef and veal, and sheep, lambs, mutton, and lamb. However, this association hesitates to encourage legislation in those areas until all administrative avenues have been thoroughly explored. Commodity legislation should be used, perhaps, as a last resort only, since it would tend to erode an existing law.

Since trade negotiations and tariff adjustments are ultimately the responsibility of the President, except under special commodity legislation, and since other avenues would in our instance present serious obstacles, the National Livestock Feeders Association has elected to submit its case directly to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. Effort on the part of the President to develop agreements with countries concerned to establish voluntary quotas themselves is a sound method of procedure, in the opinion of association officials. In the case of Australia, for example, we know the people there who are engaged in

the livestock and meat industry, and in fact, the Australian Government itself, are very sensitive to the attitude of American growers and feeders with respect to the imports of Australian meat and livestock products. We think it would be highly possible for the President to be successful in prevailing upon both Australia and New Zealand to set voluntary quotas for themselves on imports of livestock, meat and meat products into the United States.

The officers and directors of the National Livestock Feeders Association hereby respectfully request that inquiries be made into this and any other negotiation avenue which is deemed to be effective in helping to solve the problem of sharply mounting imports of meats and the impact of this development on domestic livestock producers and feeders.

In the interest of providing a ready reference on trade barriers confronting the United States in exporting livestock and meat products, a brief summary of those by country follows.

FOREIGN TRADE BARRIERS

The following is a brief summary of the trade barriers which the United States faces in the exportation of livestock, meat, and meat products to other countries. (Source: FAS publication, "Prospects for Foreign Trade in Livestock and Meat," January 1963.)

Argentina: Prohibits imports of sheep and cattle from the United States.

Australia: Prohibits imports of sheep and cattle from the United States; also prohibits imports of U.S. hog and pork products.

Austria: The United States is excluded from most tenders issued by Austria for meat and meat products.

Barbados: Prohibits imports of pork from the United States.

Belgium: Prohibits imports of unsterilized pork products from the United States, and controls imports of a large number of meat items under import licensing procedures.

Brazil: The premiums which have to be paid plus tariff duties make the cost of U.S. products prohibitive.

British Guiana: Restricts entry of fresh pork products and import of tallow and lard; bacon and ham restricted by import permits.

Canada: On June 25, 1962, Canada levied special import taxes on most livestock and meat products; these were abolished on November 15.

Chile: High import taxes discourage entry of U.S. products.

Colombia: Bars entry of most livestock and meat products, and those not restricted are subject to high duties and to license requirements.

Denmark: Prohibits entry of pork and pork products from the United States.

Egypt: Obtains large share of imports of meat products through bilateral trade agreements.

Finland: Controls the entry of most meat products by variable import fees.

France: Restricts the import of most meats from the United States, primarily to maintain livestock prices to French farmers.

West Germany: Limited entry of variety meats and fatback from the United States; lard, inedible tallow and greases and cattle hides not restricted.

Guatemala: High import tariffs restrict entry of meat; for example, hams are subject to 45.5 cents per pound plus 30 percent of the import value.

Haiti: Restricts meat imports by use of a luxury foodstuffs tax.

Honduras: High import duties limit volume of U.S. meat products; for example, cured pork at 45 cents per pound.

India: Prohibits import of most livestock products.

Ireland: Generally restricts entry of all livestock and meat products by requiring import licenses; lard subject to an import tax of \$11.76 per hundredweight.

Italy: Close control on imports of meats through a licensing system; quotas established for various types of meats, with amounts allowed to come in being determined in part by the level of domestic livestock and meat prices.

Jamaica: Requires specific licenses.

Luxembourg: Restricts entry of several livestock and meat products important to the United States.

Mexico: Entry of U.S. livestock and meat products restricted by several trade barriers (import permits, high duties).

New Zealand: Prohibits imports of most meats and other packinghouse products.

Norway: Prohibits import of most meat products.

Panama: Imports of lard limited by quotas; duty on U.S. lard is 100 percent ad valorem.

Peru: Has increased its import duty on lard and tallow.

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Requires import licenses, and imports are confined to such products as tallow, sausage casings, mutton and some canned meat.

Spain: All meat imports are purchased by the Government's National Supply Commission, which controls the amounts received and their origin.

Sweden: Regulates imports of meat and meat products by licenses and import tariffs; tariffs are flexible and are raised to reduce imports when domestic prices are low.

United Kingdom: Technically approves entry of pork originating in 44 States; most U.S. canned meats are banned by dollar restrictions; no restrictions on imports of frozen carcasses and variety meats.

Venezuela: In December 1962, this country suspended imports of pork to permit hog prices to rise.

Yugoslavia: Has a flexible control system which adjusts imports and exports according to domestic situation and price conditions.

European Economic Community

Several significant developments regarding EEC meat policy occurred during 1962.

Beef and beef variety meats: Entry will require import certificates which can effectively limit trade. Frozen beef variety meats have been bound in GATT at 20 percent. Presently, rates are below this figure in most countries and the gradual increase in duties will be a limiting factor.

Pork and pork variety meats: Subject to a complex levy and gate price system. Frozen pork variety meats have been bound in GATT at 20 percent. Present tariffs from most countries are below this figure and gradual increase in duties will be a limiting factor.

Lard: Subject to complex import levy and gate price system. The extent of these levies is not known; however, any increases will undoubtedly limit U.S. exports.

Tallow and greases: Tariff for this commodity has been bound at 2 percent ad valorem. EEC beef policy requires import certificates for tallow. Inedible hog grease has been bound in GATT at 3 percent.

Hides and skins: Duty has been bound at zero and no restrictive features are expected.

Sausage casings: Not expected to be materially affected by current EEC policy.

Mohair: EEC countries do not levy import duties on raw mohair.

Respectfully submitted for the officers and directors of the National Livestock Feeders Association.

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

THE WHOLE STORY ON IMPORTS

(Reprint of an editorial as it appeared (revised) in the April 1963 issue of the *Livestock Feeder* magazine, the official publication of the National Livestock Feeders Association)

More than a slight disservice was rendered the cattle feeding and growing industries early this month when the Department of Agriculture released its special report on the cattle situation, and stated, "While the volume of imports (of beef) does have an influence on the grades and classes of cattle slaughtered primarily for processing beef, it is not an important factor affecting the price of our high-quality beef and hence the prices of fed cattle." The release accompanying the report said, "Imports of beef have sometimes been cited as a cause of the price break for fed steers and heifers. The report finds no evidence that this is true."

These statements are misleading and obviously are the result of incomplete analysis of the situation. It would appear that the Department is attempting to cover up for deficiencies on the part of the Federal Government in foreign trade negotiations. Others have committed similar errors of conclusion.

Before refuting these statements and conclusions, let's review the figures and trends on imports of beef and veal, the relationship to domestic production and other pertinent information. We are not talking about imports of pork in this case at all because the volume is of less significance. We are, though, talking about boneless beef and veal, fresh, chilled or frozen, of manufacturing and processing quality.

From 1953 and including 1957, imports of all beef and veal, carcass weight equivalent, ranged from 211 to 395 million pounds per year, or from 1.3 to 2.5 percent of our domestic production of these same items. All of this data is taken from the U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In 1958, imports of beef and veal jumped to 909 million pounds equivalent to 6.3 percent of domestic production. In the years following, the volume and percentage went like this: 1959—1,063 million pounds, 7.2 percent of domestic production; 1960—775 million pounds, 4.9 percent of domestic production; and 1961—1,037 million pounds, 6.3 percent of domestic production.

Imports in 1962 set an alltime record of 1,454 million pounds of beef and veal, amounting to 8.9 percent of a domestic production figure of 16,297 million pounds, only slightly below the record production in 1961.

At the same time, it is noteworthy to examine the trend of imports on beef and veal from the three major countries exporting to the United States. The figures are set out in the table below:

Imports of beef and veal from 3 countries, product weight basis

(In millions of pounds)

	Australia	New Zealand	Ireland
Average, 1951-55.....	1.4	13.0	7.2
1958.....	16.9	152.0	23.7
1959.....	223.9	100.9	42.0
1960.....	144.7	130.7	43.6
1961.....	232.2	154.3	61.1
1962.....	444.7	213.6	70.7
1962 as a percent of 1951-55.....	31,764.0	1,643.0	982.0

Some have said, yes, but we also export considerable in volume of livestock and meat products. The truth of the matter is that prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products. In the past 5 years, however, the relationship

has changed and the value of U.S. exports has been considerably below the value of imports. In 1962 the dollar value of U.S. exports of all livestock and meat products came to about \$320 million, whereas our imports amounted to approximately \$670 million, plus about \$209 million of wool, making the total import value of approximately \$879 million.

With the facts and figures before us, let's move to the argument that since imports of beef and veal are largely manufacturing products, they have little or no effect on the price level of the better quality fresh beef produced in the United States and the prices of fed cattle.

This large volume of imported beef and veal does supplement domestic production of lower grade processing beef—cows, bulls, steers and heifers—creating a much larger quantity of such items as luncheon meats, sandwich meats, wieners, sausages, and hamburgers, and also making it possible to offer these products through retail outlets at lower prices.

Disregarded by the Department of Agriculture is the fact that the source of manufacturing beef from domestic production is not confined solely to nonfed animals. Also, with a more moderate volume of imports, there would be more downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from domestic carcasses of other grades. Processors are not going to use these domestic cuts, however, if they can obtain imported beef at more attractive figures.

Hence, it must be recognized that this supplementation of domestic manufacturing beef goes beyond the area of cow beef and to some degree, at least, is supplementing our domestic production of the higher grades.

Then there is the matter of competition. It has been argued that the products from manufacturing beef do not exert any pressure on the price level of fresh beef offered to consumers. At the same time, though, those making such a statement readily admit that other meat products—pork, broilers, etc.—are competitive with fresh beef. It is absolutely fallacious to contend that products manufactured from beef, usually offered in the same counter and in close proximity, are not competitive with the better quality of beef produced domestically.

The contention that a lower volume of manufactured products is apt to drive consumers away from the meat counter and cause them to use substitute products is absolutely without foundation. Yet these are some of the arguments that are being inaccurately used to justify a continued high level of imports.

Domestic production of beef and veal, in terms of consumption, came to about 90 pounds per capita in 1962. With imports of beef and veal at 8.9 percent of domestic production, it means that 8 pounds of additional product per person are offered in our domestic market from foreign sources. It is a foregone conclusion that if we were to suddenly increase domestic production to the extent of 8 pounds per capita, we would have serious repercussions in our market, almost regardless of the type of beef involved in the increase. We fail to see what special set of circumstances makes our domestic market immune from the same impact of 3 pounds of foreign beef per person.

There are some other factors in this import controversy that have not been brought out. First of all, there are reliable reports of a larger volume of better quality beef cuts, suitable for sale as fresh beef, coming into the United States from Australia and New Zealand. Beyond this, we understand advance commitments on imports of boneless beef have been made at least through midyear.

Then, there is the change in the attitude of the foreign exporters of this beef to the United States. Previously, they were not interested in overloading the U.S. market and indicated, at least, some measure of restraint in order to protect the privilege being enjoyed.

That attitude has changed and it now appears as though exporters are intent on getting as big a slice of the American market as they can obtain with less and less regard for the position of the U.S. producer and taxpayer. It may very well be that the past policy of the United States in international trade negotiations has encouraged these countries to the point where they no longer have any fear of either quotas or higher tariffs on imports of the United States.

This is the story on the import situation. No one wants to cut them off entirely. Trade with foreign countries is a recognized necessity. However, the supply of beef on the domestic market, including beef from foreign sources, is still the important price-determining factor. The industry is entitled to a better deal than it is getting now.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., July 23, 1963.

MR. IRWIN HEDGES,
Agricultural Trade Specialist, Executive
Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEDGES: Thank you very much for your letter reporting the results of the GATT meat conference in Geneva. Naturally, we are disappointed that no proposal was made by any other country which would lend encouragement for improving the position of the United States. On the other hand, the results which you reported in your letter are about what we had expected would be forthcoming. After all, why should the other countries of the world want to change the status quo as far as meat and meat products are concerned? They now enjoy almost unrestricted entry into the United States, while at the same time maintaining effective trade barriers against the importation of U.S. meat and meat products into their countries.

As to the emphasis by the U.S. delegation of the untenable position in which the United States would be placed if other major meat importers adopted more restrictive practices, we submit that it is not a case of adopting more restrictive practices; very effective restrictions are now in force.

The EEC countries in past years have provided an important market for U.S. meat and meat products. We are concerned with trying to maintain a practical degree of non-restrictive entry into these countries; however, we are also concerned with the very rapid buildup of U.S. imports from countries such as Australia and New Zealand. The Geneva meeting provides further evidence of the validity of our statement to Mr. Herter; namely, that it is necessary for the United States to take the initiative in proposing agreements with those countries who are now exporting large volumes of meat and meat products to this country. The countries with which we are the most concerned when it comes to imports are not members of the EEC, and thus, we see no reason to wait until the EEC decides to move before initiating negotiations with these countries. Accessibility to this market should surely be sufficient trading stock on our part.

We fail to understand why the United States should continue to sit back and wait for some other country or countries to make the first move, rather than taking the initiative in the area of international trade on meat and meat products. It does not seem reasonable to us to expect the domestic industry to wait indefinitely, or even until

early 1964, for some constructive move to be made toward solving the import problem. Five years have already elapsed since the beginning of the very rapid buildup in import volume of meat and meat products.

In our original conversation with Mr. Herter, we suggested to him that his office proceed to negotiate with the importing countries to seek an agreement for voluntary import quotas. Both Australia and New Zealand are very sensitive to the attitude of U.S. growers and feeders and our contacts would lead us to believe that such agreements are possible.

Instead of allowing the European Economic Community to continue to set the timetable and develop the pattern for negotiations, the National Livestock Feeders Association firmly suggests that the time has come to implement section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in view of the action of the Community on the importation of agricultural commodities.

Yours sincerely,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION
NEWS BULLETIN

OMAHA, NEBR., August 5.—"Imports of foreign meat into the United States continue to mount at a rapid clip," Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary-treasurer of the National Livestock Feeders Association, said in a statement made today from the national office of the association.

"Imports of meat in the first 5 months of 1963 are significantly above the tonnage for the same period of 1962, the year in which an all-time record was set," Magdanz added. "The rising imports of beef and veal presents one of the most prominent threats to the livestock industry," Magdanz continued.

"The increase in imports of beef and veal for the January-May period this year amounted to over 32 million pounds or a 12-percent increase over 1962. Fresh and frozen beef and veal, the products which saw a phenomenal increase in 1962, accounted for 55 percent of the import tonnage for the first 5 months and made up almost 70 percent of the increase over a year ago.

"Australia is the leading exporter to this country of fresh beef and veal. During the 5-month period this country exported over 142 million pounds to the United States, which constituted 45 percent of the fresh beef and veal imports. Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and Ireland accounted for 92 percent of the imports in the form of fresh beef and veal during the 5 months. Notable was the substantial increase in tonnage received from Mexico, over 31 million pounds, this country replacing Ireland as the third largest exporter of this type of meat product to the United States.

"Of significance also," continued Magdanz, "was the very large increase in imports of cured, canned, and cooked beef for the first 5-month period. The percentage increase over 1962 was a whopping 26 percent. Argentina led all other countries in this category, accounting for 70 percent of this type of beef offered for importation into the United States."

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., August 14, 1963.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations,
Executive Office of the President,
the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: We were particularly pleased to read your recent announcement in the press that the United States will take retaliatory measures against imports from

countries in the European Economic Community for increased duties placed on American poultry by members of the Common Market. While this move to withdraw tariff concessions the United States has made on exports from countries in the Community may not directly affect the livestock feeding industry, nevertheless we look upon the development with considerable gratification because we feel it is a step in the direction that should be taken in foreign trade negotiations.

You will recall that this declaration of policy by your office follows very closely the recommendations contained in our discussion last March, as well as the recommendations made in our subsequent memorandum and in the resolutions adopted by this association. It is a step that may easily be extended now in defense of other domestic agricultural industries, and we hope it serves as a precedent for negotiations with those countries outside the European Economic Community who are responsible for the excessive U.S. imports of certain meat and meat products.

Under the circumstances now, we feel it is an even greater probability that countries such as Australia and New Zealand would be willing to give serious consideration to the acceptance of some flexible schedule of voluntary quotas on the meat products they are sending to the United States. The people in these countries are fully apprised of the impact their products are having on our domestic market and the strong attitudes against the volume of imports on the part of domestic producers and feeders.

The importation of meat and meat products for the first 5 months of 1963 is cause for even greater alarm. The fact that we have sustained an increase in imports of beef and veal for the January to May period this year amounting to over 42 million pounds, or 14 percent as compared to the same period in 1962, represents an increasing threat to the health of the domestic livestock industry. We are also aware of the fact that the increase in imports of all meat and meat products amounted to over 47 million pounds, or 11 percent of last year's volume during the same period. At the same time, imports of fresh and frozen beef and veal were over 295 million pounds in the first 5 months of 1963, an increase of 12 percent over the 263 million pounds received in the same 5-month period of 1962.

We are grossly disturbed over the unrealistic conclusions which have recently been released by the Department of Agriculture claiming that imports of manufacturing beef and veal have very little if any impact on the domestic market for the fresh product. To support this conclusion they point to the fact that beef imports last year rose 59 percent from June to August, during which time choice steer prices rose from \$24.25 per hundredweight in June to \$28.19 per hundredweight in August. The Department also added that when fed cattle prices started to drop last December and January, imports had dropped to 62 percent of the August import rate. Knowing something about proper statistical analysis, we submit that conclusions supported by arguments of this kind amount to a gross violation of responsible research procedure, and in fact, border on propaganda. The conclusions of the Department would be accurate only under conditions where all other factors affecting price were held constant. It is a matter of common knowledge that such was not the case during the period referred to by the Department. Furthermore, the drop in imports in December and January came about in part, at least, as a result of the dock strike, and the record shows they rose phenomenally again in February.

We are complimentary to you for the announcement which has been made and we hope this initial move on the part of the United States will lead quickly to further activities in the areas where livestock producers and feeders are most concerned. If we can be helpful to you further we will be happy to respond.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., August 6, 1963.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: This association was grossly disturbed again when the Department of Agriculture released a statement on August 5 which obviously attempts to excuse and minimize the effect of large-volume imports of beef on our domestic market. The statement is the second of its kind this year and we would like you to know that in our opinion a great disservice is being rendered the American people by information of this sort from their own Government.

The particular statements contained in the release to which we refer are the following: "The bulk of imported beef is for processing and does not have an important impact on the fed cattle market." After maintaining that imports exert their prime influence on prices of cull cows and bulls and the volume of imports has mainly filled the gap resulting from decreased domestic cow slaughter, the release continues: "Beef imports last year rose 59 percent from June to August. In spite of this, choice steer prices rose from \$25.25 in June to \$28.19 in August. When feeder cattle prices started to drop last December and January imports had dropped to 62 percent of the August import rate. Thus, the sharp rise in imports had no significant impact on fed cattle prices."

Knowing something about proper research methods and analytical procedure, we submit to you that conclusions of this kind have no basis in fact. To conclude that imports had no significant impact on fed cattle prices because steer prices rose while the rate of imports was increasing is a discredit to the scientific integrity of the Department. Such a comparison can be made only when all other factors affecting price remain constant, and the people in your Department are fully aware of the fact that during the period in question domestic pricing factors were far from constant.

While it should not be necessary, we do feel the need of explaining how these large volumes of imports of manufacturing beef and veal do affect our entire market structure. This large volume of imported beef and veal does supplement domestic production of processing beef, thereby creating a much larger quantity of such items as luncheon meats, sandwich meats, wieners, sausages, and hamburger to compete with fresh products. Furthermore, under conditions of low volume of domestic manufacturing beef there would be downward substitution of some cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher quality thereby providing stimulus to the fed market.

It is absolutely fallacious to contend that products manufactured from beef, and offered in the same counter as cuts of fresh beef, are not competitive with the better quality fresh beef produced domestically. It would be just as erroneous to argue there is no competition between beef and pork, or between other food items, because they happen to be of somewhat different character.

Another point that your Department has failed to consider is the fact there is always some time lag between the date frozen beef products reach this country and the time these same products appear in manufactured form in our retail meat counters. The number of days or weeks involved in the manufacturing process varies considerably, of course, but we do not have a situation similar to that in movement of fresh beef where the items must be sold within a short period of time to avoid deterioration or even spoilage.

We are fully aware the Department of Agriculture has no jurisdiction or authority to reduce the imports of manufacturing beef and veal. We do believe it has the responsibility, however, to accurately analyze the situation according to accepted research procedure, and we submit to you that this responsibility has not been assumed in the case of imports of beef and veal. We hope you will find it possible to reconsider the statements that have been made by your Department and so inform the livestock industry as well as the American public.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the passing of Eric Johnston, the State of Washington and the country has lost one of its most outstanding public-spirited citizens. He stood in the great tradition of the businessmen like Bernard Baruch who have contributed so much to our country and the world in national and international affairs. As an adviser to Presidents, he made invaluable contributions in the tumultuous years since the beginning of World War II. In recent years he has done much to bring the North Atlantic Community close together through his work as a member of President Kennedy's Citizens Commission for NATO.

I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Johnston for over 20 years. In that association, I came to have nothing but admiration and respect for his intelligence, vigor, and dedication to the public good. To his family, his wife Ina and his two daughters, I want to extend my most sincere condolences.

COEXISTENCE: COANNIHILATION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Communist leaders of Red China are violently denouncing the limited test ban treaty now before the Senate for ratification. Likewise, members of the radical rightwing fringe—the John Birch Society and others—are denouncing it. Daily I receive many letters on the subject. Some I recognize as coming from the same authors of letters which were written to me some months ago having as their subject, "Impeach Earl Warren," and denouncing that great and loyal American. Others come from the same radical rightwing fringe, members of the John Birch Society and sympathizers in Ohio who have written to me continuously on the theme of "Take the United Nations out of the United States and the United States out

of the United Nations." Now they are on the same side as Red China in demanding that the limited test ban treaty be rejected.

Some extreme rightwingers and ex-generals and admirals are against coexistence. So also are the Chinese Communists. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has very aptly stated, coexistence is defined as existing together.

Do the generals and ex-generals who oppose the limited test ban treaty, claiming that there cannot be coexistence with the Soviet Union, believe that the Russians will merely cease to exist?

The alternative to coexistence is co-annihilation. Together we have the power to destroy millions of human beings. It has been estimated that if the Soviet Union were to launch a sneak attack against us and if we were to retaliate, in a matter of hours perhaps as many as 300 million Europeans, Russians, and Americans would be killed. In 10 years, if China, with a population of 700 million, becomes a nuclear power, then what?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I have unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Obviously, we should take this short step toward peace by ratifying the limited nuclear test ban treaty. This treaty is an objective which two administrations, representing both political parties, have patiently sought in spite of repeated discouragements, and notwithstanding opposition and criticism at home. It will not usher in the millennium. It will not end the cold war. It will not totally disarm the Soviet Union. It will not end the threat of Communist aggression. It will not bring about at once total and complete disarmament. But it will be a step toward ending one area of armament competition. It may pave the way for progress in other areas. For 17 years mankind has lived in the shadow of fear. This treaty might—just might—replace terror with confidence and despair with hope.

Mr. President, the makers of our Constitution wisely provided that civil authority must always be supreme over military authority in this country. Walter Lippmann, one of the great journalists of our time, in a fine article published in the Washington Post, entitled "Experts and the Treaty," expressed his opinion that in reading what some of the military leaders have to say about the test ban treaty we must not forget that the fundamental issue is not one on which a military man as such has any special competence. He points out that the genuine experts in this field are scientists who have worked in nuclear physics and related fields.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

EXPERTS AND THE TREATY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In reading what the military chieftains have to say about the test ban treaty, we must not forget that the fundamental issue is not military. It is not one on which a military man as such has any special competence. The fundamental issue is one of scientific method, whether continued testing in the atmosphere will produce significant, perhaps decisive, military advantages either for the Soviet Union or the United States.

The opinions of General Power and General LeMay on the probable results of future tests in the atmosphere are not one bit more expert than the opinion of Secretary McNamara. They are all laymen in this field, and their opinions are at best like the opinion of a judge when he has listened to the testimony and the arguments of both sides. The genuine experts in this field are scientific men who have worked experimentally in nuclear physics and in the related fields of chemistry and biology.

The crucial controversy is over the probable value of more atmospheric testing. On the one hand, there are those who, like Dr. Teller, believe that if unlimited atmospheric testing is allowed, the United States will forge way ahead of the Soviet Union and will achieve the absolute weapon, an antimissile defense, which will disarm the nuclear forces of the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, there is an array of eminent scientists who say that the more the two powers test, the more they will make the same discoveries and unlock the same secrets. The belief in a unique breakthrough is a romantic form of self-deception. Dr. Teller's promise that American scientists will be able to do what the Soviet scientists will not be able to do is not a scientific judgment. It is a reckless pseudopatriotic gamble on the inherent superiority of American over Russian scientists.

In the Soviet Union there are, of course, the counterparts of Dr. Teller and the Air Force generals. These Russians would also be willing to bet on the superiority of their scientists, and they too would like to try for the decisive breakthrough to an absolute weapon.

The great value of the treaty is that it takes out of the race of armaments—which will of course, continue—most of the feverish gamble for supremacy which unlimited testing invites. The experiments are to be limited by the treaty to the laboratories and to holes in the ground. This will not preclude the discovery of the secret of the absolute weapon if there is a secret that is possible to discover. But limiting the experiments will remove the hysteria, the violence, and the poison from the competitive search for absolute supremacy.

NEEDED EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, next Monday morning schools in South Dakota and across the Nation will begin opening their doors to another term of classes. As they do, I want to call attention to the fact and to emphasize the emergency which now exists in some 4,000 school districts across this land of

ours with the termination of the temporary provisions Public Laws 815 and 874 the impacted areas legislation, which died nearly 2 months ago on June 30.

As a consequence of the unconscionable delay of which this Congress has been guilty in dealing with these two important pieces of legislation, I suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should provide signs to be placed above the doors of these 4,000 schools next Monday morning, to read, "Our capacity to serve young Americans has been curtailed by political paralysis in Washington."

Mr. President, this legislation has been on the books and in operation since 1950. Never before have the schools been denied this rightful assistance by the Federal Government. Since 1950 a total of \$1,426 million has been appropriated under Public Law 874 and \$1,087 million has been appropriated for construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. I cite these figures to show how extensive these programs have become, how vital they are for our educational system, how closely they have become intertwined with the opportunity for young Americans to get an education, and how important they are with schools now going back into operation with a large portion of this legislation terminated.

Despite this, the unjustifiable and disillusioning inaction is continuing on both sides of the Congress. From all over the country this has created a mighty clamor, as suddenly school officials have been confronted by the ugly fact that they will be compelled to open their doors without the financial resources which Uncle Sam rightfully owes them because of the school population burden which Uncle Sam has imposed upon them by creating impacted areas in their communities.

School administrators, school boards, principals of schools, and taxpayers are saying, "We now need to know what kind of facilities we can finance for this school year which is about to begin." Virtually every State in this Republic is affected, because of the farflung operations of our military, because of the involvement of our large Indian population in our Western States, and because of mighty construction projects which the Federal Government is undertaking in sparsely settled areas of the country.

Federal expenditures for national security and domestic projects are still at record levels because of the unsettled international situation. The cold war is still on, Mr. President. We are still preparing our defenses against a possible catastrophic attack from communism.

Along with many other Senators and Members of the House, I have always considered Federal assistance given by this legislation to be a rightful responsibility of the Federal Government to those communities which experience a significant increase in school enrollments because of Federal activity, or which lose substantial funds because of land purchased by the Government. My own State of South Dakota has received a sizable amount of funds, and these funds

have been vital to the communities as they have helped to maintain high educational standards and quality programs, even with the increased demands upon the school districts. Because South Dakota is a small State, with many sparsely settled areas, the impact of a large Federal installation—whether it be to establish a missile base or to build a tremendous dam across the Missouri River—places upon the local school authorities problems of a magnitude which would simply cause them to throw up their hands and close up shop, except for the aid provided by these funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Failure to provide this necessary Federal assistance would mean not only a loss of education to the children of the families who go there to do the work, but it would mean also a problem to the families who live there indigenously, whose children will also be compelled to lose an educational opportunity because of this great influx of new students brought in by Federal activity, for which the Federal Government today is shirking shamefully its rightful responsibility.

I call upon the White House, and I call upon the leadership of both Houses of the Congress to correct this injustice now, because the schools are opening. We are no longer confronted with a theory; we are confronted with a condition.

Consequently, it is imperative that these programs under the impacted area legislation should be extended now so that the school districts depending on this aid, now beginning their classes, once again will have the opportunity to provide the necessary school services.

After all, one is of school age only once in his life and if we fail these youngsters now there is no way in which we can pass compensatory legislation 3, 4, or 5 years from now to take care of children whose school years have been interrupted and injured because of our failure to act promptly now. We must give these school authorities the assurance of continued assistance in their difficult task. We must give them this assurance at a time when it will be of value to them.

I am a former smalltown school superintendent myself. I can testify from personal experience the extreme necessity of knowing what funds can be counted on for operating our impacted school systems. It is difficult enough to recruit the faculty members required for the opening of the school year starting early in the summer months. Even now this Congress has delayed action on this so long that many schools may end up with the money but no available talent to employ because of the uncertainty which has hovered over their entire oper-

ating budget. To delay further will be to do an injury to the schoolchildren just as surely as though the money were not available.

I am seriously concerned that the Federal aid to education measure which encompasses this legislation is now before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Hearings started in April and were concluded in June, and the measure still pends before the committee, surrounded by mothballs. In the House, the general aid to education bill has been broken down and some of its features have been passed by the House. But H.R. 7156, which would extend the impacted areas legislation and which was reported out of the Labor and Education Committee, has been bogged down in the burial grounds called the Rules Committee since early in July.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate, I appeal to the White House, I appeal to the leadership of both bodies, to take immediate action on the extension of this vital matter. I appeal to other Senators and to our colleagues in the House who come from the affected areas to speak up for these young Americans who otherwise are going to be denied educational opportunity simply because of the failure of the Federal Government to make good on its obligations. I dislike to think that a Congress, which started out so brightly with promises by the White House for Federal aid to education, is going to deny to them the traditional and established types of aid which they have always received under previous administrations since 1950.

A CONSTRUCTIVE THOUGHT IN THE CURRENT RACIAL ISSUE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in view of the coming debate on civil rights legislation, it is pertinent and refreshing that in Alaska the problems that are agitating the 48 older States exist to only a very limited degree. It is my hope that with Alaska's record of racial tolerance and the enactment some years ago by the Territorial legislature of antidiscriminatory legislation, even that very limited degree will disappear. In this connection, the forthright and enlightened position taken by the secretary of one of our Alaska labor unions, in declining to fill out a questionnaire issued by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, is worthy of note and, in my view, his reasons therefor are entitled to commendation.

Apparently his reasoning and action were sufficiently impressive to obtain a front page display in the Washington Post, followed by an Associated Press story from Washington carrying the story to the entire Nation.

Peter Lannen's pithy comments are notable and worthy of widespread consideration; and I ask unanimous consent that the story by Frank C. Porter from the August 20 Washington Post and the Associated Press story as printed in the New York Times of August 21 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1963]
AN ALASKA UNION BARS RACIAL DATA

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Declaring that a man's race is "none of our business," a Carpenters Union local in Alaska says it is unable to fill out a questionnaire listing how many members it has from certain minority groups.

"We were unable to completely fill out the form on an honest basis, as we are not anthropologists," said Pete Lannen, financial secretary of local 1281, of Anchorage.

"We do not know when a member becomes or ceases to be a Negro, an Indian, an oriental, a member of a minority group or any of the other designations in the form," Mr. Lannen said.

For example, he said, the treasurer of the local, to the best of his knowledge, is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish, and "has perhaps a little Swedish blood."

"Another of our officers is roughly in the same category," Mr. Lannen said. "We do not desire to dissect the poor devils and put part of them in each one of these columns."

AGENCY SOUGHT DATA

The questionnaire was issued by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, headed by Vice President JOHNSON, as part of a campaign against racial discrimination. The form asks local unions around the country to list numbers of their members who are American Indians, Negroes, orientals, Puerto Ricans, and Spanish Americans.

In a section of the form headed "Remarks," Mr. Lannen wrote that Carpenters Local 1281 had no interest in an individual's ethnic background, his religion or his political beliefs. He said he guessed that the local reflected almost all the major racial strains. He continued:

"We have many members who apparently have Negroid blood. In fact, some of the experts state that there is only 1 person in 1 million in the world today that does not have Negroid blood."

"We have a number of Alaskan aboriginals with Eskimo and Indian blood mixed with Russian, Scandinavian, Chinese and other so-called races whose sexual urges resulted in crossbreeding."

"We have one member from Cuba who speaks Spanish, looks like a Norwegian and drinks like a Irishman. We have several members newly arrived from European countries with names God could not pronounce and whose ethnical origin is unknown to us."

"Fortunately we are a long way from Governors Wallace and Barnett, and a man's race is none of our business. To quote Mark Twain: 'We do not allow 1 part of a man to outvote the other 15 parts,' as they do in the Deep South."

Mr. Lannen apparently referred to Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and Gov. Ross R. Barnett of Mississippi.

REFUSAL BY WOODWORKERS

The position of the carpenters' local in Alaska recalled a similar reaction recently by the International Woodworkers of America. A. F. Hartung, president of the Woodworkers' Union, wrote the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity that the questionnaire tended to establish minority groups rather than to eliminate discrimination against them.

Mr. Hartung refused to forward the questionnaire to local union affiliates. He said it would be "an insult to the leadership of our local unions."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1963]
RACE MIXTURES DEFTY UNION IDENTIFICATION
(By Frank C. Porter)

Protesting that "we are not anthropologists," an Alaskan local of the Carpenters' Union says its membership is too ethnically jumbled to permit a racial breakdown.

For example, the local told the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity its treasurer is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish and "has perhaps a little Swedish blood."

A Cuban member "speaks Spanish, looks like a Norwegian and drinks like an Irishman."

As part of its antidiscrimination campaign, the President's Committee sent a questionnaire to labor unions throughout the Nation asking the number of American Indians, Negroes, orientals, Puerto Ricans, and Spanish Americans enrolled in each local.

Under "Remarks," Pete Lannen, financial secretary of carpenters local 1281 of Anchorage, replied:

"We were unable to completely fill out the form on an honest basis, as we are not anthropologists and we do not know when a member becomes or ceases to be a Negro, an Indian, an oriental, a member of a minority group or any of the other designations in the form."

"For example, the treasurer of this local union, to the best of his knowledge is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish and has perhaps a little Swedish blood. Another of our officers is roughly in the same category. We do not desire to dissect the poor devils and put part of them in each one of these columns."

"We have many members who apparently have Negroid blood. In fact, some of the experts state that there is only 1 person in 1 million in the world today that does not have Negroid blood. We have a number of Alaskan aboriginals with Eskimo and Indian blood mixed with Russian, Scandinavian, Chinese, and other so-called races whose sexual urges resulted in crossbreeding. We also have a number of members who came from the Hawaiian Islands. It appears that their ancestors were both promiscuous and prolific . . ."

"Fortunately we are a long way from Governors Wallace and Barnett and a man's race is none of our business. To quote Mark Twain, 'We do not allow 1 part of a man to outvote the other 15 parts,' as they do in the Deep South."

Less good-humored was the reply of A. F. Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America. He told the committee he refused to forward the questionnaire to his locals because it would be an insult to them. "We take everybody into our union unless it can be proved he is a Communist, Fascist or Nazi," he said.

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the present outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East. Now, as in the past, it is evident that the States of the Arab world are seeking to distract attention from their own domestic problems by concerted harassment of Israel. The latest direct Syrian-Israeli clashes provide continuing proof—if proof is needed—that the problems of the Middle East are not solved. In fact, they have not even eased with the passing of time.

Israel's latest charges of aggression by Syria go back to last December. Since then, it is charged there have been 98 shooting incidents which have very much the appearance of deliberate provocation against Israel.

Mr. President, in the past Israel has understandably been reluctant to press its charges against Arab nations in the U.N. The Israelis realize full well that the Arab States outnumber them in voting power. Even more significant, they recognize that, regardless of the merits of the issues, the Soviet Union and Communist bloc will back Arab charges, however exaggerated, in the continuing Communist effort to woo Arab support and infiltrate the Middle East.

What is less understandable, however, Mr. President, is the position that the United States has all too frequently taken when similar incidents have been protested to the Security Council in the past. Our Government, most regrettably, instead of standing up for the facts and judging the issues with an understanding of Israel's vulnerable and insecure position in the area, has tended to go along with Arab and Soviet initiatives. In some cases, the United States has even gone along with direct condemnations of what the Arabs describe as "Israeli aggression." In other cases, the United States has joined in watered-down resolutions that place the blame equally on both sides even though the facts indicate that the provocation was from Arab States. In no case have we contributed forceful leadership and tried to put the full weight of U.S. prestige on the side of a reasonable solution.

Mr. President, the discussions before the Security Council are—and will be viewed throughout the Middle East as—a significant test case. Israel for the first time in a number of years has brought Arab activities to the attention of the United Nations instead of considering direct retaliation. If the Security Council temporizes, if the Security Council postpones action, if the Security Council merely passes a watered-down resolution that seeks to blame both sides equally for belligerent Arab activity, then we can blame ourselves if more trouble comes. Any weakness or shilly-shallying in the U.N. on this issue will only be an invitation to the Arab States to continue their provocation.

Mr. President, the United States has a fine opportunity to assume a role of leadership in these circumstances and to make clear that we will not tolerate continued Arab harassment and provocation along the borders of Israel. Nasser has already threatened to bring his troops now in Yemen to contribute to the tensions along the Israel border.

Mr. President, the United States must take a strong stand now and make it clear that the United States will not tolerate a continuation of this belligerence. Now is the time, in the course of the present meeting and debate, to make our views clearly known and our leadership decisively felt.

CALIFORNIAN TRAVELS FASTER ON WHEELS THAN ANY MAN BEFORE HIM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the extraordinary feat of a young Californian, Craig Breedlove.

On August 5, Craig Breedlove whipped across Bonneville Salt Flats in Utah in his wingless jet car and averaged 407.45 miles an hour. This is faster than any man had ever traveled on wheels before. It broke the land speed record of 394.196 miles per hour held by England's John Cobb—a record that daredevils for 16 years had been trying to crack.

Craig Breedlove got the racing bug at the age of 12. Until he was old enough to enter acceleration events he worked at the mechanical end of the sport. At 16 he set seven records in the highly competitive southern California drag circuit.

Three years ago he began to think seriously about breaking the land speed record. He gave up his job as an aircraft stress tester and devoted full time to his dream. He gathered together a voluntary group of assistants. And he got invaluable help from the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Shell Oil Co., sponsors of the record attempt.

Shell Oil made a special blend of turbine fuel to help the J-47 engine generate its 4,250 pounds of thrust. Goodyear made the 4-foot-tall tires and tested them up to 600 miles per hour. It also designed, tested, and fitted the precision-machined wheels and brakes.

Craig Breedlove is an exceptional young man. His car "Spirit of America" is well named. It reflects his own special spirit—and the kind of will and tenacity of purpose needed for the job.

An interesting story on his triumph was published in the August 16 issue of *Time*. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A DREAM OF SPEED

Across Utah's Bonneville salt flats whipped the piercing whine of a J-47 jet engine. Technicians huddled around their electric timers. "Here he comes," somebody shouted. A strange object that looked like a wingless jet airplane flashed into sight, roared past and disappeared, leaving waves of refracted light dancing in the brilliant desert dawn. Strapped in his cramped cockpit, Craig Breedlove, 26, pressed a button that released two colored parachutes, and the Spirit of America skidded to a halt. "All I know," he said, "is that I was moving fast." The timers told how fast: in two runs through Bonneville's measured mile, Breedlove had averaged 407.45 miles per hour—faster than any man had ever traveled on wheels before.

AT WHAT PRICE?

Breaking the world land speed record has been Craig Breedlove's obsession ever since he was a car-struck 12-year-old in Los Angeles and talked his parents into letting him buy an aged and battered Ford—"not to drive, just to work on." That was in 1949, 2 years after London Fur Broker John Cobb set a new land speed record, gunning his

twin-engined, 2,500-horsepower Ralston Mobil Special up to 394.196 miles per hour. Over the years, dozens of daredevils have tried to track Cobb's mark, and few sporting pursuits have been so costly to participants in terms of money and life. The turbine-powered Bluebird of Britain's Donald Campbell is, so far, a \$5 million flop. Three years ago, Utah's Athol Graham was killed when his homemade car lost a wheel at better than 300 miles per hour. Last year California's Glenn Leasher drove his jet-powered Infinity past the timers at more than 400 miles per hour, but moments later an explosion scattered car and driver over a square mile of Bonneville salt.

Breedlove paid for his dream too. Instead of going to college, he took a variety of odd jobs (welder, fireman, sports car salesman) that allowed him free time to build fast cars and race them. His first wife divorced him. In 1959 he set to work on Spirit in earnest. Before he was through, he quit his job, exhausted his unemployment compensation, was scrimping by on the earnings of his second wife, a waitress in a drive-in (and a car buff like himself). "Four years," he said last week. "Four years of seven days a week, eighteen hours a day—no movies, no going out to dinner, no TV, nothing but work."

A well-to-do Mormon bishop bought Breedlove an airplane jet engine. Designers helped him with problems of aerodynamics. He drew up a brochure, built a tiny-scale model of his car, went in search of sponsors. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. donated the special tires he needed, and Shell Oil Co. agreed to pick up the rest of the bill. "He's a remarkable salesman," said one Shell executive. Shell's contribution came to about \$150,000.

IN WHAT BOOK?

The painstakingly handcrafted vehicle that carried Breedlove to his record was a bizarre contraption with three wheels and a tail fin jutting 10 feet high. The thing was 35 feet long and 11 feet wide, weighed 3 tons. Its single front wheel could be steered only half a degree in either direction. To keep the car from taking off at high speeds, the cigar-shaped body was designed so that terrific air pressure on the nose would hold it down ("negative lift," engineers call it). A small fin under the nose helped carve a path through the "air wake"—so strong at high speeds that it might otherwise rip the car apart.

At week's end record-book custodians were arguing over what book Breedlove's record belonged in. The Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile said no, Spirit is not an automobile, because it has only three wheels and none of them is driven directly by the engine. The Fédération Internationale Motocycliste said of course Spirit is not an automobile—it is a motorcycle and, hélas, a motorcycle that can beat any automobile. Breedlove only shrugged. He was finally going to take a vacation. "If someone breaks my records," he said, "I'll be right back." In the meantime, if Spirit of America was only history's fastest tricycle, that was all right with him. It was undeniably, he knew, the fastest something or other.

X-15 DOES IT AGAIN

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, yesterday another altitude record toppled to the airplane which has been called the most successful research aircraft ever built—the rocket-powered X-15.

NASA's chief test pilot, Joseph A. Walker, held the X-15 to 351,000 feet or 66.5 miles. He used the aircraft's speed

brakes as he arced upward to prevent excessive velocity. For about 3 minutes Walker was in a near weightless condition.

The purpose of the flight was to obtain data on stability and control in the extreme ranges of flight, especially in re-entry from high altitude with the ventral fin removed.

This flight also carried for the first time an altitude predictor as a pilot aid to avoid overshooting the desired altitude. Fast readings were provided by computer and an ultraviolet photometer. Last July 19, Walker unexpectedly reached a new altitude record of 347,800 feet when his rocket engine burned for 85 seconds—2 seconds longer than planned. Yesterday Walker kept the engine burning full throttle for 85.5 seconds and shut down at 167,000 feet. Momentum carried him the rest of the way up. From the time the X-15 was dropped from under the wing of a B-52 over Mud Lake, Calif., until its steel skids touched down on the hard clay of Rogers Dry Lake, the flight lasted just 10 minutes. The plane weighed 33,000 pounds at launch and 15,000 pounds at landing, consuming 9 tons of liquid oxygen and ammonia during powered flight.

Yesterday's flight may not be the highest the X-15 will make. But NASA's engineers say they consider 360,000 feet to be about the optimum altitude for the plane in its present configuration. However, it is worth noting that this airplane already is flying at the edges of space. This was Walker's fourth flight above 50 miles, the altitude that qualifies a military pilot for astronaut wings.

More importantly, the X-15 has climbed more than 100,000 feet above the altitude for which it originally was designed. And in 91 flights during a successful 11-year program, the X-15 has expanded its role from an experimental high-speed aircraft to that of a carrier of scientific experiments into space. The X-15's contributions to aeronautics and space research have been many. The reaction jets used to control the X-15 have been adapted to the space capsules used in Projects Mercury and Dyna-Soar. Valuable information has been gained about aerodynamic heating, new control systems, better instrument displays, and in many other areas.

Mr. President, the X-15 project has its home at NASA's Edwards Flight Research Center in the southern California desert so uniquely fitted for high-speed and high-altitude flight operations.

Most of the 375 persons who took part in yesterday's high-altitude flight, although assembled from all over the United States, now make their homes in California. The X-15 aircraft is built by North American Aviation at its El Segundo, Calif., factory.

As a Californian, but most especially as one who is interested in the continued progress of aviation and flight research, I am pleased to call the attention of the Senate to this latest successful entry in the X-15's flight log.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, August 21 is a big day for Hawaii for it is the fourth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood. It is a day of joyous celebration but also a day of sober reflection on the responsibilities we have assumed in the sisterhood of States.

On the previous two anniversaries of Hawaiian statehood, I emphasized the economic as well as the political and social progress that we had made since the advent of statehood. I am happy to report that Hawaii continues to show a healthy growth and each year attains new heights.

On this our fourth anniversary, I should like to reflect a while on the role of Hawaii in the space age.

Throughout our half-century fight for statehood, we repeatedly stressed that the geographical separation of Hawaii from the rest of the United States would not be an obstacle, but indeed could be an advantage. During the past few years, I feel that we have been proven correct to a degree beyond that which we ourselves had envisioned.

Hawaii, which is not only the westernmost State but the southernmost State as well, is located near the center of the vast Pacific Ocean. Primarily because of this favorable geographical location, Hawaii has made and will continue to make valuable contributions in our national effort to push the new frontiers of science in this space age. Let me cite a few examples:

First. At Kokee, on our beautiful garden isle of Kauai, Hawaii is proud to have a satellite tracking station which played a significant role during the recent historical space flights by Astronauts John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and Gordon Cooper. It was a particularly momentous event and signal honor for Hawaii to be the first State to welcome the returning Major Cooper, who was so dramatically picked up in the Pacific waters near our islands.

Second. The strategic location of our islands in the geographic center of the vast Pacific missile range has opened up new scientific horizons for the Hawaiian people. New emphasis is being placed on science and engineering in our institutions. In coordination with such companies as Hawaiian Telephone, Hawaiian Electric, Kaiser Industries, and Kentron, the island government is exploring the possibility of establishment of a research and development center which will exploit the advantages of Hawaii's geography and natural resources.

Third. The Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense has awarded a \$4,350,000 contract to the University of Michigan to build and operate a midrange ballistic missile observatory on Mount Haleakala on the island of Maui in the State of Hawaii. This observatory, which will be equipped with three 48-inch telescopes, will be located on land leased from the University of Hawaii and, when not being used for ballistic missile observation purposes, will be available to other insti-

tutions for astrophysical and astronomical experiments.

Fourth. The University of Hawaii on its own is making significant progress in the field of geophysics. The current multinational tsunami—tidal wave—study should prove of value to many nations.

Fifth. Early this year, Pearl Harbor was made the home port for Polaris nuclear submarines in the Pacific basin.

On this fourth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood I am, therefore, proud that our new State has enthusiastically adjusted to the space age. We must, however, remind ourselves that the space age is not confined to technical advancements. Good human relationships are even more important in this era of greater speed and awesome power. We have always felt that the people of Hawaii could contribute much, especially in helping to bridge the gap between the East and West—between peoples of different color and creeds.

The granting of statehood to the people of Hawaii, the majority of whom are of Asiatic descent, I am sure gave a new dimension to American democracy in the eyes of the world. We are proud of Hawaii's wonderful climate and natural beauties, but as a State we are infinitely prouder of our long history of harmonious race relations. We do not claim to have found all the answers to solve racial conflicts, nor are we self-righteous about our own good record. In the coming struggles over civil rights in this country, however, I do say that our newest State stands eager to share its proudest commodity—the spirit of "aloha." The spirit of aloha stands for friendship and good will.

On this occasion of our fourth statehood anniversary, I am privileged on behalf of the 50th State, to extend to you our warmest and heartfelt aloha.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the executive committee of the Kansas Republican State Committee meeting in Wichita, Kans., on August 10 adopted a resolution in regard to proposed civil rights legislation.

The Republican Party in Kansas has always been cognizant of insuring the equality of our citizens in our State, and under Republican leadership, has for many decades enacted legislation that would prevent discrimination against any of our citizens because of race, color, or creed.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

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

RESOLUTION BY KANSAS REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 10, 1963

Whereas the Republican Party is and always has been the party of human freedom and equal justice; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has been a leader in the enactment of excellent legislation pertaining to civil rights; and

Whereas the legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States is similar to legislation introduced by the Republican

administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower: Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the executive committee of the Kansas Republican State Committee, That the congressional delegation for the State of Kansas be urged to support and work for the enactment of sound and constructive civil rights legislation.

DANGER IN THE ARCTIC AS RADIO- ACTIVITY MOUNTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a grave and potentially dangerous situation exists in the Arctic regions of our Nation. American citizens of Eskimo and Indian stock who live in inland Alaska today rely upon caribou meat as their principal food stock. There is reason to believe that the caribou are becoming increasingly contaminated with strontium 90 and cesium 137. This contamination cannot be of good effect and may well be of harm to these people and to their descendants.

The time is approaching, Mr. President, when the Senate and the Nation must give real attention to the perils caused by the radioactive refuse of atomic testing. Practical action is needed and the Federal Government dare not duck its responsibility.

The above words, Mr. President, I addressed to the Senate on April 4 of this year. I said then the time was approaching when action will be needed. The time is now here.

On June 3 of this year I repeated my warning: I have received reports that lead me to believe that levels in the coming months and years will rise a good deal higher than figures now available indicate, even without further tests. A responsible official of the Public Health Service has informed me that it is reasonable to expect that in some instances individuals in the American Arctic will begin receiving exposures well into range III in the near future. I would wish that a study of countermeasures to protect the Eskimo citizen were also underway. It is not. I would wish a policy decision had been made as to when and how countermeasures would be applied in the Arctic. It has not.

Yesterday, in testimony received by the Subcommittee on Research Development and Radiation of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, my predictions were borne out. Mr. H. M. Parker, manager of the AEC's Hanford Laboratories, testified that Alaska Eskimos are now receiving doses of contamination exceeding the generally accepted permissible levels as established by the Government in the radiation production guides. I ask unanimous consent that a story by Frank Carey in this morning's Washington Post may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

HIGH RADIATION DOSES FOUND IN ESKIMOS (By Frank Carey)

Evidence was reported yesterday that Alaskan Eskimos have absorbed radiation doses exceeding at least average permissible limits—from eating reindeer and caribou meat

containing unusually high concentrations of bomb-test fallout.

Another report from Atomic Energy Commission officials said Alaska has experienced "somewhat higher" fallout than any other State—primarily because it's the first region hit by the early fallout from Russian nuclear tests in polar latitudes.

H. M. Parker, manager of the AEC's Hanford Laboratories at Richland, Wash., who told of the Eskimo radiation findings, stressed that he did not believe the Eskimos are in any danger.

But he added, in testifying at fallout hearings being held by the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee:

"This is not to say that in the long term it (would) not be dangerous * * * and if I were a resident there, I'd begin to look around to see how reasonable it would be to substitute some other kind of food (for reindeer and caribou)."

Meanwhile, it was learned that the Public Health Service and the AEC, at the urging of Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, are planning a much more extensive study of the situation.

The joint study will include an intensive analysis of radioactivity in the air and water in those Alaskan areas where the Eskimos and Indians live—and the caribou roam. It will also embrace intensive studies of the radioactive content of the reindeer and caribou meat, which is used extensively in the native diet.

Parker said the Eskimo studies were made with the help of a unique, transportable radiation counter developed by Hanford engineers.

Before using this device, to examine 700 natives from 7 villages, the researchers using other measuring techniques found fallout levels in many native plants and animals "higher than those in other States of the Union."

Unusual concentrations of cesium 137 were observed in flesh of caribou and reindeer," Parker said.

In the Eskimo studies, the highest average adult "body burden" of cesium 137 in 1962 was 450 nanocuries of radiation, and the maximum was 790.

Parker said this compares with proposed permissible limits of 300 on the average for a group, and 1,000 maximum for an individual, with respect to people in the general population. The maximum permissible limit for workers in atomic plants is much higher—30,000 nanocuries.

(A nanocurie represents a billionth of a curie of radiation.)

Mr. BARTLETT. It is true, Mr. President, that more extensive body count measurements are being taken across the Arctic. As a direct result of the concern expressed by many Alaskans as well as myself, a proposal has been worked out by the Public Health Service and the Atomic Energy Commission to establish, for the first time, a sensible Arctic-wide study of the extent of the contamination hazard to the fauna and flora. This research, to be undertaken by the Arctic Health Research Center, would be the first competent and comprehensive American approach to the problem. I need hardly say that it is months and years overdue. I regret to say that, overdue as it is, the proposal has not as yet received final approval from the Government agencies concerned. I request, I demand, that it be soon approved and that work get soon underway.

Horror stories like the one which I have just placed in the RECORD do no

one good. The Public Health Service has a responsibility to the Eskimos, a responsibility it cannot shirk.

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE FOR ALASKA NATIVES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, early in June, the chiefs of the Athabascan Indian communities which border the Tanana and Yukon Rivers of Alaska, met to confer on the many problems facing their people today. They invited several Government officials to speak to them on specific subjects and among these was Robert L. Bennett, Alaska area director, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Since assuming his duties in Alaska, Mr. Bennett has made real progress in dealing with problems of the Alaska native people. He does not sit in his office in Juneau but gets out in the bush and meets community leaders, he requests and uses their ideas before initiating new programs or projects.

Mr. Bennett's remarks to the Tanana chiefs I feel exemplify the caliber of his thinking and quality of the counsel which he is capable of giving. I feel his message to the chiefs that education is the key to the solution of their problems of unemployment, the decline of the availability of game and fish for subsistence, and their rapidly expanding population, is an important one. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS BY ROBERT L. BENNETT, AREA DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, TANANA CHIEFS' CONFERENCE, JUNE 5-7, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Bishop Gordon, Reverend Fathers, leaders, and gentlemen, I enjoy being here very much, to hear what the delegates have to say, to hear the recommendations of the various committees, and to hear what your friends and guests have had to say.

I think the reason why you are here, and why you have the problems you do, is because changes are taking place among you. Some of these changes are changes which are brought about by your own desires, your own needs—some of these changes are the result of external or outside forces.

The first one, I believe, which came about, and which probably resulted in your first meeting, is the statehood bill which gives the right to the State of Alaska to select certain lands, subject to the rights of the native people which so far have not been defined by the Congress. There is under consideration at this time in the Department of Interior a proposed bill which the Secretary of the Interior will submit to the two committees of Congress, Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. These bills will be studied by the staffs on these two committees and will be introduced with whatever changes may be made by the chairmen of these two committees.

After these bills are introduced, we will get copies from the committees or from your congressional delegation or our Washington office, so that each village in Alaska will have a copy of the bills as introduced. The bills as introduced in the Senate and in the House probably will both be the same. You will then have an opportunity to study these bills. You may then want to hold some spe-

cial meetings among you to get together on what your views and attitudes on these bills are going to be.

Before Congress takes any action the committees will, of course, hold public hearings and I believe one of your recommendations is that some of these hearings be held in Alaska so that more of the delegates have the opportunity to speak either for or against these bills or to recommend changes in them. When the bills are finally made into law you still may not be satisfied with your rights as Congress defines them and you could consider legal action. This, of course, would take some time. I believe, however, there are things which you can do and should do now.

I believe that the State of Alaska, through its director of lands, Mr. Roscoe Bell, is very interested in working out local plans for the use of land around native villages. Regardless of how the legislation comes out and regardless of any subsequent later court decisions affecting your rights, it is always good business to plan. I would suggest, therefore, that you take advantage of the opportunity you now have to plan with the State division of lands on how land around your villages is to be used.

It is evident from what I heard here, the hunting and trapping pressure is getting pretty terrific on some of the lands, some of the villages are resorting to using more land for gardens as a means of having food of a kind necessary to feed you and your families, and some areas may be developed for other purposes which will bring in income to the villages. You can sit down now with the State director of division of lands and do this kind of planning without harming your basic rights to the land. In other words, by sitting down and planning with the State you are not jeopardizing your rights, because you can plan on the condition that you are still reserving every right you feel you may have to the land as may be eventually established by Congress or established in the courts.

I feel that each village should have a committee—a planning committee—for this purpose so that you can call upon Mr. Bell and others you feel can be of help to you to develop these kinds of plans. Some of you are concerned that you're killing or trapping too much, and as a result in time there won't be any. So, I think that you are now in a situation where you will have to develop your own local plans on how you are going to use this land which is around you. I am sure Mr. Bell and people in the State division of lands want to and would be willing to accept requests from you to come out and plan, and as I said before, you can do this without jeopardizing your rights, whatever they may eventually be determined to be either by Congress or by the courts.

Now in connection with another outside factor which is causing tremendous change in the villages, both below and above the site, is the Rampart Dam. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has requested that the Corps of Engineers make available money for a social and economic study of the villages which will be affected, a survey of the lands and the property claimed by the native people which will be affected, and prospects that the native people will have for economic development during the construction of the dam and after it is constructed. In negotiating with the Corps of Engineers other construction projects of this kind, involving Indian reservations in the lower 48, we have been able to obtain from the projects: First, money to pay for the property that is lost plus the right to take the property. In other words, if you have a house which is going to be lost you get paid for the house and then you can also take the house. It's paid for and it is still yours to take. Second, for relocating and reestablishing villages; third,

payment for the rights you are losing to hunt, fish, and trap in particular areas—these are called your intangible rights which have been mentioned before; fourth, the cost of moving graves and shrines and relocating things of this kind; fifth, funds for a new community, and a better one, involving water systems, power, and streets—funds for helping the villages get started in a new area. In other words, when you go into a new area, whether it is an area in which you hunt, trap, or set up businesses, you will need funds to get started and funds for economic development.

These are all precedents which have already been established by Congress in settlement with the native people where they have lost lands in other areas because of the projects such as the Rampart Dam. We have already served notice—the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Corps of Engineers—that these are the things that we are going to insist be provided for the native people and communities which will be affected by the Rampart Dam, if it is built. As Colonel Sawyer mentioned yesterday, the decision as to whether or not it is going to be built has not been made, but since they are doing advance planning we are letting them know what our views are also at this time in relation to Rampart Dam settlements and the native people.

I was very happy to hear the recommendation of the Rampart Dam committee relative to training, because we felt also the native people had these needs and these two additional requirements are being insisted upon by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. One is for training for jobs in the preconstruction and construction of the dam and in operation of any facilities which may be permanent facilities, like the powerplant—and, second, local resident priority in employment.

These are some of the things which the Bureau is recommending in relation to the Rampart Dam project at this planning stage. Now here again I believe that the villages which will be affected should appoint a negotiating committee, or a committee that can work with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in constant negotiation and discussion with the Corps of Engineers relating to the Rampart Dam. If it is not constructed, well and good, and you are not affected. If it is constructed then you have put in several years of negotiations and planning with the Corps of Engineers, you have made your wants known soon enough, and they are specific enough so that when money is provided for construction of the dam, a part of the project cost will be included to meet all the needs and the claims of the people.

I think that the villages should, as soon as possible, appoint a negotiating committee so that we in the Bureau have someone we can work with. We hope the University of Alaska will help us also in making some of these studies so they will need a group representing the villages that they can work with and in time we develop in dollars and cents exactly what the village needs will be.

Most of the States in the lower 48, that have substantial Indian populations, have developed and created through the legislature commissions on Indian affairs. You may wish to consider suggesting to your own legislature that they develop a commission on native affairs. This could be made up of a group of men representing the State government appointed by the Governor, and an equal number of delegates from the native population, who would meet—hopefully at the expense of the State—monthly, or every 2 months or 3 months, to discuss some of the mutual problems of the native people which you are bringing up here. I'm afraid that some of the recommendations that you bring up have no organization behind it to take action.

Now, if such a commission on native affairs was created by the State legislature, then this would be the organization to which all of your needs and your recommendations would be presented. They could meet and study your problems and make recommendations to the State for additional legislation, for changes in legislation or regulations, and whatever is decided that would be in your best interest and in the interest of the State and the country as a whole. So, I believe that this is something that you might consider.

I think the best thing that has happened to the native people in the past year is approximately 118 native boys and girls graduating from the 12th grade at Mount Edgecumbe and 3 graduating from the University of Alaska. Now, when we are talking about the problems of the native people, unless you, as leaders, insist that your young people be trained, they are going to be sitting here 20 years later and talking about the same problems you are talking about today.

Now you talk about game, and game can be lost—you talk about trapping, and the prices are gone—and the population pressure, particularly in the lower Kuskokwim, is getting to the point where even if they allow you to kill and take everything they wanted, the game and fish aren't there any more like they used to be. But there is one thing that can't be lost to you and that is the education and training which your young people receive. Now, if we could have three times as many graduating from high school and many, many more graduating from college, then the next generation of the Athabaskan people won't be sitting here talking about the kind of problems you are talking about.

To me, this is the only way that you can meet the changes which are affecting you people—affecting you not only from the outside factors but also from your own desires, and your own needs. You need to have cash now to get the things that you want, to get the things that your family wants, and the things that you need, and the hunting economy and a fishing economy is at a point of no return. I mean your children and grandchildren are not going to be able to live as they want on a fishing and hunting economy. So, whether or not you are able to change the seasons on the moose or kill more moose, and sell fish and do these things you are talking about, it would help only for a very short while because with the population increases of the native people, this isn't going to be the job you want.

I hope that in the future meetings you will begin to put your thinking out further because the only way the native people are going to be able to meet what is facing them in the future is through the kind of education and training that you insist your young people have and that you insist that your young people attend and participate in.

This is not a problem or something which is peculiar to the Athabaskan people. These are problems which are being faced by people all over, even the coal miners of Pennsylvania—they can't sell their coal any more—they are having to be trained to do something else. The people in different countries who have not been trained to do anything are now having to be trained to do some of these jobs. This is the reason why many of the new governments in Africa and these places aren't working because they don't have the trained people.

The requirements for many, many jobs are going to increase—they're never going to go back to the old days. It is true there may be people amongst you who can operate machines without a high school education, but it's also true that many of these agencies for reasons of safety and many other factors, are making high school education a require-

ment for a job. And these standards will never go back or be lowered.

Now, the whole situation is what can you do to prepare yourself and your children to be able to meet these standards and not ask everything to stop so that you can take part, because it won't stop. It's going to go on and it will leave you further and further behind unless you, as leaders, begin to face up to what is really ahead of you.

What is really facing you isn't a lack of enough moose, and a lack of enough fish and ducks and so forth—what is really facing you is the fact changes which are taking place all around you. Unless you prepare yourself through the education and training of your young people, they are going to be in the same position you are 20 years from now—and they will be sitting here right where you are, wondering why they are so far behind and why they are having such a difficult time.

The many Federal and State agencies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are here to help you. There is no reason why any high school graduate—native high school graduate in the State of Alaska—should not be in college today because of lack of money. The one thing we can get money from Congress for is for college training of native students. Now, I know that the non-Indian people of Alaska would like to have that kind of assurance. They would like to have that kind of assurance, that when their young people graduated from high school they know they would get through college. They don't have that, but you do. And this is the thing that you need so you, the native people, are able to face the realities ahead, to be able to face what the future is going to be holding for your young people.

Now, this doesn't mean that I am against your having further opportunities, such as the changes in the hunting seasons and these things that you are asking for. But if you had all that you are asking for, including the land, and if that were all given to you today that would not help you meet what the future is bringing to you and you wouldn't live any different tomorrow than you're living today.

It may be true that as a legal right you are entitled to the land. That's well and good. But don't put all your faith in it because that's not going to provide you with the answer. The answer is going to come from how much you insist that your young people go to school and take advantage of the education and training opportunities they have, and how you yourselves will take advantage of the education and training and help you can get through adult education, through the participation and planning with the State agencies, through the negotiation and planning that we will help you with in connection with the Rampart Dam.

You are not facing this kind of battle alone. A lot of people all over the world are facing these kinds of problems. And I hope that when you go home you will think about this, and I hope that in future meetings you will get down to some real serious thinking in terms of what you feel and what ways you feel you and your younger people can be helped, and maybe you will want to know and to get a real understanding of the things you are going to be facing in the future.

In connection with the negotiations on the Rampart Dam, I know that you will especially need the help of the Bureau. Now, we have lawyers but we are in the Government. The Corps of Engineers has lawyers and they are in the Government, too. It isn't always best to have our lawyers represent you because they are in the Government. You may need some outside legal help and you may want some outside legal help but in order for that attorney whom you may

have represent you or to have legal standing before the Corps of Engineers or the Government agency he must have a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior. So if you, in discussing how you are going to present your case to the Corps of Engineers for the things you want, if you feel you need legal help, and I think by all means you should have legal help, then the attorney you select that you will pay money to must have an approved contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This is a requirement of law. I just wanted to mention that.

I again want to say I am very happy to be here. We stand ready to help you; we stand ready to educate your children and to train your children; we stand ready to bring community education into your village; to help you meet the future which you will have to meet, which you will have to face, and which owning the land and killing more game and changing the season will not meet for you. I hope that in future discussions we can go into this more in detail and, as I said, with the opportunities you have and the opportunities the young people have I think you have a good opportunity to meet the challenges.

As I said before, I think the greatest thing that can happen to you—and has happened—has been the native young people who have graduated from high schools and graduated from the universities, and the more that are graduated from high schools and the universities, the closer you are going to come to solving your problems.

THE EDUCATION OF BLIND YOUTH IN PAKISTAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Dr. Isabelle Grant, a participant in the U.S.-sponsored educational and cultural exchange program, has written me from Lahore, West Pakistan, outlining her experiences during the past year preparing programs to aid the blind children of that country. Dr. Grant, herself blind, is a pioneer in the field of education for blind youth.

I believe the many Members of Congress, as well as the American public, who have supported the educational and cultural exchange program will be interested to learn of Dr. Grant's work which she describes as "living with a purpose."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from her letter and an article from the *Pakistan Times* summarizing a report on the education of blind youth in Pakistan be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

LAHORE, WEST PAKISTAN,
March 18, 1963.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: As a Fulbright grantee, I would like very much to share with you some of my experiences this year. I trust that you will not think it impertinence on my part thus taking your time.

My mission here was to see what I could do regarding a very vital problem, the education of the hundreds of thousands of blind children in this country whose lot, by the traditional cultural and religious pattern, consigns them to mendicancy. If indeed some of the families with blind children do not require their blind children to make the family living for them by begging, these better families do not admit to having blind

children in the family and hide the children even from the closest relatives of the family. My experience here has been intensely interesting and stimulating and challenging, but at the same time discouraging and difficult. Yet all of these epithets do not begin to describe the 9 months I have been steadily working here. I might describe it as living with a purpose.

In order to teach their blind children, or any children for that matter, they need teachers. With my limited use of Urdu, in spite of hours of work on that language, I felt I could not approach the children directly. The native teacher with her vernacular, and her local teacher training, such as it was, was the teacher best fitted to teach blind children, I concluded. So I approached the department of education in West Pakistan and was privileged to set up a seminar for the preparation of teachers who would go out into the field, into the primary schools, and set up small groups of blind children in day classes. The publication I compiled and published just last week tells the rest of the story. It is called "Education of Blind Youth in Pakistan, a Seminar Report." I hope your schedule will allow you time to scan through some of the articles written by participants, showing better than I could describe it their awakening to a new and entirely undeveloped area of their educational program.

The *Pakistan Times*, probably the most widely read daily, for it goes to Karachi, Peshawar, and Dacca in the East Wing, was informed about the publication and a reporter came to interview me. I am enclosing the newspaper copy of his report.

The job has little more than begun. It may take years to do; but at least a beginning is being made now. The stumbling blocks have been many. They are part and parcel of this developing process in the so-called emergent countries. You will quite understand how complicated the problem became when, in January of this year, I was told that the education of handicapped children, scant as the program is, was to be taken out of the Department of Education and transferred to the Department of Social Welfare. The transfer was made, but no action whatsoever was taken. However, last week through the newspapers I learned that the Department of Social Welfare has been itself transferred to the Department of the Basic Democracies. I am at a loss to know where I stand trying to get a program of the education of blind children off the ground, but I shall keep on trying, and something may break one of these days. In the meantime, I am interviewing directors, inspectors, and headmasters, and anybody I feel will help in opening up this opportunity for education to these otherwise hopeless and helpless children.

I would like to close with my most sincere thanks for the opportunity which you have made possible for me, to have this year of living with a purpose.

Respectfully yours,

ISABELLE GRANT.

[From the *Pakistan Times*]

A NEW CHAPTER IN EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

On Friday, the 11-week seminar on the Education of Blind Youth came to a close in Lahore and with that Pakistan turned a new chapter in this woefully neglected field of education. It would yet be time before the fruits are gathered but the seed has been sown and both the soil and climate have been galvanized thanks to the aging but incredibly energetic Dr. Isabelle Grant, herself blind and a pioneer in the field of education for blind youth.

The statistics about the seminar look modest to the point of being negligible. But they mislead; they do not tell the whole

story, anyway. Some 34 men and women from 23 different cities of East and West Pakistan have been trained to teach the blind and, also, to train teachers like themselves. For a country with many more than 500,000 blind people, a third of them in school-going age groups, but scattered all over this large country, 34 trained teachers would be less than a drop in the ocean. But, surely, they are infinitely better than none. These 34 go back to their respective towns to start the good work they have been trained for and they have dedicated themselves to.

What lends the seminar and its results a truly historic significance is that from now onwards we shall have an altogether new and admittedly sensible attitude toward our blind. Thanks again to Dr. Grant, we have come to learn and believe that blindness is not a curse; it is a challenge—to the sighted. One physical handicap—for blindness is no more than just that—need be no deterrent to learning. Therefore with properly trained teachers on the staff of the ordinary schools for the sighted children, blind children would be entering them like the rest of their brothers and sisters. All told, there are only 200 blind children going to some sort of school in Pakistan today; 200 out of nearly 100,000. This works out like this, nearly 38 percent of the sighted children in Pakistan go to school, only 1 percent of the blind. This picture should soon begin to change for the better as a result of what had been happening during the last 11 weeks in a Lahore school under the guidance and inspiration of Dr. Grant.

The basic idea behind the new philosophy of education for the blind is that "handicapped though they be, they form a vast reservoir of potential assets for the Nation . . . they should be rescued from their present hopeless and helpless status as objects of pity and charity and given a chance to be contributors instead of being consumers, an asset instead of being a liability to the society." Pakistan cannot afford to have another generation of blind beggars. The end of the Seminar is, in fact, the beginning of this new and soul-stirring crusade.

But it is only a beginning and a modest beginning, too. The task cannot be accomplished by trained teachers alone, even if there be a million-strong army of them. In Dr. Grant's words, the sighted must be cured of their blindness towards the blind. They must be persuaded, if necessary taught, to realize that the blind are just like any one of themselves; that they do not need charity but the normal facilities to be educated and made into normal and useful citizens like any other children. A painful aspect of the new efforts to send the blind and sighted children to school together is that the sighted children have yet to get used to their blind fellows in the class. The sighted children imbibe a self-conscious attitude towards the blind from the society in which they are brought up. The responsibility for setting right this emotional disequilibrium between the sighted and the blind would naturally lie on parents and teachers.

There are many hurdles in the way still. There are no statistics about blind population in the country. The Burki recommendations require collection of these when the census is taken. Then there is the problem of braille books. Very few are as yet produced in the country. A braille press is taking shape at Karachi. But it would take some time before adequate number of braille books are available. The society as a whole has to be educated on this subject. The deep-rooted fatalistic belief that blindness is a curse and there is nothing one could do about it has to be eradicated. Unfortunately parents of blind children have to be taught that their child has every chance, or

just about as good a chance, of making good in life as any other child provided he is afforded the same opportunities and facilities.

The first, and admittedly the hardest step, has been taken; a beginning has been made. A vast deal remains still to be done but it can be done, and quickly, too, if the new path now cut is pursued with diligence and devotion. All must play their part for experts and the teachers they have trained alone would not be able to achieve the object if society as a whole fails to wake up to its obligations to the blind child.

GEORGIA JAYCEES OPPOSE FORCE LEGISLATION AND MOB RULE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce, one of the most outstanding Jaycee organizations in the United States, on August 11 adopted a resolution in opposition to the administration's so-called civil rights legislation, specifically, H.R. 7152 and S. 1731.

Describing the proposals as both an unnecessary and an unwarranted infringement upon individual liberties and private property rights, the Georgia Jaycees urged that these bills in their entirety be defeated. The problems this legislation would purport to solve can best be met at the local levels of government by individual citizens and businessmen, their statement said.

Mr. President, I urge all Members of the Senate to carefully consider this resolution and the views expressed therein, and at this point I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States, certain proposed legislation commonly referred to as the civil rights bills; and

Whereas this legislation (H.R. 7152 and Senate bill S. 1731), contains certain provisions which are contrary, not only to the basic junior chamber of commerce beliefs favoring free enterprise, but to the inalienable rights of all citizens of the United States as guaranteed by the Constitution to engage in free enterprise; and

Whereas title 2 of the aforesaid legislation, now commonly known as the public accommodations section, does clearly deny rights to the majority of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas we believe that title 2 of said legislation, the public accommodations title, would, if passed, deny the fundamental principle of free enterprise and would impair the rights of private owners of businesses and would generally curtail freedom and handicap commerce; and

Whereas we believe that businessmen should, in our free country, be able to operate under a free enterprise system and do business with those with whom they choose; and

Whereas we, the members of the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce, feel that any social injustices which might exist can be, and are now being, solved by voluntary action without either force by mob rule or force of government control; and

Whereas that although we believe in the right of all qualified individuals to vote and have for years strongly urged all qualified voters to exercise their privilege to vote, and we do believe that the qualifications of voters should be fairly determined and administered, we feel the right and duty to set such qualifications is vested in the various States; and

Whereas we have confidence in the ability of the free American citizens to voluntarily solve any inequities found to exist in our social order without force from either mob or government; and

Whereas political rights enjoyed by freedom-loving Americans include the right to hire people of their choice without advice from a government study commission; and

Whereas other provisions of this legislation also call for the substitution of action of the Federal Government for the rights of the citizens; and

Whereas the States, localities and individuals should and can handle the problems sought to be remedied by this legislation; and

Whereas we believe the people of the United States should sue and be sued as individuals if they feel their rights infringed and that neither the Federal Government nor the Attorney General should be allowed to take away the rights of individual citizens to enforce their own rights through our courts of justice; and

Whereas there are sufficient laws now in existence and just and favorable courts to administer these laws so as to make further rules, regulations, and laws on civil rights, not only unnecessary, but an infringement on the political rights of the majority; and

Whereas the answers to problems existing in the social field lies in individual human action, not in hastily passed statutes enacted under force and duress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce does hereby go on record as favoring voluntary action where deserved and needed to give all citizens rights guaranteed to citizens, but as being opposed to H.R. 7152 (Senate bill S. 1731) in its entirety and urge that every legal step be taken to defeat this ill-conceived legislation and that copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the Georgia delegation in Congress with the request that it be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the minutes of the appropriate committees.

ROBERT A. SLOAN,

President,

Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

HAL KUNKEL,

Executive Vice President,

Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in an editorial of August 15, the Baxley, Ga., News-Banner suggests that if the Congress enacts the public accommodations section of the administration's so-called civil rights bill, then there should be provisions made for making reparations to the businessmen who are forced to turn their businesses over to Government control.

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

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

A TIME FOR REPARATIONS

While reparations are generally thought of as payments made by a defeated nation for property destroyed by the loser, it seems to us that congressional provision should be made for reparations to property owners whose businesses have already been wiped out or are certain to be as a result of racial demonstrations, riots and other illegalities condoned by the Kennedy administration.

Already by Executive order, before any additional civil rights legislation has come before Congress for a vote, the Armed Forces

have been given authority to declare off limits any business or community discriminating against members of the Armed Forces. Executive orders against discrimination are coming from other branches of the Federal Government to State agencies expending Federal funds.

It has been the News-Banner's belief that Georgia has been making steady progress in resolving its racial issues in the use of tax-supported public facilities. However, the invasion of private establishments catering exclusively to certain groups has already resulted in many property owners having to close or liquidate their properties at heavy losses.

As the News-Banner has stated before, restaurants, motels, hotels and similar establishments stand to lose their investments either as a result of uncontrolled demonstrations driving away their regular patrons, or from the loss of regular patrons if their establishments are integrated.

Under the free enterprise system existing long before this country was founded, it has been until now an unquestioned right for an individual to deal with whom he chose. Therefore, if the Congress of the United States insists on passing the public accommodations section of the President's civil rights bill, then the Congress should provide in it for the compensation of innocent persons who may well lose all their life's earnings as a result of such legislation. Such compensation is provided for in the public acquisition of property for urban renewal and other programs conceived to be in the general public interest. An extension of that principle of the acquisition of property only by due process of law should be extended to include the loss of property by such a fundamental change in the laws governing property rights.

To the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States we respectfully address this proposal.

PENNSYLVANIA'S WELFARE PROGRAM AN EXAMPLE TO THE NATION UNDER THE CONSTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP OF THE SCRANTON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an exciting new welfare approach in my home State of Pennsylvania has been approved by an enlightened and knowledgeable 1963 general assembly.

It is being advanced with encouraging administrative help from our Gov. William W. Scranton, and Secretary of Public Welfare Arlin M. Adams. Secretary Adams has accomplished much for Pennsylvania citizens and has brought the welfare department to the highest place among the States, in the opinion of many observers.

I want to share the public welfare record of the 1963 Pennsylvania Legislature with you, because I think some of the programs it approved will become model legislation for other States.

When the new administration praised public welfare on taking office in Harrisburg last January it realized immediately that these problems could not be solved with money alone. More would have to be done to rehabilitate persons dependent on public aid. Hospital stays of the medically indigent would have to be shortened whenever medically possible, and reimbursement methods improved. Idle hands would have to be retrained to do new work in a changing industrial world.

Only bold, new steps would break the "cycle of dependency" threatening to make public aid a way of life for some persons. Pennsylvania's legislature took those steps by authorizing a modern hospital purchase of care system; liberalizing medical care to the aged; requiring able-bodied aid recipients to work on public projects, and improving family and child welfare services.

To supplement his landmark legislative program to combat the social ills of our time, Governor Scranton by executive action created the Governor's Council for Human Services and named Public Welfare Secretary Adams as chairman.

The council, as the Governor pointed out in establishing it, is "of a pioneer nature within the Nation." Its members consist of the heads of State departments dealing with humanitarian services to people. It has the mission of providing better health and welfare services without wasting tax dollars.

The first project of the council, aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation, is a 5-year study of the school dropout problem. This will start in the Centennial School District in Bucks County in September.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly, in addition to tackling the problems of public assistance by authorizing 25 percent more caseworkers to emphasize social rehabilitation of those on public aid, adopted major improvements in many other public welfare activities, including enactment of:

More realistic medical aid for the aged—MAA—under the Kerr-Mills Act by expanding asset and income limitations so that Pennsylvania's eligibility requirements are the most liberal in the United States; authorizing post-hospital nursing home care to shorten hospital stays; ease relative responsibility; abolish repayment claims against estates; and permit prequalification of medically indigent 65 and over—H. 56, 57, 58.

Modern hospital aid on the basis of purchase of care for the first time since Benjamin Franklin in the 1750's instituted hospital grants-in-aid. This system of general hospital aid for all medically indigent persons was placed on a "purchase of care" basis, on a descending formula of percentage of cost to encourage maximum hospital utilization. Previously the State subsidy system limited a grant-in-aid to nonsectarian hospitals—S. 772.

Legislation authorizing the department of public welfare to contract with nonprofit corporations such as Blue Cross for the cooperative administration of assistance to the medically needy. This is another landmark in social welfare. It means that the aged will not have to deplete their savings when hospitalized—H.R. 1750.

Child welfare legislation that will enable Pennsylvania to assure adequate uniform child welfare service throughout the State. It changes the entire base of financial and administrative relationships for a more effective partnership between the State and its 67 counties in providing suitable child welfare services for every Pennsylvania child.

This bill gives the State department of public welfare authority to administer such services directly if counties do not have satisfactory programs by January 1, 1968—H.R. 1720.

Legislation for the protection of children from inhuman treatment, by requiring physicians and pharmacists to report to the authorities all cases of injured children that come to their attention, the so-called battered child. This legislation was designed to stop shocking attacks by adults on children in their care, many of which are unreported at present—S. 96.

Pennsylvanians can be proud that while much of the Nation continues to debate the merits of various kinds of medicare programs, we have moved ahead to meet our responsibilities in the best way possible under existing Federal legislation.

The practice of demanding repayment of medical aid from the estates of our senior citizens is now eliminated.

This program increases the allowable limits on both assets and annual income of an aged couple from \$2,400 to \$3,840. For one aged individual allowable assets and annual income are upped from \$1,500 to \$2,400. These are the most liberal terms in this country.

Persons with assets and income exceeding these amounts may receive partial benefits, depending on the size of their bills. Their home, household furnishings, and car and \$500 in insurance are exempted in computing assets.

Another valuable feature of this program authorizes the department of public welfare to prequalify aged persons for medical care. This means they do not have to undergo questioning during the stress of an illness.

In an effort to shorten hospital stays, the legislation provides for up to 60 days of care in nursing homes for elderly patients after they leave the hospital.

The responsibility of relatives of medically indigent persons may be reasonably regulated by the department of public welfare, within the framework of public funds available.

Under the new State aid to hospitals, purchase of care system eligibility will be determined by the department of public welfare's public assistance staff. Uniform regulations using present MAA eligibility—\$1,500 and \$2,400—will be applied.

Persons under 65 who are needy or medically needy will be eligible.

Sectarian hospitals can take part in the new program because payment for care has been held not to be a contribution toward the maintenance of the purveying organization. These hospitals did not qualify under the previous State aid grants system.

Whereas the highest rate paid the hospitals was \$10 a day under the State aid system, rates more nearly approaching actual costs can be paid under the purchase of care system.

Sixty days of nursing home care in a 12-month period will also be provided.

The public child welfare program—H.R. 1720—gives the department of public welfare authority to administer

child welfare services in any county that fails to have a satisfactory program.

Before the department assumes operation of child welfare services in a county, the county will be given ample opportunity, including a hearing, to conform with the requirements of an adequate child welfare program.

The costs of a county child welfare service program if administered by the department of public welfare will be divided between the county and State in the same proportion as if the program was administered by the county.

The bill also provides a procedure for the grants to be paid in quarterly installments to replace the present reimbursement procedure.

This new grant procedure will expedite subsidy payments to counties by eliminating detailed audits prior to payment and substituting adjustments to later grants for any overpayments that may occur.

Where charged with responsibility for affirmative action, as in many States, progressive social legislation at a State level under Republican Governors has resulted. This excellent record of constructive legislation achieved in Pennsylvania in the Scranton administration since January 15, 1963, is compelling evidence of what the Republican Party can accomplish where it has the voter's mandate as the majority party. Indeed, I would suggest to you that Republican State administrations not only implement aggressive social legislation, but in many respects promote programs along these lines far in advance of, and more imaginative and effective than the program of the opposition.

The Republican Party, as the party of the "constructive alternate" to spending for its own sake, is proving its point and winning public approval wherever Republican Governors are given legislative backing.

FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. SCOTT. It is hard to put into words one's feelings about Tad Walter. Tad lived a fascinating life, excelling in all he undertook and constantly impressing his colleagues with perception, wisdom, patience, and hard work.

He was the recipient of many academic honors, defender of his country in two World Wars, and an outstanding legislator for many, many years. He had the respect of his fellow Congressmen on both sides of the aisle.

I consider myself fortunate to have been able to have called him colleague.

DRAFTING OF NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Drafting Test Ban Treaty Job for Former Memphian," written by Charles Edmundson, and published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of August 10, 1963, being a tribute to Adrian Sanford Fisher, of the State Department.

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

DRAFTING TEST BAN TREATY JOB FOR FORMER MEMPHIAN

(By Charles Edmundson)

Next to Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, the American most responsible for writing the new international treaty to halt nuclear testing in the atmosphere was a former Memphian, 49-year-old Adrian Sanford Fisher.

Mr. Fisher, son of the late U.S. Representative Hubert F. Fisher, spent 10 hard days in Spiridonovka Palace in Moscow as a member of the three-man drafting committee which hammered the treaty in shape.

His coworkers on the drafting job were Britisher Charles Darwin (a lineal descendant of the great British naturalist) and Semyon Tsarapkin, a top level Russian diplomat.

Now back at his State Department desk in Washington, Mr. Fisher is helping work out the strategy of getting the history making treaty ratified by the Senate.

One of the first things Mr. Fisher did after returning to Washington with Mr. Harriman was to telephone his mother, Mrs. Hubert F. Fisher, Sr., of 198 South McLean.

In Washington yesterday, Mr. Fisher described his drafting sessions with Mr. Darwin and Mr. Tsarapkin as a "no-nonsense type of discussion, not hostile, not friendly, but businesslike."

Matters were made easier because all three draftsmen speak fluent English.

"Once or twice Tsarapkin actually picked me up on the meaning of an English word," Mr. Fisher recalled. "Once I said, 'We have three alternatives.' Tsarapkin corrected me at once. 'Not three alternatives,' he said, 'There can be only two alternatives to a question. What you mean is three choices.'"

Mr. Fisher's committee met each morning to argue out draft versions of the treaty. Each afternoon this committee presented its draft to a meeting of the full delegation.

"The conferences in World War II were so short," Mr. Harriman has been quoted as saying, "that sometimes the hastily accepted language simply concealed the differences—papered over the cracks, that is. Perhaps that's one reason those agreements failed to stick. But this time the language we finally agreed upon preserved the understanding of both sides."

In nearly 2 weeks in Moscow Mr. Fisher took one afternoon off. He went with Mr. Harriman to see the men's events in the American-Russian track meet, which the American men won by a narrow margin.

"Mr. Khrushchev was there," Mr. Fisher says. "He seemed not only popular with the Russian people but acted like a man who thought this was important."

Mr. Fisher was a Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton, where he was a member of the football squad, winning a coveted gold football.

He took his law degree at Harvard in 1937. He was law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis and then to Justice Felix Frankfurter, under whom he had studied at Harvard. (An uncle, the late Edward Terry Sanford of Knoxville, had served on the Supreme Court.)

He has been in Government ever since except for a few years as a member of one of Washington's most prestigious law firms, Covington & Burling.

His full title now is Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. His title at the Moscow Conference was deputy to Mr. Harriman.

Mr. Fisher visited Memphis last October, when his mother was ill.

"I hope to get back there this fall," he says, "to visit my mother and my brother (Hubert F. Fisher, Jr., executive vice president of Cook & Co., Inc.)."

Meanwhile Mrs. Fisher is checking on her son through news pictures.

"Wrinkles are showing up in these photographs," she says. "I think he's working too hard."

RECLAMATION'S CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN PROSPERITY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the August 16 issue of Life magazine features an article which is supposed to be an exposé of what is termed the "pork barrel outrage." The article, an outrage in its own right, sheds buckets of indignant tears over Federal appropriations for various sound domestic programs. It tries to persuade its readers that when Congress invests money in public works projects for the benefit of our national economy, what is really going on is a wholesale raid on the taxpayers' wallets.

The article represents the combined efforts of four reporters, one photographer, one cartoonist, and I cannot say how many editorial geniuses, one of whom writes that the reporters spent 2 months of travel and research digging out facts. You would think that an informative, enlightened contribution to public knowledge might have resulted from all that effort, but such is not the case. Since these are presumably intelligent men, who must be capable of assembling and interpreting facts in order to get and hold positions as writers and editors, there is only one conclusion I can reach: Life's editors must have started out with an armchair decision that Federal investment in public works programs—particularly in the field of water resource development—was a shameful waste of public money; and then they must have ordered their reporters to seek out any facts whatever that would appear to support their preconceived thesis. Such methods are a far cry from responsible journalism.

I will take no more time berating Life's editors for this shoddy piece of journalism. I will put my faith in the intelligence of the American reading public. When the truth is placed before the people, they will have no difficulty in separating fact from fancy, truth from bias.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which is responsible for bringing life-giving water to the western half of the United States, is singled out for attack by Life. The article mentions no more than three of Reclamation's water conservation projects as examples of what it pretends is a needless drain on the Federal Treasury and a shameful bilking of the poor helpless taxpayers, but the implication is clear that many more "fat slices of pork" in the reclamation program could be cited if only there was a little more space. Such statements and implications cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. The truth is that the Bureau of Reclamation has been the chief architect in the development of the West; it pays for itself in hard dollars; and its monetary value in direct and indirect benefits to the West—and to the East and all other sections of the country as well—is many times the original Federal investment. I want the record to show this.

I was born and reared in Montana, one of the 17 arid Western States which

could not possibly have achieved their present levels of growth and prosperity without the vital programs of reclamation. I have lived in and around reclamation areas all my life; I have watched dry, worthless sagebrush land that could hardly support a jackrabbit converted by the magic of irrigation water into prosperous farms and farming communities supporting thousands of prosperous people. And these people pay for their projects. Also they buy materials and equipment and all manner of consumer goods from factories and businesses in every State in the Union. And do not forget, they pay taxes into the Federal Treasury in addition to just paying back the cost of developing the water that permits them to earn their livelihoods. Reclamation is good business. I have seen it work all my life, and I know what I am talking about.

MONTANA RECLAMATION

Let me give you some statistics about reclamation in Montana. Reclamation has developed facilities in my State that now irrigate 267,558 acres of farmland. In 1962, crops grown on these lands were worth \$14 million. That is \$52 worth of crops for each of these irrigated acres. Without irrigation much of this land would have been producing nothing at all; it would have lain idle—a wasted resource of no value whatever to Montana or the Nation. Or else it would have been dry-farmed for wheat and other surplus crops. A point that easterners should keep in mind is that irrigation agriculture is not a significant contributor to our crop surplus problem; instead irrigation offers farmers the opportunity to diversify their crops and grow such things as sugarbeets, vegetables, fruits, and other specialty crops in high demand in the produce markets.

The cumulative value of crops grown on reclamation farms in Montana through 1962 totals \$313.6 million. The total cost of construction and rehabilitation and betterment programs in Montana to date has been \$250 million. There is one measure of how reclamation pays for itself.

Let us look at the payout picture on a few of reclamation's Montana projects. The Frenchtown project—not far from my hometown, incidentally—was built at a cost of \$282,000. The water users have contracted to pay back to the Treasury \$297,000—yes, \$297,000—more than the original cost of the project works. So far, they have repaid \$102,000, and they keep building up that sum every year. Meanwhile, the businesses and communities in the surrounding area grow and prosper as a result of the stabilized economy fostered by irrigation agriculture.

Stabilized agriculture made possible by irrigation, sets a chain reaction in motion. When a farmer knows his water supply for next year, and the year after, is assured, he has a good idea what kind of a crop year he can expect, and how much income he will have. He can purchase the machinery and equipment he will need, service and related industries in the area can expand their inventories to meet the predictable needs of the farmers, and the economic benefits are

felt not only in the immediate trade area, but also across the State and the entire Nation. Had Life magazine been interested in giving a true evaluation of the worth of the reclamation program, they would have done well to hire the services of an agricultural economist. He could have given them an insight into the economic facts of life very quickly.

Let us get back to examples of direct payout for Montana reclamation projects. Water users on the Huntley project, in the south-central part of the State, have contracted to pay back \$1,788,000 for water storage facilities and an irrigation distribution system built for them at an original cost of \$1,884,000. So far they have paid back \$1,217,000 of this—nearly three-quarters of the total.

On the lower Yellowstone project—in the eastern part of Montana, with a portion of it spreading over into western North Dakota—water users have contracted to pay back \$3,828,000 for facilities built at an original cost of \$3,589,000. So far, \$3,070,000 has already been returned to the Treasury, more than three-quarters.

Incidentally, I am quoting repayment figures compiled at the end of fiscal year 1962. I do not happen to have later figures on payout in front of me now, but you may be sure that in each case the water users have paid back more than the sums I am quoting.

On the Minidoka project in my neighboring States of Idaho and Wyoming, there are repayment contracts in force totaling \$34,466,000. The total project cost of \$37 million includes Minidoka power facilities amounting to \$3,125,017, of which \$2,773,000 has been repaid.

An offshoot of the Minidoka project, the North Side pumping unit, celebrated its 10th anniversary just a few days ago. It was developed following World War II and gave many war veterans a valuable homesteading opportunity. Last year the 72,154 acres of irrigated unit lands contributed crops having a gross farm value of \$10,309,270 to the national economy. Most of the acreage was in forage crops, vegetables, sugarbeets, and seed crops—which do not contribute to any crop surpluses. On the Minidoka project as a whole, crops produced in 1962 had a gross value of \$114,740,464.

Let us move down to Arizona and the Salt River project, the granddaddy of the reclamation program, built in the first years of this century when reclamation was established by Congress to bring water to the great empty West.

The original \$16.5 million cost of Salt River's irrigation and power facilities has been completely paid out. The Salt River Valley water users have been running their own project since 1917, and have built four more storage dams, additional power facilities, and at least two-thirds of the present distribution system. Through 1962, the cumulative value of crops grown on Salt River project lands had reached the enormous total of \$1,935,812,042. But this is by no means the most significant aspect of the Salt River story. The project is located in and around Phoenix, as you know—the fastest growing metropolitan area in the en-

tire United States. When reclamation first built the Salt River project, Phoenix was a dusty desert town of 12,000 people. Today, the Phoenix metropolitan area supports a population of more than 700,000 people. And what has made this fantastic growth possible? Just water. Water originally developed by reclamation, first to make the desert green with crops, then later—in ever-increasing volumes—to supply the domestic and industrial needs of the city and its surrounding towns.

The Phoenix story illustrates the magnitude of reclamation's role in the development of the West, totally above and beyond its original purpose of irrigation. Last year reclamation projects supplied 474 billion gallons of water for the municipal and industrial use of over 10 million people. Let me point out to you a fact about population growth that may have escaped general attention. Everyone seems to be concerned about the rate of growth of our eastern seaboard. We hear talk about a "megalopolis"—one solid city—reaching from Portland, Maine, to Richmond, Va. But fast as the population may be growing in the Eastern United States, the population of the West is growing twice as fast. In the East, we have twice as many people as we had at the turn of the century—in the West, four times as many. This is not an alarming statistic. This is fine, exactly as it should be. There is still plenty of wide open space in the West. It is logical for our excess numbers to migrate out to where there is room for growth. They are doing it in greater and greater numbers, and they are opening new businesses, new jobs, new opportunities for the young. The West is becoming an increasingly greater factor in the economic prosperity of the Nation, where once it was a hostile, empty waste, totally dependent on the resources of the East. The difference is written in one word: water. And the water development program of the Bureau of Reclamation has been the greatest single factor in Western development and prosperity.

That is just one more yardstick for measuring the vast indirect benefits that reclamation has brought to the Nation.

To get back to the payout picture let me just run quickly through a few more projects in other States to demonstrate how reclamation pays for itself all over the West.

The Yuma project in southwestern Arizona—another of Reclamation's earliest undertakings. Built at an original construction cost of \$5.5 million, it has been entirely paid out by the water users.

The Baker project, Oregon: total to be repaid by contract, \$225,000; repaid as of June 30, 1962, \$147,000.

Boise project, Idaho: repayment contracts, \$30,339,000; repaid, \$15,398,000.

Carlsbad, N. Mex.: to be repaid by contract \$3,747,000; repaid, \$2,175,000.

Fruitgrowers, Colorado: contract, \$198,000; repaid, \$91,000.

Humboldt, Nev.: contract, \$1,334,000; repaid, \$660,000.

Strawberry Valley, Colo.: contract, \$3,349,000; repaid, \$3,044,000.

Orland, Calif.: contract, \$3,291,000; repaid, \$1,919,000.

North Platte, Nebr.: contract, \$26,207,000; repaid, \$17,319,000.

And so it goes, for projects large and small all over the West. They have either paid for themselves, or they are doing so.

Life magazine, for obvious reasons, fails to mention such projects. In fact, the article does not mention one single completed, functioning project in its imaginary chamber of horrors. The three it singles out are either still under construction, or only authorized—projects which have not yet had the chance to prove their worth.

Attacks of this sort are an old, old story. A time-honored saying has it that it is not fair to attack dead men, when they cannot stand up to defend themselves. The same applies to newborn babies. They cannot defend themselves either.

There are many people still around who remember the debates when Reclamation's great Boulder Canyon project came up for authorization. It was called a gigantic boondoggle, by its uncomprehending critics, a harebrained scheme to rob the taxpayers; the water and power to be developed there were not needed and never would be needed; the project could not possibly pay for itself—and so on.

But what has happened? The total cost of project facilities—including the giant Hoover Dam and powerplant—was \$172 million. By June 30, 1962, \$110 million had been paid back. Twenty-five million dollars of this was principal, \$85 million interest. The entire principal will be paid out by 1989, and by then the interest paid back will total \$143.5 million. So the project will pay back nearly twice its cost—and the revenues thereafter will go to develop other water supplies so badly needed in the Southwestern United States.

I want to mention just one other reclamation project that has been so vital to western development: the Colorado-Big Thompson project. To pay for the irrigation facilities on the Big T, there are repayment contracts in force totaling \$29 million. To date \$3 million has been repaid, and the total will be paid out within 50 years of the time of project development. Commercial power investment in the Big T is \$60.5 million. Ten and three-fourths million dollars of the principal has been repaid, plus \$15.25 million in interest. The total will be paid back on schedule—within 50 years—in addition to \$32.5 million in interest.

But the real story of the Colorado-Big Thompson is told in terms of drought and the value of crops saved. This life-saving project has been worth \$126 million to northeastern Colorado. During the drought years of 1954, 1955, and 1956, Big T facilities brought vital water to some \$41 million worth of crops each year. There is another drought in the area this year—a bad one. Bad, that is, to those farms outside the area served by the Big T. I have an article here from the Denver Post of August 4 under the headline "Drought Nullified in Northern Colorado by Big Thompson Water." It tells us that the experts

agree that without the Big T this year "losses from lack of water would be catastrophic in one of the richest and most diversified farm areas of the West."

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

DROUGHT NULLIFIED IN NORTHERN COLORADO BY BIG THOMPSON WATER

(By Bert Hanna)

With thousands of acres of Colorado land scorched by drought, the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project is proving a lifesaver to a vast agricultural area of northern Colorado.

Without this complex of reservoirs, canals and tunnel diversion from the western to the eastern slope, experts agree that losses from lack of water would be catastrophic in one of the richest and most diversified farm areas of the West.

The "Big Tom" is taxed to its limit this year to supplement streams that have dwindled to trickles and to supply water needed for a profitable harvest.

The region 7 office of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation points to this project as the prime example of agricultural stabilization in the West.

They also cite it as justification for the planned future water resources development of the South Platte River involving the downstream Narrows Dam and upstream Two Forks Reservoir—a project that would conserve thousands of acre-feet of water for Colorado use.

It is estimated that last year Big Thompson project water increased by more than \$22 million the value of crops grown in the 720,000-acre area under the Northern Colorado Water Conservation District.

This year, that figure is expected to be significantly higher and to represent the difference between virtual crop failure for many farmers and normal production.

The actual 1963 deliveries of project water so far have amounted to nearly 150,000 acre-feet of water. The project spreads over a tier of counties, including Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, Summit, Washington, and Weld.

Normally, deliveries from the system would be about 200,000 acre-feet annually. But because of the drought, the maximum allotment was declared at the beginning of the irrigation season—or 310,000 acre-feet.

It is estimated that at least 300,000 acre-feet will be delivered this season—a record.

Last year, the take from the Big Thompson was 283,000 acre-feet, but much of this water went into private storage of small irrigation companies.

This year, that storage is being consumed along with direct deliveries. The estimated 160,000 acre-feet of storage water used, plus the direct diversion, would be the equivalent of direct stream use. Thus the project is supplying about half the water needed to mature crops. Normally, the project water utilization is 28 percent of need.

The Reclamation Bureau points up an experiment conducted under Bureau auspices on water use and value by a farmer near Eaton, Colo., to determine how much additional production is obtained from an acre-foot of project water.

It was found that in the past year, the benefits in this case ranged all the way from \$17 per acre-foot on such crops as oats to around \$79 for potatoes. For diversified production on this farm, it was estimated that the value in terms of additional crop production was about \$60 per acre-foot.

However, this was a controlled experiment, it was pointed out, and the average throughout the district was scaled down to about 60 percent of this farmer's result.

H. P. (Pat) Dugan, Denver regional director for the Reclamation Bureau and George R. Highley, Big Thompson project manager, say that each year since completion of the full facility in 1955, the increased gross value of crop production due to project water has amounted to more than the original repayment contract.

The total value of crops harvested in the irrigated area totaled \$78,602,244 in 1962, or an average of \$109.17 per irrigated acre.

Bureau officials also stress the importance of crop diversification which is brought about by supplemental irrigation. Delivery of project water was made to farms on which 35 different crops were grown.

Irrigated sugarbeets continue to be the most valuable cash crop and corn ensilage the most valuable feed crop. Sugarbeets harvested from 114,094 acres accounted for \$26,856,107 of the total gross crop value in 1962. Other valuable crops include cucumbers, onions, and dry beans.

Livestock feeding on a large commercialized scale is a vital industry, consuming much of the agricultural feed products. The beef, poultry and dairy products sold or processed add much to the area's economy.

Thus, reclamation officials assert that projects such as the "Big Tom" do not contribute materially to the Nation's crop surplus because they permit a diversified agricultural economy to meet national needs.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I point out the virtues and the solid financial value of the Colorado-Big Thompson project to the western economy because Life has seen fit to attack the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, authorized by Congress last year. Fryingpan-Arkansas is, in its essentials, a sister project to Colorado-Big Thompson. It will divert water through the Continental Divide—just as the Big T does—to irrigate the fertile plains of southeastern Colorado. And it holds every promise of being just as valuable to the economy of the southeastern part of that State as the Big T has been to the northeastern part. It too will pay for itself, just as the Big T is doing; and it will pay off in direct and indirect benefits to the National economy in sums many times over the original investment.

Life states that Fryingpan-Arkansas will make Colorado water "that now flows west flow east and \$170 million will flow out of U.S. taxpayers' pockets." I believe that no further words are necessary to demonstrate the irresponsibility of that statement, nor of the other charges set forth in Life's unworthy efforts to link "pork barrel" with the water resource developments of the Bureau of Reclamation.

ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE HARLAN AT AMERICAN BAR CENTER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 13, Mr. Justice John Marshall Harlan gave the dedicatory address of the William Clarke Mason Wing and the American Bar Foundation William Nelson Cromwell Library of the Bar Center in Chicago, Ill., as part of the activities of the annual convention of the American Bar Association.

Mr. Justice Harlan's speech is a magnificent reminder of the nature of our constitutional system of government and the demands made upon those who would preserve this system, the key-

stone of our liberties. Particularly at this time, when both national and international unrest might cause lesser men to agree to, or to seek, easy solutions which would destroy our entire constitutional fabric, we should be especially grateful for Mr. Justice Harlan's reminder.

As Members of the Congress, it is incumbent upon us to review thoroughly the constitutional basis for every legislative proposal. As we attend to our task of legislating, I feel it would be helpful to pause and reflect upon the wisdom of the remarks of Mr. Justice Harlan. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be inserted in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF JOHN M. HARLAN, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE AMERICAN BAR CENTER, AUGUST 13, 1963

A role similar to that in which I find myself this afternoon has twice before been filled by members of our Court. In 1953 Mr. Justice Jackson spoke at the laying of the cornerstone of the American Bar Center. He was followed in 1954 by the present Chief Justice of the United States who dedicated the original buildings of the center. Today I have the honor of addressing you on the occasion marking the addition of two fine new facilities to this important part of the American Bar Association's establishment. In the 10-year interval this notable enterprise has come to fruition in a rapid and impressive manner, so that what is now said about its significance need no longer be confined to the promise of the future but should also embrace the present.

Few who know the American scene would, I think, dispute the generalization that the Constitution of the United States has proved to be the great instrument of government it has largely because it was the product of men who in a revolutionary era were able to preserve a sense of moderation and proportion. They were content to strike the balance between orderly government and individual liberty in terms of broad outlines, leaving the framework to be filled in by future generations. Their farsighted handiwork has proved fully equal to meeting the needs of the Nation in periods of domestic tranquility, unrest, and strife as well as in times of international peace and war, and under it the country has attained a position of preeminence in world affairs.

We are again in an era of international unrest and domestic uncertainty. Our system of government is being challenged from abroad and readjustments of one kind or another are facing us at home. Only the fainthearted could doubt our ability to cope with both. Yet it would be shortsighted not to recognize that times like these are bound to produce temptations and pressures to depart from or temporize with traditional constitutional precepts or even to shortcut the processes of change which the Constitution establishes. Is it not the special responsibility of lawyers, whether on or off the bench, to see to it that such things do not happen?

One of the current notions that holds subtle capacity for serious mischief is a view of the judicial function that seems increasingly coming into vogue. This is that all deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts. The principal theme of these remarks will be to challenge the validity of that thesis from the three principal standpoints that are most frequently heard in its support. These are: Doubt whether

the federal system is any longer adequate to meet the needs of modern American society; impatience with the slowness of political solutions generally; and an urge for quick and uncompromising panaceas for things that call for reform. I venture to say at the outset that this cosmic view of the place of the judiciary is not only inconsistent with the principles of American democratic society but ultimately threatens the integrity of the judicial system itself.

Our Federal system, though born of the necessity of achieving union, has proved to be a bulwark of freedom as well. We are accustomed to speak of the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment as the principal guarantees of personal liberty. Yet it would surely be shallow not to recognize that the structure of our political system accounts no less for the free society we have. Indeed, it was upon the structure of government that the founders primarily focused in writing the Constitution. Out of bitter experience they were suspicious of every form of all-powerful central authority and they sought to assure that such a government would never exist in this country by structuring the Federal Establishment so as to diffuse power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The diffusion of power between Federal and State authority serves the same ends, and takes on added significance as the size of the Federal bureaucracy continues to grow.

Federalism as we know it in this country does not, however, have to find justification only in terms of history or of its significance as an instrument of freedom. What other political system could have afforded so much scope to the varied interests and aspirations of a dynamic people representing such divergencies of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and at the same time unified them into a Nation blessed with material and spiritual resources unparalleled in history?

A Federal system is of course difficult to operate, demanding political genius of the highest order. It requires accommodations being made that may often seem irksome or inefficient. But out of that very necessity usually comes pragmatic solutions of more lasting value than those emanating from the pens of the best of theoretical planners. Unless we are prepared to consider the diversified development of the United States as having run its course and to envisage the future of the country largely as that of a welfare society we will do well to keep what has been called "the delicate balance of Federal-State relations" in good working order. The association took a notable step in this direction yesterday when it rejected with an unequivocal voice a proposal which in the name of preserving our Federal system would actually destroy it.

Apart from what they regard as the shortcomings of the Federal system some well-meaning people apparently believe that the judicial rather than the political process is more likely to breed better solutions of pressing or thorny problems. This is a compliment to the judiciary but untrue to democratic principle. That point of view is some times difficult for judges to resist for it carries ostensibly authentic judicial hallmarks—the function of statutory construction and the power of judicial review. If the Congress or a State legislature has passed an inadequate statute why should it not be revised by judicial construction? If the statute is one that is manifestly unwise, harsh, or out of date, why should it not be abrogated by the exercise of the power of judicial review? It is said that there can be nothing wrong with the courts so acting because whatever they may do can always be undone by legislative enactment or constitutional amendment.

The objections to such alluring but deceptive plausibilities are more deep seated than might appear at first blush. For in the end

what would eventuate would be a substantial transfer of legislative power to the courts. A function more ill suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be, aloof from the political arena and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct. Such a course would also denigrate the legislative process, since it would tend to relieve legislators from having to account to the electorate. The outcome would inevitably be a lessening, on the one hand, of judicial independence and, on the other, of legislative responsibility, thus polluting the bloodstream of our system of government. We should be on guard against any such deliberate or unwitting folly.

The late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, once observed that "one of the greatest statements that was ever made by anybody was: 'Just a minute.'" He was referring to the catalytic effect of time as a factor in the legislative process. The same factor is important in the judicial process. A judicial decision which is founded simply on the impulse that "something should be done" or which looks no further than to the "justice" or "injustice" of a particular case is not likely to have lasting influence. Surely Mr. Justice Holmes, a man of unsurpassed judicial sensitivity, was not being untrue to that quality when he wrote to a friend: "I have said to my brethren many times that I hate justice, which means that I know if a man begins to talk about that, for one reason or another he is shirking thinking in legal terms." Our scheme of ordered liberty is based, like the common law, on enlightened and uniformly applied legal principle, not on ad hoc notions of what is right or wrong in a particular case. The stability and flexibility that our constitutional system at once possesses is largely due to our having carried over into constitutional adjudication the common-law approach to legal development.

Woodrow Wilson in an academic address dealing with the function of colleges in the training of men for the "Nation's Service" epitomized that approach in these eloquent words: "But not all change is progress, not all growth is the manifestation of life. Let one part of the body be in haste to outgrow the rest and you have malignant disease, the threat of death. The growth that is a manifestation of life is equable, draws its springs gently out of the old fountains of strength, builds upon old tissue, covets the old airs that have blown upon it time out of mind in the past. Colleges ought surely to be the best nurseries of such life, the best schools of the progress which conserves. Unschooled men have only their habits to remind them of the past, only their desires and their instinctive judgments of what is right to guide them into the future; the college should serve the State as its organ of recollection, its seat of vital memory. It should give the country men who know the probabilities of failure and success, who can separate the tendencies which are permanent from the tendencies which are of the moment merely, who can distinguish promises from threats, knowing the life men have lived, the hopes they have tested and the principles they have proved."

How do the thoughts which I have so generally, and doubtless inadequately, expressed fit the occasion we are observing today? May I put to you in summary fashion, even at the risk of seeming guilty of oversimplification, several ways in which I believe that these fast-moving times especially call for leadership on the part of lawyers and particularly by the American Bar Association which speaks the national voice of the profession.

First it seems to me that every public-spirited lawyer should keep himself abreast of current constitutional trends. Since as Chief Justice Hughes once said, "The Constitution is what the judges say it is," you

will not consider it brash of me to suggest that the bar generally should have more than a newspaper, radio, or television acquaintance with the important constitutional decisions of the day. While this may be regarded by many lawyers as having little relevance to their practice, such an awareness is quite essential if the profession is to play its full part in the shaping of things to come. The Nation and the courts themselves should not lack the informed best thought of the bar in the current swift pace of constitutional litigation.

Second, constructive criticism of judicial decisions, as with other aspects of the work of the courts, is a good thing for the judiciary and for healthy development of the law. Only a warped judicial outlook could think otherwise. But it is surely equally true that ill-informed or intemperate criticism of the doings of the courts only serves to breed misunderstandings and ultimately disrespect for law. Is it claiming too much to say that the judiciary is entitled to count on the bar sternly setting its face against that sort of irresponsibility from any quarter?

Third, much of the useful criticism of judicial decisions, whether from the standpoint of substance or professional quality, now comes from the law schools. I believe it would be of great value were their output to be supplemented on an organized basis by bar critiques bringing to bear the points of view of active practitioners on important cases.

Fourth, there have been few periods when the public has shown as much interest in the work of the courts as at the present time. This makes it important that the news coverage of the courts should be done without sensationalism, and that the accounts of their decisions should be as accurate as possible. With notable exceptions, it is fair to say that the quality of legal news-reporting is generally not as good as it should be. I believe it would be a worthwhile project for this association to explore with some of the principal news media ways and means of improving the situation.

In conclusion, the leadership of the bar at the community level is becoming more and more a thing of importance in connection with many of the burning issues of the period. The readjustments that some of such issues call for will never be satisfactorily accomplished by the excesses of pressure groups on whichever side of the matter they may be. Their solution requires objectivity, understanding, patience, willingness to reckon with the just demands of history, and, above all, insistence upon steadfastness to the orderly processes of our system. The bar has a peculiar responsibility for furnishing these qualities in great measure. I have no doubt that by serving the bar as its "organ of recollection," its "seat of vital memory," the American Bar Center can play a large part in enabling this association to fulfill that responsibility and in keeping our institutions on even keel.

Thank you for this opportunity of addressing you.

ALAN H. NEWCOMB'S REPLY TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the wisest commentators upon the passing scene is Alan H. Newcomb, the public affairs director of station WBT—WBTV, Charlotte, N.C. On August 21, 1963, Mr. Newcomb broadcast his reply to a communication received by him from the Department of Justice. This broadcast demolished in a most effective and lucid manner the arguments upon which the Attorney General relies in his effort to

find a constitutional basis in the interstate commerce clause for the so-called public accommodations provisions of the administration's civil rights bill. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Newcomb's broadcast entitled "The Attorney General's Reply" be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection a copy of such broadcast was ordered printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPLY

We have received a communication from the Department of Justice questioning our position taken in a previous editorial on the use of the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing integration in public accommodations business.

After a careful study of the Attorney General's legal memorandum, and with all due respect for his position, we find it impossible to modify the opinion that we previously expressed.

Let us emphasize again that this station is not opposed to full civil rights for Negroes. On the contrary, we favor it. Our argument was that the use of the interstate commerce clause as a weapon to force compliance in matters not affecting interstate commerce would set a precedent dangerous to all American liberties.

The issue seems to be this: does segregation in public accommodations have an effect on interstate commerce justifying the use of the clause to protect trade across State lines?

We still believe it does not.

The Attorney General uses several illustrations to prove his point. He says that a segregated restaurant will not serve as many customers as an integrated restaurant and will therefore not buy as much out-of-State food; hence to that extent segregation interferes with the movement of interstate commerce.

We doubt that he can establish that thesis. In the first place, it is not at all certain that a restaurant will have more customers after integration than before. In the second place, all those people must eat, whether in an integrated or a segregated restaurant, or at home. The same amount of food will be consumed in any case, and interstate commerce will not be affected.

As another illustration the Attorney General cites the report that in six southern States that practice segregation, new construction contracts for the first quarter of 1961 were 11 percent below those of the first quarter of 1960, though the national average was up two-tenths of 1 percent. Therefore fewer building materials moved in interstate commerce, and segregation was to blame.

That is only a post hoc argument, because no connection has been shown between segregation and the drop in building contracts for that quarter. And why did he go back to a particular 3-month period in 1961 to get his figures. What about the other three quarters of 1961?—or all four quarters of any year?

We submit, therefore, that the Attorney General has not made a case for invoking the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing private business to integrate.

We hold to our opinion that this use of the clause makes it a dangerous weapon which in unscrupulous hands could undermine the very civil liberties that the proposed bill is intended to safeguard.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on August 15, I complimented my freshman colleague in the House, M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, of Kentucky, for his ef-

forts to bring to the attention of that body and the country what appeared to him to be the unwise use of taxpayers funds. As I pointed out at that time, some of his revelations of Government spending appeared almost fantastic and I checked them with the Comptroller General, who verified the gentleman's statements in all instances except one.

Subsequently, there has been brought to my attention a page 1 article in the August 19 issue of the Louisville Times in reference to my insertion in the RECORD of the Comptroller General's letter to me. This article is a biased presentation of only a part of the facts. It appears to be an effort to discredit the gentleman from Kentucky when in truth and in fact he should be applauded for his efforts on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of all taxpayers of this country.

The Louisville Times article omits that the Comptroller General indicates that we are being charged \$57,000 to cancel the inexcusable contract for the purchase of the 1,000 TV sets for a country with no electricity. While the Louisville Times tries to explain the necessity of the other expenditures, I think a more correct statement would be that the Comptroller General verified the charges of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. President, if this news article had appeared on the editorial page, there could be no complaint; but for this story to be represented as factual news reporting is a disservice to the gentleman from Kentucky and to his constituents who might read the article.

Mr. President, I want to commend any Member of either body, regardless of political affiliation, who is endeavoring to promote fiscal sanity and fiscal soundness. I, therefore, hope the gentleman from Kentucky will continue his exposures of wasteful spending.

NOT ALL EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS ARE ALIKE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, of Alexandria, Va., is a distinguished citizen of my home State. He served as superintendent of schools in three South Dakota cities before becoming president of Sioux Falls College. He is author of two books about his home State and was president of the South Dakota Education Association.

On active duty during World War II and the Korean war he also directed the school and college relations program for the U.S. Navy Recruiting Service and left the Navy as a commander U.S. Navy Reserve. Later he served with honor and distinction as Governor of American Samoa followed by a term as Governor of Guam.

As a student of history, government, and international relations, Governor Lowe's position paper on "Putting the Lunatic Fringes on the Far Right and the Far Left Into Perspective" should prove useful material for Senators and Congressmen to have in mind as they discuss the pertinent issues of our time. I request permission to have the article

printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PUTTING THE LUNATIC FRINGES OF THE FAR RIGHT AND FAR LEFT INTO PERSPECTIVE

(By Richard Barrett Lowe)

During the depression years before World War II there was a comparable balance between the far rightists and the far leftists in the United States. The lunatic fringe on the right mainly were Fascist agitators who got inspiration from the philosophies of Hitler and Mussolini, while the leftists were Communist inspired.

History dealt a blow to the Fascist agitators in the United States. With Russia as an ally in World War II the prestige of the leftists was enhanced, while the rightists were almost totally submerged. In the meantime the leftists somehow were able to give the public impression that they were intellectuals while the rightists became labeled as "squares." The leftists, duped by Communist propaganda, became apologists for Soviet chicanery, treatybreaking and satellite oppression. They supported the movement to decolonialize all non-self-governing people who sought freedom, self-determination and independence outside the satellite bloc, but never were they heard to cry out against Soviet and Chinese oppression behind the Communist curtains, nor to object to the infiltration of underdeveloped nations to bring about the communistic controls of the police state.

Since World War II the United States, within the framework of the United Nations, has supported the concept of self-determination which has resulted in the complete independence of 43 new nations in the free world. Independence for the Filipino people, planned prior to World War II was an initial unilateral step forward by the United States.

During this same period the Soviet Union has been swallowing up whole nations behind the Iron Curtain in violation of agreements and without allowing for a free vote of the people concerned. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and to some extent Yugoslavia—all have been made Soviet satellites, where the people have no opportunity for freedom, self-determination, or independence, to say nothing of freedom for education. A similar fate in Asia has overtaken North Korea, North Vietnam, Manchuria, Sakhalin, the Kuril Islands, and Tibet. Laos is fighting for its life because the Soviet Union has not upheld its agreements. The hammer and sickle, under police state controls, dominates the people of Cuba, and menaces the governments and people of the Western Hemisphere. Even now the Communists are attacking our relationships with Puerto Rico. Hundreds of thousands of refugees have managed to escape from behind the Communist curtains, while hundreds of millions of others have had no choice but to exist under the tyranny of Communist dictatorship.

For 18 years the United States, the United Nations, and the Soviets have supported the principle of self-determination for all people outside the Communist bloc, but the Communists, while agitating continually for the freedom of others, have given no opportunity for self-determination to the imprisoned people of their own satellites and have, in fact, extended their system of tyranny whenever and wherever they could. The Hungarian Revolution is a case in point, and it may be asked how long Castro would last if the Soviets removed themselves and their police state system from Cuba.

Even in the discussions regarding the nuclear test ban treaty the Soviets made it

clear that their willingness to sign did not in any way change their long range objective to communize the world. With over one-third of the world's population under Communist domination, and the rest under continuous pressure it behooves the United States and the free world to look after their knitting. It seems obvious that the radicals in the lunatic fringe on the left, with all the power of the Communist propaganda machine behind them, are a real menace to our national security and well-being, as well as to the rest of the free world.

Millions of words have been spoken and written about Communist infiltration, subversive activities and dangers to the American way of life. Among these millions of words is the House Committee on Un-American Activities "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" (revised December 1961) which lists 871 organizations. Of these about 94 percent are Communist or Communist front (left wing) organizations; 2½ percent are Fascist, mostly prewar German or Italian; another 2½ percent are totalitarian mostly prewar Japanese; and 1 percent believe in violence to deprive citizens of their constitutional rights. The German and Japanese inspired organizations have mostly disappeared. This guide also lists 122 publications cited as Communist or Communist front by Federal authorities and 25 listed by State or territorial investigating committees.

The last available Attorney General's consolidated list of subversive organizations names 287 groups of which over 81.5 percent are Communist or Communist front. Most of the Fascist or totalitarian organizations (15.3 percent) under German, Japanese, or Italian inspiration have disappeared, leaving perhaps less than 10 percent which either believe in fascism, totalitarianism, or extremism in general. This does not include the new extreme rightists which so far have not been publicly classified as subversive.

While the above percentages may not show the true picture it must be recognized that the total substance of the radical leftwing movement in this country is appalling. Little wonder that they grasp the opportunity to promote the attack on the new radical rightist movement—it transfers the spotlight from them to another reprehensible movement, new and small as it may be, compared to the pernicious long-term activities of the radical leftists. Currently their guns are mostly leveled at the John Birchites, all of whose supporters are not lunatic fringe rightists any more than all of the supporters of the Americans for Democratic Action are lunatic fringe leftists.

While many liberal politicians have found the rightist movement to be a made-to-order issue, interestingly enough, two of the most potent attacks on the extreme rightists came from speeches in the U.S. Senate by MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota¹ and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California.² One odd example of the hate techniques of the extreme rightists is an attack on Senator BARRY GOLDWATER because of his Jewish ancestry despite the fact that he was born a Christian and has always been one. This smacks of KKK'ism, but is of domestic rather than of international significance. The Ku Klux Klan, while talking about 100 percent Americanism, is chiefly interested in maintaining white supremacy in violation of the legal and constitutional rights of the colored people. The KKK's seem to spend the rest of their time ranting about Catholics and Jews. The activities of this fringe on the right, it seems, may be compared with the

agitationist leftwing fringe which is using the civil rights issue to further the Communist cause.

THE "AGITATIONISTS"

In the civil rights issue the American people seem to be divided into three main groups—the segregationists, the moderates, and the integrationists. The segregationists of course, and many of the moderates and sincere integrationists find themselves on the defensive because of the radical left wing of the integrationists; the agitationists. The agitationists should be differentiated from most demonstrationists; although they are part of that movement—the radical part.

Because it is morally right the integrationist movement can be supported so long as it stays within reasonable bounds, but the agitationists who agitate for the sake of agitation are a menace to the American system of law, order, and domestic tranquility, and jeopardize the cause for which they agitate.

The agitationists of today may be compared with the radical wing of the Abolitionist Movement prior to the Civil War which because of its uncompromising temper helped prevent any other solution to the differences between the North and South than that of civil war.

The radical left wing agitationist movement of today may well prevent a satisfactory solution to the integrationist crusade because it tends to harden moderate men against a justifiable cause. Even if Congress passes a satisfactory civil rights bill much will remain to be done within the hearts and minds of the American people, white and colored alike.

In all likelihood the radical left wing of agitationists will not be satisfied with the passage of a good civil rights law, but will continue their covert promotion of overt violence, for immediate total organic acceptance within the entire social, political, and economic structure of the Nation regardless of the necessary period of adjustment to the legislation.

Communist propaganda is aimed at causing internal dissension, conflict and disaffection among all people outside the Communist satellite bloc. Within the bloc no opposition is tolerated. It is obvious that the worldwide Communist propaganda machine has in the American civil rights issue an ideal subject for continued agitation—and only those who are blind to the objectives of the Communists are likely to reach any other conclusion. This is not to say that all American agitationists are Communists.

The moderate colored leadership of the country is confronted with a tremendous problem—they must find some way to control the situation or the agitationists will continue to render great disservice to their cause. They must recognize that anyone who supports the agitationists is either too weak to stand up to them, agrees with them, or is one of them.

After all, in round numbers 90 percent of the American people are white and 99 percent plus of all the citizens, white and colored alike, are loyal Americans, but the 1 percent minus on the radical left, with Communist propaganda behind them, can create an inordinate amount of trouble for our country both domestically and internationally.

In the main the extreme rightists cannot be separated from the international picture any more than can the extreme leftists. The rightists are opposed to teaching about international understanding under the misguided concept that such teaching will undermine American patriotism. They are against foreign aid, the World Court, the United Nations and all its family of related agencies. Their basic philosophy is covered in the slogan—"Get the United States out

of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the United States."

One reason that educators currently seem to be more upset by the activities of this group than they appear to be with the leftists is because the new rightists attack at the local level, while the leftist activities are further removed and have become old hat. The rightists censor textbooks, visual aids, library books and the statements or supposed attitudes of teachers, thus putting local school systems, teachers and librarians on the defensive. Deluded as they are, most of these agitators think of themselves as patriotic Americans defending their national heritage against enemies from without. Unfortunately the lunatic fringe on the right succeeds, occasionally as does the lunatic fringe on the left, in obtaining support from good American citizens who are victimized by their fanatic propaganda.

For over three decades the extreme leftists have attempted to infiltrate their insidious propaganda into the schools in many devious ways. The fact that they have had some success probably is partly responsible for the present rash of rightist activities. In any event, the recent rightist attacks on the schools have become of sufficient importance to justify an organized attempt to cope with the "vigilantes, censors and critics" comparable to the organized attempts to cope with the Communists and Communist front activities which have been active so long.

Perhaps the best article related to the problem of putting the lunatic fringes of the far right and the far left into perspective is one by Alan F. Westin in Harper's magazine, April 1962, entitled "The Deadly Parallels; Radical Right and Radical Left." Mr. Westin points out "how the new breed of extremists are using the same tactics once tried by the radical left, and why the business community should be especially wary of such infiltration."

CONCLUSION

Without minimizing in any way the stupidity of the lunatic fringe on the right it should be noted that since World War II no rightist has been guilty of defecting, spying, aiding, or abetting any foreign power. It is the lunatic fringe on the left which has produced such enemies and traitors to our country in the international field. Yet it must be understood that both fringes, if either could be allowed to prevail, would lead America down the road to dictatorship. Fascism and communism converge at the point of totalitarianism. At that point, when the individual has lost his freedom, it makes little difference whether he is governed by a Fascist or a Communist police state. Americans must be alert to the dangers of "isms" foreign to our way of life no matter how they pose—whether under the swastika of the fascists or the hammer and sickle of the Communists.

A final point should be considered in attempting to put the lunatic fringes into perspective; patriotic Americans should not condemn the lunatic fringe on the right without simultaneously condemning the lunatic fringe on the left. Those who attack one and remain silent about the other appear to be guilty of being biased, dishonest, or stupid: Biased, because they see only good in one and evil in the other; Dishonest, because they do not want both sides to be disavowed; Stupid, because they have been duped by one side or the other. "A plague on both their houses."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I feel Governor Lowe's thoroughly objective and analytical presentation deserves the careful study and consideration of America's opinion makers and prominent public figures. These days we are hearing altogether too much demagogic nonsense about the alleged perils to our freedoms

¹ "The John Birch Society," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 8, 1961.

² "The Fright Peddlers," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 88th Cong., 1st sess., May 2, 1963.

represented by groups of citizens with whom we may happen to disagree. I submit, Mr. President, the right of dissent is as much of an American right as the right to speak freely or the right to consent. It is about time somebody in this country develops some criteria and standards by which to measure and evaluate the perils to our future, if any, involved in the fact that there are groups among us who articulately and violently disagree with prevailing public policy or even with prevailing public opinions and attitudes. It is simply an exercise in forensic fakery and an effort to deceive when prominent individuals attempt to balloon up into serious implications a group of dissenters who dare to be different—call them crackpots if you must—whose criticisms may jar our individual sensibilities but whose capacity to change the course of human history or to direct our country's destiny is obviously a nonexistent factor.

Two recent examples of what I consider baseless charges of this nature come quickly to my mind. The first was of course the regretful headline seeking attempt by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, to conjure up a nonexistent danger to America growing out of some actions by a Young Republican Convention of which he disapproves. I, also, disapprove of some of those actions and statements but to conclude that excesses of this type demonstrate a deterioration in the good sense of young Americans and comprise a danger to our freedoms is simply to demonstrate that those who make such assumptions have grown prematurely old and have lost personal touch with the fine citizens of our younger generation who as they grow older will moderate their statements, temper their actions, and become a stimulating and thoroughly patriotic influence in our body politic.

Likewise when men like Governor Rockefeller attempt to convince hard-headed Americans that mature citizens who join up with a John Birch Society or a flamboyant pro-American or anti-this-or-that organization compromise a movement likely to take over and make over the United States, he rendered a disservice to our country by leading people in other lands and of other nations to really believe this country has ceased to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I come happily from a State virtually devoid of hate groups or extremists of any type. I am not aware, for example, of the existence of a single John Birch Society chapter or club in my entire State. I, like most Americans, disagree with many of the methods and objectives of that organization but I also recognize the American right of people with whom I disagree to organize and to express their attitudes just so long as they employ no subversive forces to overthrow our Government and just so long as they are devoid of any foreign controls or connections which make them servants of a foreign cause or creed.

The other recent example of how excitable men may seek to build into unrealistic and imaginary proportions actions of which most good Americans dis-

approve grows out of the rather astonishing resolutions adopted at a recent Young Democratic Convention meeting in California. Naturally I am disturbed and saddened when the Young Democrat Clubs of America in convention assembled resolve to, first, resume diplomatic relations with Cuba; second, to propose a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations; third, to withdraw U.S. support of South Vietnam; fourth, to recognize Communist Red China; fifth, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and similar proposals which follow so faithfully and fully the Communist line mouthed by all American Communists and directed from international Communist headquarters in Moscow, Russia. I would hope that President Kennedy would repudiate these resolutions and denounce them as not representative of the great political party which he heads. I would also hope such repudiations and denunciations might come from other prominent Democrats in and out of public office. But whether such public scolding takes place or not will disclose primarily the profiles of courage applicable to these party leaders and whether it is forthcoming or not I am convinced these young Democrats will not control our national policies and that given 5 to 10 years of more maturity they, too, will become responsible and reliable members of our body politic.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me express the hope that in future statements by important people who feel compelled to dwell upon such comparatively insignificant developments on our domestic scene as flamboyant and excessive declarations of position by groups or organizations of our fellow citizens instead of making penetrating and intelligent observations and recommendations about public policies designed the better to serve America at home and abroad, such leaders will at least pay sufficient recognition to the good sense of most Americans to do two things:

First, devote themselves with equal vigor to the groups operating both at the extreme right and the extreme left of our political and economic spectrum dedicating to each end of the spectrum the attention and criticism it deserves on the basis of the importance and the success experiences demonstrated by each, and second, give Americans the demonstrable truth in making comparisons between the two extremes which will recognize the difference between those who would influence an election or promote a public policy by constitutional means and those who associate themselves with the causes and the creeds of those favoring the destruction of our way of life by force and violence. There is a real and growing difference, Mr. President, between groups operating on the American scene as indigenous dissenters and extremists and those operating on the American scene to promote the objectives and the policies of communism. It is the height of absurdity and the zenith of intellectual dishonesty even to suggest that the forces at opposite ends of the spectrum are equally dangerous and should be viewed and exposed with equal alarm.

Mr. President, there are many valid reasons for not comparing the voices of the far right to the voices of the far left as though they were of equal significance or equal danger. So far as I know, for example, no rightwing group in this country is financed or directed by an alien power; unfortunately, as every alert American knows, this cannot be said of a host of front organizations and crypto-Communist organizations at the extreme left.

Only the Communists and their dupes or followers have the force of an atomic bomb located on alien soil with the objective of burying America. Only the far left in the areas that it is influenced or infiltrated by Communists has as its patron saint a country guilty of the bloodiest, the boldest, and the biggest aggressive acts of human history. If some of our American spokesmen fail to recognize this basic difference or seek to obscure it for partisan advantage they can emphatically be advised of the basic differences involved between these groups at the far right and the far left by talking with the first Cuban refugee they meet. Only the groups associated with the Communist elements in our midst, Mr. President, take any satisfaction in having a Communist dictator like Castro 90 miles from Miami, Fla.

I hope, therefore, that Governor Lowe's presentation paper may help induce us all to recognize the realities involved and to devote less time to fighting political windmills and more time to helping all Americans to decide what policies and programs are best suited to maintain the strength, the freedom and the future of our great Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the unfinished business automatically comes before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into. It is Senate bill 1153.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

Sec. 2. Section 3(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1102(b)) is amended:

(1) by striking out the phrase "War and Navy Departments" wherever it appears in the subsection heading and text and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Defense".

(2) by striking out "such Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department".

Sec. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by striking out "1962", "1963", and "1964" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "1965", "1966", and "1967".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs."

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1), and the maximum United States share under subsection (a) (2)."

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting "not to exceed 75 per centum."

Sec. 5. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as (5) through (9), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and take-off of aircraft."

(2) by striking out "(5)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I propose a unanimous-consent agreement, that the proceedings today on the pending legislation extend through the third reading; that on Monday next, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be permitted to offer his amendment; and that 10 minutes be allowed for debate on each side on that amendment, even though we will have had the third reading of the bill. I also ask that rule XII, requiring a quorum call before fixing the time for a vote on passage of a bill, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to clear up one point. I have a minor amendment that probably will not take more than 5 minutes altogether. I wish to be sure that I will have an opportunity to offer it. If the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is not available today, I should like to have an opportunity to offer that amendment also on Monday. Does the acting majority leader know whether the Senator from Oklahoma will be available today for the purpose of acting on my minor amendment?

Mr. METCALF. I am quite sure that the Senator from Oklahoma will be present.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he intends to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the amendment I shall offer on Monday; yes.

Mr. GRUENING. I mean on today's amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On today's amendment I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be present on Monday morning, but I should like to make an inquiry. As I understand, there will be morning business on Monday, following which the Senate will take up the pending bill; and the Senator is suggesting that debate be limited to 10 minutes to a side. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. Yes; 10 minutes to a side.

Mr. KEATING. Can the Senator from Wisconsin advise the Senate what the nature of his amendment is?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My amendment is very simple. It reduces the airport grant program by one-third—from \$225 million to \$150 million.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. It is anticipated that there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the third reading of the bill (S. 1153), to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which shall be reached today, further consideration of the measure shall be postponed until the conclusion of morning business on Monday, August 26, 1963, at which time, notwithstanding the third reading of the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], to reduce the cost of the program by one-third.

Ordered further, That debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the majority leader, or someone designated by him, to be followed by a vote on final passage of the bill.

Mr. METCALF subsequently said:

Mr. President, I wish to supplement the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered by providing that after the pending bill has been read the third time, further proceedings on the bill be postponed until Monday, and that at that time the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] will be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] may proceed to make some remarks on another subject, and that I may speak briefly on it also, and that the time we consume be not charged to either side on the bill.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that the time that I consume and that the Senator from New York will consume

will not be charged to either side. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 10 days ago I introduced a new proposal, S. 2038, to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology—COST—which would provide for the Congress an independent, responsible, readily available means of obtaining scientific assistance.

In the years since the war, we have seen a fantastic spiralling growth of Federal spending for scientific research and development.

Congress has got to control the great and, in some cases, extravagant spending that is going on in this field and has got to do it in a responsible manner.

The Office of Science and Technology which I suggest, would provide, for a few thousand dollars, a way of obtaining the independent scientific advice which is so badly needed if responsible opposition is to ride herd on these programs costing ever more and more, billions and billions of dollars.

As it is now, we are just stumbling in the dark.

The proposal to establish COST has received in the last few days a remarkable amount of comment and attention.

I am pleased to say that as of last night, 12 of my colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this proposal. The support which they have shown illustrates the concern of all Senators of both parties with the growing and troubled ties between the Government and the sciences and guarantees that the Congress will, in due time, come to grips with the problems which these ties create.

The cosponsors are: The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Because some Senators are out of town, I have been asked to leave this proposal on the desk for 5 days longer, until Wednesday, August 28. I ask unanimous consent that S. 2038 be allowed to lie on the desk until Wednesday next.

This proposal to create a Science and Technology Office for the Congress is receiving attention in the House as well as the Senate. Congressman SIBAL, of Connecticut, has been in the forefront of these efforts. His bill, H.R. 6866, proposes to create a similar office to assist the Congress. Congressman WIDNALL, of New Jersey, has introduced a bill identical to S. 2038. It is H.R. 8066. It is important and significant that these two Congressmen are able and distinguished members of the Republican Party. The

COST proposal is not a partisan one: It is nonpartisan. It is not a Senate proposal; it is a congressional proposal. It does not narrow or lessen the authority of any committee, it does not upset the balance between the Houses: It provides, on a purely advisory basis, information and direction independent of the special pleaders and the already committed, for the use of every Member and every committee.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles commenting on these proposals may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first is an editorial from the eminently respected Science magazine, of June 28, 1963, the second from the National Observer, of August 5, 1963, the third from the Fairbanks News-Miner, of August 14, 1963.

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

[From Science, June 28, 1963]

DEVIL'S ADVOCATES

Increasingly the future shape of science is being determined by legislative actions taken by men who can be expected to have only a superficial knowledge of the technical facts embodied in their decisions. The Government provides about two-thirds of the support for the Nation's efforts in science and technology, and the fraction has been growing.

On the surface it would seem that more money for science is a good thing. Indeed, I have heard some scientists say that it would be almost impossible to provide too much support. However, the realities today are that in many areas of science and technology the crucial bottleneck is brains, not money. For instance, top-quality physicists are in short supply, and this deficiency is likely to continue. When Congress votes to expand activity in a field requiring first-rate physicists, it simultaneously makes the negative decision to remove them from other important endeavors.

It has been pointed out that the educational background of Members of Congress is heavily weighted toward the legal profession, with little representation from science. The remedy usually proposed is that more scientists should get into politics. On the surface this suggestion is attractive. One obvious difficulty is the time it would take for any considerable group to be elected. A second problem is that, in becoming politicians, the erstwhile scientists would in general lose their professional acuity. Moreover, there is no certainty that a man trained in science would bring as much wisdom to Congress as one trained in the law. Some of the most narrowminded, uncompromising, chauvinistic individuals in this world are scientists. Many research workers are deeply convinced that their narrow area of inquiry is the only one worth pursuing. I recently sat on a panel which cheerfully toyed with the desirability of channeling the total gross national product into a single area of scientific endeavor. A man representative of such a body of opinion would be a dangerous nuisance on the congressional scene.

The Government does not suffer from a quantitative lack of scientific information. Rather, the difficulty is that most of the advice comes from special pleaders. The executive branch has good counsel from the Bureau of the Budget and Jerome Wiesner's office, but the Congress has no independent impartial source of advice. Since the legislative branch cannot evaluate technical proposals, the temptation arises to employ phony arguments in advocating major projects. In scientific circles there is a tendency to be more concerned with the glamorous,

salable aspects of a proposal than with intrinsic merit.

It seems well to consider other ways of improving the scientific judgments of Congress. To make good decisions it is not necessary to digest all the facts. It is necessary to be well advised. One of the more promising methods would be to make available to Congress a special group of scientific counselors. These would supplement existing staff and would not be permanent Government employees. They could be nominated by such a body as the National Academy of Sciences on request of Congress. They might serve for short, intensive periods while retaining their professional connections. They would be expected to act as devil's advocates (the Washington Star recently made a similar suggestion), with a duty to insure that the public interest was well protected. If such a system could be properly implemented, a substantial improvement in the quality of science legislation might ensue.

[From the National Observer, Aug. 5, 1963]

SCIENCE PUZZLES: WHEN TECHNOLOGY Baffles CONGRESS IT'S TIME TO CALL FOR THE EXPERTS

Growing achievements in science breed a growing uneasiness among laymen. Between the far-off lure of space travel and the dubious prospect of manipulated heredity, the man in the street is hard put to understand developments that may vitally affect his future.

Congress is in the same boat, and additionally it has the job of sitting in judgment on the huge sums of Government money—an estimated \$14.7 billion last fiscal year—that make the dizzy pace of scientific and technological progress possible.

Complained Alaska's Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT last week: "We have water research bills, fish research bills, mineral development research bills, urban psychological study programs, supersonic airplane bills, satellite communication bills, air pollution, water pollution, environmental hazard bills, cancer, heart disease and mental health bills, retardation and epilepsy programs, moose conservation and forestry research bills. Who is to tell the Congress what is redundant, what is necessary, what is duplication, and what is vital?"

THE WHITE HOUSE PATTERN

The Democratic Senator expressed a mounting fear that decisions that could shape the future of our Nation are being made by anonymous experts and not by elected officials. His idea for a solution: Congress should hire its own experts. It should set up a Congressional Office of Science and Technology (COST) to advise Congress on scientific questions. The unit would be molded on the White House Office of Science and Technology, established last year to give the President a firmer hand in U.S. scientific decisions.

Senator BARTLETT presented figures showing this "incredible" growth in Federal research and development appropriations: Fiscal 1960-61, \$9.6 billion; 1961-62, \$11.2 billion; 1962-63, \$14.7 billion; 1963-64 (requested) \$17.4 billion. In the 1963-64 request, \$7.6 billion is for space activities.

DISTURBING BUT TRUE

"Neither man nor party," said the Alaskan, "will be able to halt or reverse the trend. . . . 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. Communication between the two must be improved and the Congress must inform itself—for its own protection and that of the people—on the activities of the sciences."

"Increasingly, policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and tech-

nology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country, but 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 the making of 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 elected representatives, but by unknown administrative officials.

"In this world of cataclysm, change, and of almost impossible complexity, representative democracy is put to severe test. How is a popularly elected government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they cannot understand with implications they do not comprehend?"

[From the Fairbanks News-Miner, Aug. 14, 1963]

CONGRESS NEEDS CONSULTANTS

Congress is beginning to worry about how to deal with a boom in Government-sponsored scientific research, and a bill by Senator E. L. BARTLETT that would give the Congress a small staff of professional consultants is a step in the right direction.

"It is disturbing but true," the Alaska Senator declared, "that at the present time the Congress does not understand science and it is also true that science does not understand Congress."

During the 1963 fiscal year, Congress was called upon to appropriate at least \$14.7 billion for scientific and technological research, a 31-percent increase over the previous year. An additional \$2.7 billion has been recommended by the President for fiscal 1964.

BARTLETT's measure would keep the scientific advisers totally separate from the executive branch. The congressional Office of Science and Technology, as he would term it, would enable the legislators to assign priorities. There would be less chance for hoodwinking.

BARTLETT noted that the representatives must consider water research bills, fish research bills, mineral development research bills, urban psychological study programs, supersonic airplane bills, satellite communication bills, air pollution, water pollution, environmental hazard bills, cancer, heart disease and mental health bills, retardation and epilepsy programs, moose conservation and forestry research bills.

The Senator and his colleagues might well ask: "Who is to tell the Congress what is redundant, what is unnecessary, what is duplication, and what is vital?"

BARTLETT, who has been openly critical of the administration's failure to take a clear stand on radioactive fallout protection guides, has cited four examples of scientific decisions "of grave implication," which he said were inadequately understood by the public or the majority in Congress when they were made.

These were (1) the apparent discarding of radiation protection guides in the measurement of fallout; (2) the high-level test of an atomic weapon which altered the Van Allen belt and disrupted radio signals; (3) the placing of millions of copper needles into space; and (4) the proposed construction of a harbor in Alaska by atomic explosion.

In voicing this concern, Senator BARTLETT does not stand alone. Last month the House Rules Committee passed a resolution seeking to create a select committee to make a "complete, full, and thorough investigation into the Federal Government's \$14.7 billion research effort." But in the Senate, the need for professional advice is even greater. The 435 Members of the House of Representatives

have more time to delve into special projects than do their counterparts in the Senate, who number only 100.

We agree with the Alaska Senator's conclusion, that if the Congress does not insist upon participating in these vital decisions, they will be made by lower echelon administrative officials and scientists. If Congress does not arm itself with an independent pool of scientific wisdom, great powers will pass on to those who make the decisions, "leaving but the mantle and circumstance for the Congress."

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SECTION 1. There is established in the legislative branch of the Government the Congressional Office of Science and Technology, which shall include an Office of Science and Technology of the Senate and an Office of Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, each of which shall be supervised by a Director.

SEC. 2. (a) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology of the House of Representatives shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Each Director shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the office. No person while serving as Director may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The gross annual compensation of each Director shall be \$——.

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the approval of the officer by whom he was appointed, each Director shall employ and fix the compensation of assistant directors and employees, and shall purchase furniture, equipment, books, stationery, and other supplies, as may be required by his office for the performance of its duties.

(b) No person may be appointed to or serve in any position in either office until the person has been determined to be qualified to have access to any information classified in the interest of national security as matter which may not be publicly disclosed. Upon written request made by the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall (1) cause to be conducted an investigation as the Director deems required to determine whether any person considered for service in, or serving in, the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate or of the House of Representatives is qualified to have access to such information, and (2) transmit to the requesting congressional officer a full and complete report of the investigation.

SEC. 4. (a) It is the duty of the Office of Science and Technology of each House of the Congress—

(1) upon request, to advise and assist any Member or committee of that House with respect to matters relating to science and technology;

(2) to make studies concerning matters relating to science and technology as may be directed by that House or any committee thereof;

(3) to maintain a register of scientific and technological consultants who have indicated a willingness to advise and assist committees and Members of that House; and

(4) to transmit to committees of that House reports concerning significant scientific or technological developments which

pertain to matters subject to the jurisdiction of such committees.

(b) The Office of Science and Technology of each House to the greatest practicable extent shall furnish to any joint committee of the Congress upon its request information and assistance as the joint committee may require with respect to matters relating to science and technology.

(c) The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall determine the priority to be given by the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, to directions and requests authorized by this section.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act. One-half of all appropriations of the Congressional Office of Science and Technology shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk until Wednesday next.

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

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend my colleague for the very constructive proposal which he has asked me to cosponsor and which I have been very happy to cosponsor.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is one of the 12 cosponsors.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his initiative in this matter.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] in cosponsoring legislation to establish in the legislative branch of the Government a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. Because the Government is today involved in many programs that concern scientific and technical issues, the Members of the Congress are often required to make decisions on complex technical points where they obviously cannot be great experts. Most of the testimony heard by congressional committees with respect to scientific efforts and programs is limited to Government officials or advisers who naturally want the largest possible sum for their agency. Many are eager to pursue their pet projects, more concerned to get ahead, than to eliminate needless costs. What the Congress needs—and I have often made this point—is something like a devil's advocate or perhaps it should be called a taxpayer's advocate—a group of experts whose job it should be to analyze scientific programs and requests for Government spending with a view to determining where Government cuts can be made and what programs are not worthwhile.

Senator BARTLETT's proposal to establish scientific advisers to the Congress would go part of the way to meet this need. I would like to suggest that it go a little bit further.

Instead of being modeled on the Office of Legislative Counsel, I would have it modeled more along the lines of the General Accounting Office, with the authority to undertake independent studies of scientific programs throughout the executive branch of the Government. I would also suggest that instead of merely consulting on a staff basis with the members of committees involved in scientific programs and expenditures, such a group would be expressly required to present testimony of its own evaluating and criticizing the requests of the executive branch. We have more chances than we frequently want to hear from Government officials who all want more money, but we seldom have any chance at all to hear enlightened well-informed experts arguing against specific parts of the program or suggesting changes. This is a necessary part of intelligent decision-making, and certainly should be carefully considered by the members of the Rules Committee.

The Constitution provides for due process of law in any court where life, limb, and property are concerned. We need something like that in the spending process, especially where technical scientific programs are involved. The taxpayers' pocketbook deserves a fair trial, and due process in spending needs people equally sharp and equally competent technically to argue on both sides regarding the funds Congress appropriates.

The establishment of a congressional office not merely to study and consult privately with Members of Congress, but also to present open testimony and even argument against executive agency requests in scientific programs, would be extremely beneficial for Congress and for the country.

Mr. President, this suggestion was first brought to my attention during hearings before the Senate Space Committee when one of the distinguished scientists, who was offering just this type of informed scientific advice, urged the Congress to consider a similar proposal. These hearings by the Space Committee in which distinguished scientists were called on to testify freely were extremely useful to the committee and I believe also enlightening to the country. I would like to see a continuation of this kind of advice to the country not only on general scientific questions, but also on specific programs and specific items in appropriation bills and other bills as they are brought before the Senate from time to time. Therefore, I commend the Senator from Alaska for bringing this proposal to our attention. I am happy to joint with him. I hope that he will give serious consideration to the proposal which I have made for a broadening of the duties of such an office, to permit it to be of even greater help to Congress in dealing with the scientific advances and problems which, over the years as we face the future, look as if they would become more complex and multiplied many times over.

I commend the Senator from Alaska for his initiative. I thank him for yielding.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am most pleased to have the Senator from New York as a cosponsor of the bill. His suggestions are provocative. I am sure they will be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration when hearings are held on the bill. I expect and hope that many more ideas will be advanced. I hope that hearings may be held within the reasonably near future.

The situation as I see it is exactly as described by the Senator from New York. We live in a world of science and technology. Ten years ago Congress appropriated approximately \$3.4 billion for scientific purposes of all kinds throughout the whole range of Government. Last year the appropriation amounted to more than \$14 billion. There is every indication that instead of leveling off or decreasing, the amount will likely increase.

As Senators know, there is no person or no group in Congress to whom we can turn for such information. We are not scientists. We must seek our scientific knowledge from others. We must discover where those others may be who can give us the kind of unprejudiced information that we really ought to have. I do not for a moment suggest that if the bill becomes law it will make scientists of any Members of this body; but it will afford us, conveniently at hand, a base of scientific knowledge derived from specialists in the field.

My bill was deliberately designed to establish a relatively small office to be directly under the control of Congress—small so that it would not cost too much money. It is not necessary to establish an extravagant office. We do not believe that will be necessary in order to provide highly useful and even essential information to Members of the Senate and the House.

I should mention that Representative SIBAL, of Connecticut, introduced a similar proposal in the House even before I introduced S. 2038. We have met to discuss the subject. I do not believe there will be any difficulty in reconciling our views with those of Representative SIBAL. In the House, Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, with whom the Senator from New York and I served in the House, has introduced in the House a companion measure to S. 2038. I hope we may make progress and that the bill will soon become law. I thank the Senator from New York for his contributions to the discussion.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

EXTENSION OF 4 YEARS OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

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 Com-

pact 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 (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 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: 'BETTY' FRINK

"(SEAL) "Secretary of State

"THE STATE OF ALASKA

"By WILLIAM A. EAGAN, 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 ORVALE 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 MEYER

"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: 3-6-62

"Attest: E. JAMES TRIMARCHI, JR.

"Secretary of State

"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

"By ARCHIE GUBBARD, GOVERNOR

"Dated: 3-26-62

"Attest: ESSIE WIENEMAN

"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.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on August 19 the House amended Senate Joint Resolution 33 by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the language of House Joint Resolution 220 as reported by its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In all substantive respects, Senate Joint Resolution 33 and House Joint Resolution 220 are identical. The sole difference is a slight change in the wording of section

3, which sets forth an amendment reserving to the Congress the right to alter, amend or repeal the first section of the legislation granting consent. The language adopted by the Senate Committee is identical to that in previous statutes approving and extending the compact. However, the Parliamentarian tells me the House language will accomplish the purpose and will do no harm.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I support Senate bill 1153, to extend for an additional 3 years the Federal program of providing matching grants for the construction of airport facilities.

Before touching on the details of the bill, I want to make a few general comments on the role of aviation in America today.

We hear much about new supersonic transports, the aircraft of the future which can whisk passengers across the continent or across the oceans at 2,000 miles per hour. We also hear much about the controversies over transatlantic air fares, and even about what carriers are going to fly from New York to Miami.

Without in any way minimizing the importance of these matters, I think it is crucial that we recognize that the revolution which air transportation is bringing to our Nation is not confined to the major cities and not restricted to the long-distance traveler. The heart of America—the hundreds of cities which cannot be called major air traffic centers—are also caught up in the advance of air transportation.

One of the principal avenues of growth, not only for the air transport industry but for commerce generally, lies in short-haul transportation and communication between smaller cities, or between the smaller city and its closest metropolitan neighbor.

The demands for short-distance air transportation are on the increase, not only because of the modern insistence on speed and convenience, but also because one alternative method of transportation, the passenger train, is phasing out of the picture in many areas of this country if, in fact, it has not already disappeared entirely in some.

The future reliance of many millions of our citizens for intercity transportation will inevitably be on air transportation, as it already is to a marked degree.

The hearings of our Aviation Subcommittee, last week and this week, on air service in New England dramatically highlighted this situation and provide firsthand evidence, from the grassroots of America, of the importance of air transportation to a major area of the Nation.

Adequate airport facilities are a basic first requirement for adequate and safe air transportation service; and the pending bill is part of the continuing effort of the Federal Government to carry out its share of the responsibility in this field. And let me say at this point that I do not regard Federal airport grants as gifts to a particular city, but rather as a proper and necessary effort to promote the commerce and the welfare of the entire Nation. The adequate airport benefits the traveler from afar, just as much as it benefits the community in which it is located.

The safety of air travel has always been a major concern to our committee; and the emphasis on safety aspects which have been written into this legislation in recent years is continued by the pending bill. But the safety of airports and air facilities has another side which is also important, though often overlooked. That is reliability and dependability. Witnesses in our hearings on air service in New England again and again stressed the need for dependability of air transportation schedules in marginal weather, as well as in good weather, as a key factor in air transportation. The Federal Airport Act plays a major role in this respect, because of the emphasis it places on the installation and establishment of facilities which contribute directly to safety, reliability, and dependability. Such things as in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and high intensity runway lighting all fall within this category, and can be installed with the aid of funds provided in this bill.

In my own State of New Hampshire, there is pressing need for improved facilities. We are seeking an instrument landing system for Manchester, and eventually hope for another at the Lebanon Regional Airport; flight service stations at Keene and Manchester and, when traffic warrants, at Laconia, and Berlin; a weather bureau forecasting facility for the State. These and other facilities are sorely needed. While some of the navigational aids are provided directly through the Federal Aviation Agency, many communities in New Hampshire and all other States rely on the aid to airports program to provide the assistance which enables them more fully to participate in commerce.

Passage of the bill, therefore, would be one more step in the direction of better, safer, and more dependable air transportation, for small cities, as well as for great cities. The bill is not designed just to build longer and longer runways for bigger and bigger airplanes; to the contrary it is designed to make air service safe, attractive, and dependable in all cities which have a reasonable chance of utilizing such service.

These general considerations impel me to support this bill, and nothing in the

details of the legislation weakens my support.

The bill continues, for another 3 years, the \$75 million a year program. The committee heard from a number of witnesses who requested a larger program, but I believe this amount has provided a realistic and effective program over the past several years and will be adequate in the immediate future, at least. To my mind, it strikes a reasonable balance between the desire of many for more money and the fears of others, which I largely share, that we simply cannot afford more when the Federal budget is close to an all-time high.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement on this bill. Vermont and New Hampshire have a common cause. In this instance, Vermont makes very liberal use of two of the airports, those at Keene and Lebanon, which are just across the river from us. I believe some 40 percent of Lebanon business generates on the west side of the river.

That leads me to say that one cannot always tell, by looking at a few populous centers, where the wealth and strength of this country originate.

We have our main highway system, and we have our byroads and access roads. Statistically, access roads do not pay for their upkeep. The main highway system would not exist except for the many access roads that empty into them; and I think the same is true of airports. Of late, there has been a tendency for airlines to neglect the business of the more sparsely settled rural areas; yet those are areas where it is possible to build up more business, and thereby expand the economy and prosperity of the country as a whole.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is performing a valuable service. We know that business can be built up in some of these areas if an effort is made to do it. In the case of the Mohawk Lines, I believe the part of Mohawk which services Vermont is not subsidized, so I understand. Mohawk Lines have built up their business there, and that would be true of any other airline that sees fit to serve northern New England. The potential business is there, but there must be adequate service and—more important than all else—it must be sustained service. When passengers plan to return by air to wherever they came from, they want to know that the planes will be running the next week or the next day—weather permitting. So sustained service is very important.

We have had demonstrated to us how easy it is for an airline to discourage service at certain points which it finds inconvenient to serve. Both Vermont and New Hampshire have suffered in that respect.

I have seen at the Barre-Montpelier airport, in Vermont, passengers who have driven there all the way from Berlin, N.H., about 80 miles away. That situ-

ation has existed there ever since service was suspended at the Berlin airport.

That is the nearest place to which they could drive from the Berlin area and the area to the north of it, yet we know that certain interests would like to see even the Barre-Montpelier Airport discontinued. So once more I join with the Senator from New Hampshire in his remarks and state that I think he is doing the whole rural area a great service.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his observations. In his characteristic brief, direct, and succinct manner he has put his finger exactly on the point that I was seeking to emphasize in relation to the problem that confronts his State, my State, our neighboring State of Maine, and other so-called marginal areas in this country. As the Senator from Vermont has so well stated, it has been demonstrated that when an airline chooses really to develop a rural area and encourage travel by being dependable, reliable, informing the public, and giving the people good service, it is surprising how many passengers the airlines find will travel that route.

There is an old saying about a certain railroad in this country that it hated passengers—meaning that the railroad would like to curtail its short haul passenger service and encourage only the long haul service.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 3 more minutes. The same situation has been distressingly true sometimes in air service. On behalf of myself and the Senator's distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who serves with me on the Committee on Commerce, I should like to say that we are thoroughly alert to the situation that confronts our 3 northern New England States. We shall have some suggestions which we shall desire to discuss among the two Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE], the two Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], and the two Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MCINTYRE] concerning that problem in the near future. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from New Hampshire for the help he has given us in past years and this year in putting together an effective Federal Aid to Airports Act, and also the continuing interest he has shown in the vast needs of the entire New England area for improved airports and airline service. He is the Senator who sparked the investigation and study resulting from the discontinuance of the Northeast Airline run to Florida in an effort to determine what type of air service we would be able to obtain for that great industrial area. The Senator was the one who, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and other New England Senators, afforded leadership in requesting committee hearings on that question.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the hearings it was brought out effectively that safety features are badly needed at New England airports for more reliable public air services that can go through New England weather, as well as consolidation of regional airports when we can get them. If I remember correctly, there is not a single instrument-landing system available north of Boston. Is that correct?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. While the bill does not include a provision for an instrument-landing system, it includes provision for runway lighting, glide angle approaches, and many other features. I hope that the Federal Aviation Agency will give immediate and satisfactory consideration to the things for which the Senator has been working for so many years in the committee, including the installation of landing aids to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his observations. I wish also to thank him for his kindness, his willingness, and his patience in holding long hearings day after day concerning New England's problems in connection with the discontinuance of the Northeast Airlines' route to Florida. I am sure that every New England Senator, including the distinguished present occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and his distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are grateful to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. I thank him also for his work on the bill now before the Senate. It is a good bill. The subcommittee has unanimously reported it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

THE BOKARO (INDIA) STEEL PLANT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject of the Bokaro steel plant, which the U.S. Government is contemplating financing up to about \$950 million through the foreign aid program. The AID of our Government hired the United States Steel Corp. to make a study of the steel industry in India. We paid to the United States Steel Corp. the sum of \$686,344 to make the study. The study consists of two volumes, both of which are available for inspection. Since the time the study was completed, a synopsis of the study was prepared by an economic expert of the steel industry. I should like to discuss that synopsis because it contains information of the most vital consequence.

We should have in mind that we contemplate putting up \$950 million to establish a steel plant costing \$1.5 billion, which would compete with private industry in India. If the plant were con-

structed, it would be governmentally operated, and in a governmental operation, it would compete with existing steel plants in that country.

In volume 1 of the study, there is set forth an analysis of the capacity and the present use of the six main sources of steel production in India. I should like to point out the status of the capacity and the present utilization of the capacity:

First is the Tata Steel Works, having a rated capacity of 2 million tons, which is not now being realized due to raw-material-supply difficulties. Second is the Indian Iron and Steel Co., with a capacity of 1 million tons, which is operating at that level.

No. 3 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Rourkela, with a rated capacity of 1 million tons, which is not operating at full capacity.

No. 4 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Bhilai, with a rated capacity of 1 million tons, operating at the capacity of its productive ability.

No. 5 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Durgapur, with a 1-million ton capacity, also operating below that level.

Thus, three of the main plants in India are operating below their maximum production capacity. India, however, wishes to build a \$1.5 billion plant. It would be the largest venture at a single time into steel plant building in India.

India wishes to do this so as to operate on a governmental basis to compete with private industry, as I have heretofore stated.

If the five plants now existing are not operating at their full capacity, why should we put up American taxpayers' money in the sum of \$950 million to establish another plant? I cannot see the wisdom of that design. I think it is wrong, and that it ought not to be done.

This synopsis was prepared by experts of the steel industry of the United States. In volume II the synopsis shows that—

Eighty percent of India's steel capacity is located within 135 miles of the Tata works.

Which is the private steel plant.

Bokaro is contemplated for this same area. Over and above the problem of limited trained personnel which are at present inadequate even for existing steel plants, there are four major additional problems—

I am quoting from the synopsis—transportation, power, water, and raw materials. Raw materials, as indicated above, are already plaguing the Tata works and the problem should be allowed an additional 2 years to be solved.

2. One of the most difficult problems is poor and remotely located limestone.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 minutes more?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I continue to read from the report. There is also a problem with respect to ore:

Ore seems to be adequate except that alumina runs almost 5 percent.

That is not my statement. That is the statement made by the economic experts of the steel industry in the United States.

Coal is rather poor with ash averaging 16 to 18 percent, after washing and sulphur running 0.5 to 0.7 percent. Coking coal reserves are 1½ billion tons and weekly coking coal reserves are 3.5 billion tons.

With respect to manpower, Bokaro is in an agricultural area with no large nearby cities and no industrial know-how except coal mining. It is a poor location for Indians to move to and live and even worse for Americans. The estimated manpower needed for step 1 including administrative, technical, etc., is slightly over 8,000 people. It is assumed that Bokaro would involve a 10-year management contract with qualified Americans.

The estimated costs of the Bokaro steel plant, step 1 through step 3, are as follows:

The total is, in the three steps, \$1,382 million.

This analysis of the impediments is not mine. It was made by experts of the U.S. steel industry. The analysis points out that economically it is not advisable at this time to build the plant. Therefore, I express my vigorous opposition to the proposal that we should make a \$950 million loan.

Finally, if we should make the loan, the money would go to the Indian Government to establish a socialized steel plant. Money earned in our free enterprise system in the United States would be loaned to establish a governmentally owned steel plant to compete with the privately operated steel plants of India. I cannot see the logic of such a course.

We have no right to tell foreign nations what type of economy they will adopt, but we have a right to say, "If you wish to borrow our money you cannot have it if you are going to establish an economic system which is against our philosophy and is constantly attempting to break down the free enterprise system of the United States."

I thank the Senator for granting me the time. I ask unanimous consent that the complete study may be printed in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read it, because it is of extreme importance.

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

NOTES TAKEN FROM THE FEASIBILITY STUDY ON PROPOSED BOKARO STEEL PLANT IN INDIA, PREPARED BY UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

VOLUME I

1. Population of India at mid-1962 was approximately 450 million. It is expected that 100 million will be added in the next decade.

2. With respect to the possibility of steel exports in the future, the report says the following at page 30: "Although steel exports will depend to a large extent on the relative cost of producing steel in India compared with that in other countries, and particularly on the pricing policy that is worked out for steel exports, there is no reason why India should not be able eventually to compete in at least segments of the world steel trade."

India has been having a series of 5-year plans, of which the third is in progress and due to end the end of March 1966. The fourth plan will cover the ensuing 5 years. The report does not anticipate much in the way of exports during either of these periods.

3. The following table indicates, in thousands of metric tons, production, imports, apparent consumption, and indirect imports (i.e., steel contents in things imported) in India for the years 1952 and 1961.

	Production	Imports	Apparent consumption	Indirect imports
1952.....	1,142	154	1,296	475
1961.....	2,901	1,038	3,939	1,050

In 1960, consumption of steel in India was divided among the following general categories:

	Percent
Railway.....	10.9
Structural.....	11.8
Bars and bar shapes.....	40.0
Flat rolled.....	31.5
Other.....	5.8

Consumption, including indirect imports, grew at the rate of approximately 12 percent per year for the years 1952 through 1961.

4. The report is largely predicated on the following estimated steel demands for India for the periods noted:

Estimated demand per year	
Period:	[In thousands of metric tons]
1965-66.....	6,916
1970-71.....	11,235
1975-76.....	17,000
1980.....	24,000

The foregoing tonnages are tons of finished steel products. The 24 million tons for 1980 are considered to require approximately 32 million tons of ingots. The 1970-71 demand assumes a rate of growth over the previous 5 years of 10 percent per year. The 1975-76 presumed demand assumes a rate of growth of approximately 8½ percent per year over the previous 5 years. The first two estimated demands are predicated on the overall Indian expansion plans for those periods, i.e., the third and fourth plans, and discount the estimates of Indian economists by 20 percent. In other words, demands used in the report are 80 percent of those predicted in the third and fourth Indian plans.

5. Following below are the existing steel plants in India, their current rated capacity, and their estimated effective capacity to produce finished products, in the years ahead, based upon estimated realization of the expansion plans.

A. Tata (Jamshedpur) has a rated capacity of 2 million metric tons which is not being realized at present due to raw material supply difficulties. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	1,730
1966.....	1,920
1971.....	2,620
1976.....	2,620

B. Indian Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (Burnpur) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating at that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	1,190
1966.....	1,190
1971.....	1,690
1976.....	1,690

C. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.-Rourkela (built by West Germany) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons but is operating below that. Its effective capacity to produce

finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	630
1966.....	1,050
1971.....	2,040
1976.....	2,040

D. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.—Bhilai (built by Russia) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating at that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	790
1966.....	1,420
1971.....	2,020
1976.....	3,230

E. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.—Durgapur (built by Great Britain) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating below that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	630
1966.....	840
1971.....	1,360
1976.....	2,780

F. Other (over 100 small plants rerolling rails, semifinished, etc.). Their effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]	
Year:	
1963.....	930
1966.....	1,113
1971.....	1,535
1976.....	1,635

6. The following table indicates the estimated steel to be provided by the foregoing plants in India, expanded as it is anticipated they will be expanded in the future:

[Thousand metric tons]			
Year	Finished products	Total steel mill products	Total ingots
1966.....	5,678	6,476	7,350
1971.....	8,794	9,969	11,290
1976.....	11,185	12,460	14,390

7. The following table indicates the anticipated demand as shown in paragraph No. 4 above related to the anticipated supply and the apparent deficit.

[Thousand metric tons]			
Year	Demand	Supply	Deficit
1966.....	6,916	5,595	1,321
1971.....	11,235	8,684	2,551
1976.....	17,000	11,075	5,925

The anticipated supply figures do not exactly match those in paragraph No. 6 and I was unable to find the reason for the discrepancy. However, they are quite close.

8. The Bokaro steel plant is planned in three stages or steps, with the following number of blast furnaces and the anticipated iron production, steel ingot production and finished steel production:

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Number of blast furnaces.....	2	3	4
Anticipated iron production ¹	1,251	2,193	3,529
Anticipated steel ingot production ¹	1,400	2,500	4,000
Anticipated finished steel production ¹	1,040	1,800	2,900

¹ Thousand metric tons.

It is anticipated that steps 1, 2, and 3 would be completed respectively by about 1966, 1971, and 1976. On this basis, the steel deficits in those years would be as follows:

Year	Deficit before Bokaro	Contribution of Bokaro	Deficit after Bokaro
1966.....	1,427	1,040	387
1971.....	2,348	1,800	548
1976.....	4,910	2,910	2,000

9. The products anticipated for Bokaro are hot rolled sheets and strip, cold rolled sheets and strip, galvanized sheets, and plates.

10. The facilities contemplated are a coke plant, blast furnaces, a Universal slabbing mill of 4 million tons capacity, and 80-inch hot strip mill of 3,500,000 tons capacity, tandem mills, and a 140-inch sheared plate mill. Anticipated annual sales from these facilities, in dollars, are as follows:

After step 1.....	\$157,198,000
After step 2.....	272,711,000
After step 3.....	445,877,000

VOLUME II

Volume II points out some of the problems involved in Bokaro and the anticipated capital cost.

1. Eighty percent of India's steel capacity is located within 135 miles of the Tata works at Jamshedpur. Bokaro is contemplated for this same area. Over and above the problem of limited trained personnel which are at present inadequate even for existing steel plants, there are four major additional problems: Transportation, power, water and raw materials. Raw materials, as indicated above, are already plaguing the Tata works and the problem should be allowed an additional 2 years to be solved.

2. One of the most difficult problems is poor and remotely located limestone. Consideration is even being given to fine grinding and flotation to improve its quality. Ore seems to be adequate except that alumina runs almost 5 percent. Coal is rather poor with ash averaging 16 to 18 percent, after washing and sulfur running 0.5 and 0.7 percent. Coking coal reserves are 1¼ billion tons and weakly coking coal reserves are 3.5 billion tons.

3. With respect to manpower, Bokaro is in an agricultural area with no large nearby cities and no industrial know-how except coal mining. It is a poor location for Indians to move to and live and even worse for Americans. The estimated manpower needed for step 1 including administrative, technical, etc., is slightly over 8,000 people. It is assumed that Bokaro would involve a 10-year management contract with qualified Americans.

4. The estimated costs of the Bokaro steel plant, step 1 through step 3, are as follows, in thousands of dollars:

	Dollars	Rupee cost stated in dollars	Total dollars
Step 1.....	512,588	314,653	827,241
Step 2.....	162,367	75,488	237,855
Step 3.....	216,597	100,346	316,943
Total.....	891,552	490,487	1,382,039

It is estimated that step 1 will cost roughly \$125 million more than it would in the United States.

5. The anticipated spending schedule is as follows (in thousands of dollars):

1963.....	3,925
1964.....	100,491
1965.....	298,602
1966.....	280,953
1967.....	118,988
1968.....	24,282

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes from the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 6 minutes.

PROPOSED LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it seems to me that our Defense Establishment has been speaking with two voices in discussing the proposed limited nuclear test ban treaty. The statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as released by the Preparedness Subcommittee, was frank enough to admit that there are "military disadvantages to the treaty." On balance, however, the statement says they "are not so serious as to render it unacceptable." Their conclusion explains that this is so because of the important political gains which might be achieved.

The Secretary of Defense, however, takes a more optimistic view. His testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee concludes with this statement, that "the values of the treaty are substantial even if we consider only the military area."

The Secretary's view is based upon the main theme of his testimony: That the United States possesses "tens of thousands" of nuclear warheads, and that this numerical preponderance over the Soviets will be maintained even under such a treaty as that now proposed.

I am well aware that in other portions of the two items of testimony there are catch phrases and qualifications which attempt to make them perfectly compatible. The job of the Senate is to make absolutely sure that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the civilian optimism and the military reservations do not conceal any significant disagreements as to the impact upon this Nation's security of the test ban proposal.

And I would like to cite here one area in which such a disagreement might well be possible. I refer to the difference between the Secretary's assurances regarding our tens of thousands of warheads and the foreseeable future in which delivery vehicles for those warheads may significantly be diminished in number and quality in comparison to the delivery systems of the Soviet.

No number of warheads can truly be reassuring if we do not have adequate means of delivering them. No treaty regarding nuclear tests can be reassuring if our defenses become inventory items in a warehouse. No talk of preparedness to test under the treaty can be reassuring if we lack equal preparedness regarding the delivery systems which turn warheads from mere statistics into a true shield of freedom.

Let us, in considering this treaty, then discover if the military disadvantages mentioned by the Joint Chiefs have anything to do with such areas as these:

What percentage of our present nuclear striking force depends upon the Strategic Air Command's force of manned bombers? The percentage, I am sure, is high.

I may say that the Secretary himself estimates it to be about 75 percent. Therefore, what is the future of that striking force as we cut back on our manned bomber system? If it is to be replaced by new systems, can the replacement be made, in full security, without any of the tests banned by the proposed treaty? Do the civilians and the military men speak with a single voice on this?

How has the withdrawal of our Thor and Jupiter missiles affected our delivery capabilities? Do the civilians and the military speak with a single voice on that? Are further withdrawals possible under the treaty and its subsequent steps? How would that affect our security?

What impact upon the relative strength of Soviet and American nuclear delivery systems can be anticipated as a result of Russia's admitted superiority in high-yield weapons and our admitted disadvantages in developing comparable ones under the treaty? Could our numerical superiority in warheads be overcome by qualitative advances on Russia's part?

The treaty proposal speaks of not testing nuclear weapons in space. There is nothing in it to inhibit the Soviets or ourselves from testing space delivery systems, however. On our side, by contrast, we have as a stated policy of the Defense Department the fact that we will not orbit weapons of mass destruction. Will the treaty freeze that policy while heating up Russian advances toward usable space delivery systems?

What is our delivery position overall? The B-47 and B-52 programs are being phased out. Three Titan missile squadrons, previously programed, have been cut out. Our Polaris program remains the same 41-boat program as during the previous administration. Skybolt, a highly-sophisticated attempt to preserve the utility of our manned bomber force into the 1970's, has been cancelled—and with it much of the delivery capability of our British allies. Our orbiting space platform program, which would be a step, at least, toward preventing a space weapons gap has dropped, and dropped in priority in America, while similar programs are advancing in the Soviet.

My point simply is this: The assurance that this treaty has no adverse military impact is so far backed by imposing statistics of numbers of warheads. My question is whether these assurances will hold as strongly if we direct our questioning toward delivery systems. Is it not enough to talk of our strength in numbers alone. Nor is it enough to speak of readiness to test. It is the readiness to strike, the real readiness to defend ourselves, that counts. What steps to assure that readiness have to be guaranteed under such a treaty as the one we are considering?

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 more seconds.

If there is any doubt about our ability to deliver our weapons in the years ahead, this treaty will not ease those doubts but merely turn them into more grave dangers. The time to thrash this

out is now, before we commit the security of this Nation to any proposal which may be anything less than completely thorough.

THE RAILROAD WORK RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, if the news ticker account on the proposed legislation for settling the railroad dispute which allegedly came out of the Commerce Committee this morning is correct, I cannot think of a greater legislative mistake we could make. If the ticker account is correct—and I understand it is—the Commerce Committee recommends a proposal for compulsory arbitration; and let us stop “kidding” ourselves about it. I will never vote for a full-fledged compulsory arbitration bill for the settlement of a labor dispute in America as long as I serve in the Senate.

When that bill reaches the floor of the Senate I shall move to substitute the President's proposal for the settlement of the railroad dispute. The President's proposal is far superior to the committee's proposal. I do not care what semantics the Commerce Committee uses—a proposal which sets up a 7-man board for a settlement of the dispute, binding upon the parties by law, is compulsory arbitration. Oh, I understand that it is said, “What about the senior Senator from Oregon's proposal in support of the President's proposal? Is not that compulsory arbitration?” And the answer is “No.”

I have discussed that subject before in the Senate and I shall again during the forthcoming debate. The President's proposal is to turn this problem over for temporary determinations for a 2-year period to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The ICC was created by law to exercise jurisdiction over the railroads in this country. The Congress itself, upon the recommendation of the railroad brotherhoods and the carriers, in the past has assigned the jurisdiction of the so-called Washington agreement to the ICC. Under the Washington agreement, the Interstate Commerce Commission is given the determination of job security problems in cases of mergers. Under the Interstate Commerce Commission, the parties remain free, by the President's proposal, to continue collective bargaining on the issues in dispute during the 2-year period, but after the 2-year period the problem will be before us *de novo*. All of the appeal procedures and procedural legal rights available under the Interstate Commerce Act will be available to the parties under the President's proposal.

I am at a complete loss to understand why the railroad brotherhood chiefs seem to have lost their commonsense. Some of us have been pleading with them for weeks to take to their membership a proposal of voluntary arbitration for settlement of the dispute. The senior Senator from Oregon believes that if the railroad brotherhood members were given the facts about the railroad dispute, the rank and file of the brother-

hood membership would vote overwhelmingly for voluntary arbitration of this dispute.

Such a precedent of compulsory arbitration established in the bill reported to be coming from the Commerce Committee in this case cannot be established without our finding it on our doorstep in the future in case after case. It will rise to plague the Congress. It is just as bad as the proposal pending before the Senate, introduced by a group of Senators, to establish a watchdog committee over collective bargaining in the railroad industry. In the first place, Congress is not qualified so to function. We are dealing with a field of American life in which a group of politicians is not qualified to function as watchdogs of collective bargaining—for the same reason that there should not be turned over to the courts the determination of the economic problems of labor relations.

I say to the brotherhoods, “Come to your senses. You have no right to try to settle the economic issues which are involved in this issue on the picket line, for they are not subject to settlement on the picket line.” A settlement calls for a careful analysis of the facts. It calls for a careful analysis of the problems that are going to arise in respect to automation. Congress will have to enact legislation in the field of automation and job disjunctures in an attempt to seek to determine to what extent the public, the chief beneficiary of automation, the principal beneficiary of technical advance and progress, should pay for the loss of jobs that thousands upon thousands of workers are suffering week by week as a result of the rapid advance in technology.

Mr. President, it is not fair to expect employers to pick up the total cost of automation in the form of paying for the loss of jobs. There is an area where some contribution should be made by employers, and industrial statesmen among employers recognize it. It has been recognized in various collective bargaining agreements that are being adopted these days. It is found in the steel industry. It is found in the west coast longshore industry. It is found in the rubber industry.

These collective bargaining agreements, on the other hand, are not capable of covering the issue as to how much the public should pay. Labor cannot expect, either, not to pay some share of the cost of job losses due to automation. Here is the area of legislation that will have to be dealt with in the next few years, in my judgment. The President recognized it in his proposal, and suggested and recommended the creation of a Presidential National Council on Automation, to do two things; first, to find out what the facts are in regard to automation and the resulting cost of it, and, second, to recommend what legislation needs to be passed in the public interest to cover the problem.

A few weeks ago, on the floor of the Senate I said that the problem is somewhat similar to the problem that confronted Congress in the period from 1900 to 1920, the so-called era of progressive labor legislation, dealing with

such issues as the Adamson 8-hour law, minimum wages, safety legislation, and a long list of legislative objectives dealing with the problem of protecting the legitimate rights of labor and of industry in the field of employer-labor relations.

The mere fact that a critical labor dispute is facing us is no justification for coming forward with a proposal that amounts to compulsory arbitration for the settlement of disputes. We cannot reconcile compulsory arbitration with economic freedom. I am at a loss to understand how any employer or any labor leader in America could propose or agree to compulsory arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes.

That is, in effect, turning the economy of the country, segment by segment involved in disputes, over to a third party for a determination of the wages and working conditions. It would also lead to a determination of prices and managerial rights for employers.

I shall fight to the last roll call against this proposal of the Commerce Committee. I may go down whipped again, which is no new experience for the senior Senator from Oregon, but the principles that I shall defend will rise time and time again to plague the Senate if it adopts this unwise proposal for compulsory arbitration.

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two articles on American policy in South Vietnam. The first is an article entitled “War Against Reds Dominated News,” written by Homer Bigart and published in the New York Times of August 22, 1963; the second is an article entitled “The Swamps of Saigon,” written by Robert Karr McCabe, Newsweek's correspondent in Southeast Asia, which appeared in the New Leader of August 19.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these articles tell a very sad story of American foreign policy. It is a policy that has failed, and has cost us billions of dollars in the meantime, and the loss of precious American lives. The sooner the United States ceases its support of the Diem Government, the better off we shall be.

Newspaper accounts coming from that area in recent hours indicate that there have been some changes in the Government in South Vietnam, but the accounts of such changes are not very reassuring. It appears that the changes consist of changing from the dictatorship of Diem to a dictatorship of the military.

We keep Diem afloat with huge sums of foreign aid; and although that aid is touted as a means of containing communism without use of American forces, we are using American forces, too, in South Vietnam. Diem, is our responsibility, and the world knows it. If we were to cut the string, he would sink. So long as we do not, we must accept all the opprobrium that goes with his noxious regime. He is our responsibility be-

cause we assumed it. We assumed it wrongfully. In my judgment, the position that we should have taken from the very beginning was that we would cooperate with other free nations in the defense of freedom in South Vietnam, but that we would not assume full responsibility for the protection of freedom in South Vietnam.

Time and time again on the floor of the Senate I have raised the question, and I raise it again, and I shall continue to raise it until our policy in South Vietnam is changed: Where are the other free nations in respect to helping in the protection of freedom in South Vietnam? Why is it America's responsibility alone? Where are Australia, New Zealand, and Canada? Where is England or France or West Germany? Where are the rest of our alleged allies?

The American people are entitled to a full exposure of all the facts, involving our present and past relationships with Diem.

I have opposed unilateral U.S. intervention in South Vietnam from the beginning. I have insisted that we should not give aid there unless the other free nations of the world were willing—and they were not—to help us in South Vietnam, with their financial aid and their blood. I have always urged that we stay out of South Vietnam if going in means for the most part that the United States will carry the full load. I urge now that we get out, unless our alleged allies in NATO and elsewhere in the world are willing to do their fair share—and that includes France and Great Britain.

I again refer to the two articles which I have asked to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. First I refer briefly to the article by Homer Bigart, published in the New York Times. In the article he discusses how we got into South Vietnam in the first place, and points out the conflict that developed between the U.S. Ambassador and CIA. It is difficult to speak on the floor of the Senate on what the CIA policy really was, because Senators cannot find out. However it is the responsibility of Congress to find out. For several years Congress has refused to return foreign policy to the American people. For several years Congress has refused to pass the necessary legislation that places an effective check upon CIA. Congress has permitted CIA to continue to exercise what appears, in fact, to amount to a police power in a democracy. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I cannot tell the Senate—nor can any other member of the committee—what the facts are about the CIA policy in South Vietnam or anywhere else in the world.

I say to the American people: "You are long overdue in making your demands crystal clear to Republican and Democratic administrations that you want an end to the growing trend toward sanctioning a continuation of what amounts to police procedures in a democracy."

There is no justification for giving any agency of Government—CIA or any other—unchecked power. That is exactly what we have given to CIA.

But listen to what Mr. Bigart says about the conflict that arose originally in South Vietnam:

The chief CIA agent, Col. Edward G. Lansdale, threw his support behind Ngo Dinh Diem, opposing the U.S. Ambassador, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who recommended that the United States withhold support from the Saigon government. Allen W. Dulles, then Director General of the Intelligence Agency, persuaded his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, that Colonel Lansdale was right.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been very unhappy, within the sphere of my knowledge of facts concerning certain incidents, relative to the influence the CIA has exercised throughout the world in the determination of American foreign policy, particularly including instances in Latin America. I know nothing about the so-called Lansdale-Dulles difference of opinion other than what is stated in this article. However, I now call upon the Secretary of State, from the floor of the U.S. Senate, to give me a memorandum setting forth the history, from the very beginning of our relationships with South Vietnam, of steps that were taken that resulted in our becoming involved in South Vietnam. I particularly call upon the Secretary of State to advise me in that memorandum why we are following what amounts, for the most part, to a unilateral course of action in South Vietnam.

I say to the Secretary now: "Do not give me a memorandum containing references to so-called token help that is being offered by some countries, for I am not interested in form, only in substance." I want to know from the Secretary of State how we got into the plight we are in; why we have a commitment to support a tyrant in South Vietnam. I am satisfied that had it not been for the United States buttressing Vietnam, the anti-Communist forces in South Vietnam would have thrown Diem out in 90 days, a long time in the past.

I remember an occasion when I conducted a cross-examination in the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning anti-Diem groups exiled in Paris, France. I cross-examined witnesses in behalf of the administration, and they made clear that those exiles are anti-Communist. They are also anti-Diem.

What one must be on guard against when he makes a speech such as the senior Senator from Oregon is making today are the smear artists in the country, who seek to give the impression that because one does not support a tyrant in South Vietnam, he must be in favor of supporting the Communists. Quite to the contrary. We have been building up Communist power in South Vietnam by supporting a dictatorial tyrant in that country. In fact, too frequently in American foreign policy we have played into the hands of the Communists by supporting wrong regimes in various parts of the world. I have no doubt that we have made that great mistake in South Vietnam.

The time has come for the Secretary of State to prepare for the senior Senator from Oregon a thorough, detailed mem-

orandum—and every Member of the Senate is entitled to it—containing a detailed account of the history of our participation in the internal affairs of South Vietnam. If we do not put an end to the mistaken policy that we are following in that country, we will hear from the American people in no uncertain terms—and should—for there is a restlessness developing at the grassroots of America in respect to foreign policy.

If my other duties of the day permit, I may later today, when the pending business has been laid aside, discuss foreign aid. The restlessness of the American people applies to foreign aid.

Mr. President, all I can do is make the record. I intend to continue to make the record, issue by issue, and then let the people of the United States, at the only place that, apparently, politicians understand, namely, the voting booths, make clear to Congress in 1964 what they think of the failure of Congress to save the American people the huge sums of money that Congress owes it to them to save in connection with the foreign aid bill this year.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

WAR AGAINST REDS DOMINATED NEWS—ANTI-COMMUNIST OPPOSITION TO REGIME WAS PLAYED DOWN BY WASHINGTON

(By Homer Bigart)

One day last June a 73-year-old Buddhist monk sat down in the middle of a Saigon street. Thousands watched in shock as his fellow monks poured gasoline over him and he calmly touched a match to his saffron-colored robes.

His suicide jolted millions, including top officials of the U.S. Government, into realizing that a strange new crisis confronted South Vietnam.

Ordinary crises involving intrigue, money, and revolution have been commonplace under the authoritarian rule of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Since 1959 the regime, with massive support from the United States, has been involved in a nasty, frustrating war with Vietcong guerrillas. While there is no doubt that the Vietcong is Communist led, the regime has made bitter enemies among non-Communists, also.

BOMBING PLAYED DOWN

The U.S. Government has tended to play down the non-Communist opposition to the Ngo Dinh Diem regime. Thus, when two Vietnamese Air Force officers bombed the Presidential Palace on February 27, 1962, narrowly missing the ruling family, Washington echoed Saigon's contention that the incident was "isolated" and of passing consequence.

Those on the scene who felt that the bombing was a manifestation of deep-seated unrest were shushed and called defeatists.

Americans in Saigon assumed that the President and his family, if they lost power, would be overthrown by a military junta. They presumed that any new rulers would be those generals who had worked closely and amicably with the American military advisers.

Few Americans bothered to worry about the possibility of a religious revolution. They were aware, of course, that while the President and his family were Roman Catholics, 70 percent of the population and an even higher percentage of the army were non-Catholic.

BUDDHISTS SEEMED DOCLIE

Yet the Buddhists seemed docile, appeased by the fact that the vice president,

gentle Nguyen Ngoc Tho, was a practicing Buddhist.

The first intimation of trouble came May 8, when Government forces opened fire on a Buddhist procession in Hue, killing nine marchers. The Buddhists were demonstrating against an attempt by the regime to ban the flying of their five-colored patchwork flags.

Hue (pronounced Way) is the seat of Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, a brother of the President, and of Ngo Dinh Can, another brother, who runs the northern provinces.

In a country where public protests are forbidden and the press is tightly muzzled, the Hue demonstration was a clear portent of impending crisis.

The Government refused to accept responsibility for the shooting down of peaceful demonstrators. Despite eyewitness reports and photographs, the Government insisted that a Communist guerrilla had thrown a grenade into the crowd.

PROTEST QUICKLY SWELLS

The Hue incident quickly grew into a full-scale popular protest. President Ngo Dinh Diem made a concession; the ban on Buddhist flags was rescinded.

The concession came too late. Buddhist leaders brought up other grievances.

Contending they had been treated as second-class citizens, the Buddhists demanded the right to buy and hold real estate as freely as did the churches of the Christian minority.

They demanded the conviction of the soldiers who had fired into the Hue procession and indemnity for the victims' families.

They demanded the right to meet freely without special police licenses.

This last demand sounded especially sinister to Ngo Dinh Nhu, a brother and chief political adviser of the President. He and his wife, Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who has expressed amused contempt at the world's concern over what she called the "Buddhist barbecue," believe the regime cannot tolerate free expression while fighting the Communists.

REGIME WARNED BY UNITED STATES

By mid-June reports from South Vietnam were sufficiently alarming to oblige Washington to caution the Saigon Government. The U.S. Embassy was instructed to tell President Ngo Dinh Diem "in the bluntest terms" that Buddhists disaffection could be disastrous.

The Kennedy administration seemed to be losing faith in the effectiveness of quiet pressure. This pressure had never really dented the secretive and suspicious atmosphere of the palace.

The Ngo family, despite the presence in the country of a dozen American generals and 12,000 advisers of lesser rank, continued to run the war pretty much as it pleased.

The conduct of the war was clearly threatened by the religious strife. The United States had sunk billions of dollars into the preservation of South Vietnam from Communist rule. The investment might go down the drain unless the regime came to terms quickly with the Buddhists.

In June the United States told President Ngo Dinh Diem that it would publicly condemn the treatment of Buddhists unless he moved quickly to redress their grievances.

The regime reacted coldly. Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu charged that the U.S. Embassy had threatened and blackmailed her in an attempt to "shut me up."

Her husband, always suspicious of an American plot to overthrow the regime, summoned 30 of the nation's military leaders and upbraided them for having failed to take adequate precautions against a coup d'etat.

SUICIDES DEEPEN CRISIS

Meanwhile, the crisis deepened. Four more Buddhist monks and a nun killed themselves. The Government suffered military setbacks.

Yesterday the regime reacted by raiding Buddhist temples and jailing more than 100 monks. The President declared martial law.

Washington issued its threatened denunciation, calling the anti-Buddhist measures "repressive action" and contending that the action was "a direct violation by the Vietnamese Government of assurances that it was pursuing a policy of reconciliation with the Buddhists."

For nearly 2 years Washington has not acted, although the Saigon regime was becoming increasingly unpopular and increasingly incapable of arousing the war-weary population to greater efforts.

Washington discouraged criticism that the Saigon Government was repressive and that American aid had been wasted and mismanaged.

"Why do not reporters give President Diem the benefit of the doubt?" Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., used to ask American correspondents.

REGIME APEASED

The Ambassador's desire to maintain good relations with the Ngo Dinh Diem regime sometimes led to extreme appeasement. Embassy personnel were ordered to stop dancing, even in the privacy of their homes, when the Government cracked down on night life and decreed that modern dancing was "immoral."

Mr. Nolting has now ended his tour of duty in South Vietnam and is being replaced by Henry Cabot Lodge.

The involvement of the United States in the affairs of the Saigon regime did not begin with the Ambassador's surrender on square dancing.

Relations have seemed inextricable since 1954 when Ngo Dinh Diem rose to power in South Vietnam with an important assist from the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Agency was right, in the opinion of most observers, in seeing in Ngo Dinh Diem the only clear prospect of a strong anti-Communist leadership.

OTHER CANDIDATES RULED OUT

There were other candidates for power in Saigon when, after the defeat of the French in the Indochina war, Vietnam was partitioned, the Communists taking over North Vietnam and South Vietnam relying on American support. But the other candidates were either tarred as French collaborators or were palpably corrupt.

The chief CIA agent, Col. Edward G. Lansdale, threw his support behind Ngo Dinh Diem, opposing the U.S. Ambassador, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who recommended that the United States withhold support from the Saigon Government. Allen W. Dulles, then Director General of the Intelligence Agency, persuaded his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, that Colonel Lansdale was right.

President Ngo Dinh Diem may be credited with having saved South Vietnam for communism. But Washington is wondering whether a strict policy of supporting him in maintaining an increasingly repressive regime may not alienate all the Buddhists of southeast Asia.

The dilemma is that the United States considers South Vietnam militarily important. It controls the mouth of the Mekong River, the main artery of southeast Asia. The country's loss would jeopardize the remaining free nations of southeast Asia.

THE SWAMPS OF SAIGON

(By Robert Karr McCabe)

SAIGON.—"Vietnam," said the frazzled American, "might be a nice little country if it weren't for the Vietnamese." His despair was not entirely unjustified, and he was not speaking strictly of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. During the several years of his residence here, he has seen the political situation crumble almost daily.

Vietnam's problem today is greater than simply ridding itself of the Diems.

To the journalists who have haunted Saigon since early May, one of the single most disturbing factors in the situation is the reluctance—or the inability—of the Vietnamese to take matters into their own hands. "You Americans must help us," the chorus goes, "Diem is too powerful for us alone." This has long been the cry of the weak, disorganized politicians of the opposition. It now has been taken up by the military dissidents * * * and by the Buddhists as well.

Late in June, for instance, one of the Buddhist Big Five explained the pagoda position to me. "The Government of South Vietnam was created, and is supported, by the American Government," he said, gesturing emphatically. After pausing to readjust the hem of his robe, he continued: "If the Vietnamese Government betrays the agreements it has made with us, the U.S. Government will be held responsible. Americans, by putting Diem in power, assumed a responsibility to the Vietnamese people. If Diem is allowed to betray his pledges, the United States will be accused of abandoning the Vietnamese."

Then he shrugged. "This problem can only be solved by the United States, because Diem will do nothing. Diem is a puppet of Washington just as Ho Chi Minh is controlled by the Chinese and the Russians."

He rejected a suggestion that Vietnamese themselves might be able to oust Diem. "The President has American-armed troops to back him," he said. "There are thousands of secret policemen around every pagoda. How can we do anything alone?"

The bonze has a point: There is no doubt that a large-scale popular uprising would face tremendous difficulties. But there is equally little room for enthusiasm over the chances of an American-engineered coup surviving, Washington's continuing support for Diem, in the face of every political reality in the book, has sullied the American image in Vietnam. ("Kennedy is Catholic," a Saigon intellectual notes. "So is Diem. The connection is obvious.") And any government pushed into office by would-be American Machiavellis would run headlong into exactly the problems faced by the current tenants.

Much of the responsibility for the reluctance of Vietnamese to take matters into their own hands must be borne by retiring Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr. It is obvious he arrived in Saigon with instructions to get along with Diem, but it seems equally clear that he has exceeded his orders. Though Nolting is a career Foreign Service officer, and thus by definition a diplomat, he has not had much success of a diplomatic nature. His incredibly maladroit comment on the Buddhist problem last month sums up his work in Vietnam: "The trouble with this damn thing, if I may speak frankly, is that everybody focuses on a tiny aspect of it. I myself, I say this frankly after almost 2½ years, have never seen any evidence of religious persecution." Mr. Nolting just wasn't looking.

Neither were other American officials. Until mid-June, as a matter of policy, most American diplomats in Saigon were getting their information on the Buddhist movement from just two sources: Vietnamese government functionaries and American journalists. No attempt was made to contact sect leaders: "The Buddhists have a pretty fair publicity organization," a high-ranking U.S. official told me in mid-June. "We get copies of all their pronouncements." After the Reverend Thich Quang Duc immolated himself, the American Embassy finally began to take the Buddhists seriously, and the flow of information has improved markedly.

But the damage had been done, both in Saigon and in Washington. Vietnamese out-

side the government no longer seem to trust Americans. And Washington's official policy has evidently been frozen on the basis of the rosy reports sent back to the State Department under the Nolting tenure. One of the least exclusive groups in American officialdom is the Corner-Turners Club: "We have turned the corner in Vietnam," said Admiral X, General Y and Secretary Z today. And tomorrow, might we turn another one?

Adding to the mood of despair in Saigon is the unpleasant fact that the Kennedy administration has come up with no fresh ideas on Vietnam. The delay in the arrival of new Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge may well be because Washington still has not made up its mind on an alternative policy. Meanwhile, in Saigon, embassy officials are leaderless. Most drift along, expressing mild unhappiness about the uproar and parroting the old "Sink-Along-With-Diem" line: "Maybe he's not the greatest guy in the world," one told me cautiously, "but he's all we've got." (In this context, a comment by an American diplomat in Seoul is illuminating. Asked his opinion, he said, "That's phony. There's always an alternative.")

Among the viable alternatives to Diem today are at least one high-ranking soldier, a well-known intellectual and perhaps one or two politicians. None can be named for fear of Diem's instant retaliation, but many sources in Vietnam seem to believe there are alternatives. There is little hope that the several groups of Vietnamese exiles will produce acceptable candidates; most are tarred either by collaboration with the French or the Hanoi regime.

The Buddhists themselves, however admirable their struggle may seem, offer no real prospects. Buddhist spokesmen vow their movement remains nonpolitical, though there are signs the younger bonzes have more than sutras on their minds. After 8 weeks interviewing various members of the hierarchy, however, the most lasting impression is one combining equal parts of pettiness and slyness. Buddhist spokesmen have lied outright to the press (as is all too usual elsewhere in Vietnam), and in typical Asian style suspect all news reporters on the scene of being either in the pay of the CIA or the brothers Ngo.

There seems little question that the Buddhist movement was in fact nonpolitical in its origins. For the past several hundred years, Vietnamese Buddhism has been in a state of decline: Academics say that even today its doctrinal purity is suspect. In the early 1930's, when the General Buddhist Association of Vietnam (GBAV) was founded, vague attempts were made to restore the importance of the area's Buddhism. Little came of these efforts until the early 1950's, after the International Congress of Buddhists in Colombo, Ceylon.

Since that time, though Buddhists did increase their efforts to work together, the split between the Mahayana and Hinayana groups has remained a troublesome point. The former dominates the GBAV; its base is in Hue, where all the trouble began last May 8. The differences seem to rest more on personality than on theory, however, and in any case are not understood by 99 percent of Vietnam's lay Buddhists. In essence, Hinayana is an earlier and simpler school, which stresses individual salvation. (Saigon Buddhists, by the way, prefer the term Theravada to Hinayana.) Mahayana is much more "religious" to Western eyes. It stresses compassion—helping others to reach Nirvana as well as one's self. Cynics might say this caused the present clear political involvement.

In theory, Buddhist leaders profess to remain religious types rather than politicians. At Saigon's Xa Loi Pagoda, bonze after bonze will solemnly swear that "all we want is acceptance of our five demands."

These five demands are:

1. Withdrawal of the Government ban on display of the Buddhist flag.
2. Special status for Buddhism parallel to that accorded Catholicism.
3. Cessation of arrests and terror directed against Buddhists.
4. Freedom to preach and practice Buddhism for both bonze and laymen.
5. Compensation for families of those killed and wounded in the Hue riots, as well as punishment of the officials responsible.

(Diem has relented on the flag ban, ordered commissions to investigate points 2 and 5, and stated that points 3 and 4 are met by provision of the Constitution. In practice, of course, the latter is simply not true.)

Until these five demands are completely met, the Buddhists will continue their protests. Asked if traditional Buddhist non-violence has not been a bit besmirched by such raucous incidents as self-immolation and riots, they disagree vigorously. "Self-sacrifice has been practiced in the past to protest religious injustice," a priest declared. "And the riots are all the fault of the government police."

On this last point, there seems room for doubt. Certainly the Buddhists have provided an enormous amount of provocation. And the Saigon government, by coping with the problem in a somewhat reasonable manner, might well have been able to score at least a few propaganda points, if not totally smooth things over. One of the first things a reporter learns about Vietnam, however, is that events do not proceed in a sensible fashion.

In this case, blame must be laid squarely at the dainty little feet of aging—but still attractive—Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who seems to find someone new to hate every year. In this year of our Lord 1963, President Diem's sister-in-law has zeroed in on the Buddhists. They are, she said 2 weeks ago, "so-called holy men who have never considered the interests of the nation."

The Times of Vietnam, generally accepted as Mme. Nhu's mouthpiece, has maintained a steady flow of insinuation that the Buddhists are influenced by Vietcong agents: "When a Communist in the cloth of a bonze is arrested, is it discrimination against Buddhists or is it protection of public security against subversion?" asked a recent editorial. After stating that "Vietnam for over 2,000 years a land of multiple religions, is an example of true religious peaceful coexistence," the editorial warned that "such loosely structured organizations as the Buddhist clergy are especially vulnerable to (Communist) exploitation. It would be well to keep this salient fact in mind in judging the present problem."

Mme. Nhu's intransigence, in fact, seems to be creating troubles within the once-monotheistic Ngo family. It is widely felt in Saigon that President Diem is somewhat more flexible on the Buddhist issue than the Nhuses or Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, and that the otherwise unexplained minor waverings in the Government's line are due to this situation. If recent events are any criteria, however, the Nhu line has won out.

Even the most determinedly optimistic Americans in Saigon see little hope for genuine victory in Vietnam under present conditions. The effects of the strategic hamlet program, beneficial at first and bearing promise of better things, have been totally nullified by the anti-Buddhist campaign. (It should be noted that these hamlets are not concentration camps, certain U.S. liberals' opinions to the contrary. Diem already has plenty of prison camps.)

Local military successes, however impressive the casualty reports, are meaningless in a broader context. The war in Vietnam is, and has always been, a struggle for popular allegiance. Diem et famille have now forfeited whatever claim they had on mass esteem. And the younger Vietnamese, fol-

lowing the pattern laid down in postwar China, are forsaking the republic for either the Vietcong or the furtive opposition parties. The Diem regime is growing older, more rigid, more fearful of change. The Buddhists, through their antiregime activities, have provided a channel for protest on a truly national scale. But no one, not even the Buddhists themselves, knows where this channel leads.

PROPOSED NEW CLASSIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL SUBJECT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is agreeable to my being yielded 7 minutes, without his losing the floor, and that this time shall not be taken from the time allotted to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is necessary for the Senator to obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, who has the floor at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control at present; but without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has proposed to establish a new classification of executive, administrative, and professional personnel in businesses subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. This reclassification, to become effective September 3, 1963, will have severe repercussions on the small business of this country. This action will interfere with business management's ability to use its personnel most effectively. It will increase the cost of business operations unjustifiably and it will adversely affect the already increasing cost of living. The resolution I introduce today is intended to call for a congressional review of this action by the Secretary of Labor and to urge that he postpone the effective date pending the completion of this review.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Secretary of Labor has congressional authority to determine who qualifies as a bona fide executive, administrator, or professional employee and is, therefore, not eligible to receive overtime pay.

To be ineligible for overtime pay, an employee must meet two basic requirements under existing regulations. First, he must fit the act's description of the duties and functions of an executive, administrator, or professional employee. Second, he must earn in excess of a specified amount. If both conditions are met, the individual is considered a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional employee and, as such, is not eligible for overtime pay. This, of course, is applicable only to personnel in establishments coming under the jurisdiction of the act.

The Secretary of Labor has recently announced that one of the criteria will be altered on September 3. Specifically the salary level shall be raised.

A number of adverse repercussions to this decision arise. In situations where an employee has hitherto been considered a bona fide executive, after September 3, he must receive overtime pay for

hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. This, in turn, increases the weekly salary of the employee and increases the cost to the employer without rendering him any increase in effort or productivity.

If, as a result of the decision, an employer is compelled, out of economic necessity, to return an individual to an hourly pay scale, the results may have further detrimental effects. Pension, retirement, or insurance plans are in many cases, geared to the manner of payment, the employee classification, and the salary level. Consequently, the operation and intent of these programs may be disorganized or totally interrupted by a change in employee classification. In addition, if an employee is compelled to return to an hourly wage basis, the morale of the individual in question and his job efficiency may be greatly damaged.

Equally critical is the extension of Federal interference into the management of business. It is one thing for the Federal Government to deal with minimum wages. It is quite another to manipulate the classification of employees in such a way as to restrict the ability of management to effectively classify, assign, utilize, and compensate its personnel.

In issuing his decision, the Secretary of Labor noted that alternatives to present criteria had been suggested in testimony, but he consistently rejected each alternative.

In arriving at his decision, the Secretary stated that he was persuaded by the division's experience, and by the results of relevant surveys, that a salary increase was appropriate. The survey indicated that the following percentages of establishments would be affected by the proposed salary increase: for executives, 13 percent of establishments; for administrators, 4 percent; for professional employees, 12 percent.

However, with respect to the number of employees concerned, the percentage is larger. Eighteen percent of the executive employees would thereafter become eligible for overtime pay, 11 percent of the administrators; and 29 percent of the professional employees.

No survey was conducted to determine the average hourly workweek for executive, administrative, or professional employees. If the number of overtime hours which an employer would be expected to meet under the new criteria established in the decision is unknown, the financial impact on the businesses in question cannot be properly estimated. Furthermore, the geographical variations of salary levels have apparently not been taken into consideration, and due emphasis was not given to the fact that there is a wide variety of conditions which exist. For example, the South and the nonmetropolitan areas were classified in the same manner as large industrial metropolitan centers. From all indications, no attempt was made to determine, or to give consideration, to the probable financial cost of the decision.

Consequently, in view of the apparent lack of consideration given to the consequences of this decision, I urge the

Select Committee on Small Businesses to request the Secretary of Labor to delay the enactment of his decision until the committee can conduct an investigation to determine: First, the economic cost to businesses affected; second, the consequences resulting from a reorientation of classification and its further repercussions on pension plans, insurance programs, employee morale and efficiency; and third, to establish if the techniques used and material relied upon were both sound and adequate.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield the Senator from Kansas 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this rise—which in 1959 was \$55 and \$75 for various classifications, and later was raised to \$80 and \$95 for the various classifications—is not of so much concern to me as it is to the Secretary of Labor, in reaching his decision about the new classification without regard to the institutions in the area which might be affected, without regard to the impact upon the small businesses throughout the country, particularly in the Midwest, and further, without any consideration of the repercussions that may take place in the various pension funds and insurance plans and benefits for the employees.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the resolution referred to, and ask that it be received and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the Select Committee on Small Business established by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation with respect to the proposed promulgation by the Secretary of Labor of revised regulations relating to the coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 of executive, administrative, and professional employees, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) the validity of the classifications of employees provided by such revised regulations and, particularly, the impact thereof on small business, (2) the propriety of techniques and methods used by the Department of Labor in ascertaining factual data forming the basis for such classifications, and (3) such other matters relating to such revised regulations as the Committee may deem necessary.

(b) The Committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

(c) The Committee is authorized to request the Secretary of Labor to postpone the effective date of the proposed revisions referred to in subsection (a) for such reasonable time as may be necessary to enable the Committee to complete its investigation.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation has been the Federal aid to airports program, which authorizes Federal matching funds for airport development in the amount of \$75 million a year. This successful program will expire on June 30, 1964.

S. 1153, as unanimously reported by the Commerce Committee, would extend this program for an additional 3 years. The bill would make only two changes in the existing law. First, it adds a new provision requiring as a condition precedent to any grant that the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been or will be made to restrict use of land adjacent to airports in order to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I am particularly interested in this provision because obviously we have had problems with growth around airports all over the country. In the bill it is provided that the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable efforts, including the enactment of zoning laws, have been made.

Mr. MONRONEY. An effort must be made to secure such an enactment, if the State law would permit regional zoning or zoning by county or zoning by State. We recognize that there is a patchwork of 50 different State laws, with varying zoning requirements. Most of them are limited to municipalities. Therefore, zoning is impossible for an airport which lies outside the limits of a municipality. In such cases the Administrator often will work with the airport authorities to encourage the purchase of additional land. Unless it lies in the path of the safety zone, the Administrator does not participate in that transaction. The purpose is to protect the airport itself against constant encroachments by the construction of schools, churches, nurseries, or housing developments close to the end of the jet runways—and then those concerned wonder why the properties decline in value because of the noise and the danger.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does this provision also apply to the funds for the general aviation airports?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; \$7 million is included.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do the zoning laws still apply?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; although that is not so important. This provision

merely amounts to advice to the airport authorities that in their own way they should do what they can to protect their investment in the airports. The airport land is perhaps the largest block of land in the community or in the county; and whatever they can do locally to protect this investment will eventually diminish the Federal Government's investment.

So we ask the Administrator to show in his reports that everything possible has been done.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is an extremely valuable provision, and I am glad to see it included in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know that the Senator from Colorado, as a pilot, understands how many airports can be ruined by the construction of high-rise apartments, smokestacks, and similar buildings which encroach on the flight patterns.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his question.

Second, the bill incorporates certain technical amendments to eliminate references in the act to airports according to classification by size to conform the law to administrative practice.

I should like to summarize briefly some of the significant and desirable features of the existing Federal Airport Act. Under the act, Federal participation is limited to items directly related to safety; items such as public parking lots, restaurants, and passenger terminal facilities are ineligible for any of the matching funds provided for in the bill.

A special fund of \$7 million a year is provided for the development of general aviation airports and to relieve congestion at high-density airports.

Whenever congestion is relieved at high-density airports and at busy air terminals, overcrowding of airspace by private planes is eliminated. The private planes will use the general aviation airports, where they will have more compatible atmosphere and better service areas than they could possibly have at high-density metropolitan airports.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield on that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to make clear, so far as the RECORD is concerned, that it is my understanding that, although we are trying to place special emphasis on general aviation airports, there is no intent by the committee, and no provision of the bill so states, that commercial airports shall not be available for general aviation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Oh, no. We set aside the \$7 million to give the small plane operators an opportunity to have an atmosphere compatible with the speed and design of their planes. They can still land at the busiest airports of the country if their planes are equipped to communicate with the radio towers and otherwise to comply with the airport regulations.

We felt it was better to provide an alternate place at which he could land and still permit him to have access to the metropolitan airport if he wishes it, than to say, "You cannot land at the

metropolitan airport." There may not be any other place for him to be served.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Funds allocated to any State under the area-population formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years revert to the discretionary fund.

This is a program which was continued in spite of the FAA recommendation that the funds should revert in 1 year. We retained the 2-year provision because we felt that many municipalities—particularly smaller communities—could not provide for their financing or make the necessary arrangements for the construction of the airport within the 1-year period. Therefore, reversion of funds from the State quota would leave them in an uncertain status in determining whether the cost of the airport could be financed by up to 50 percent of Federal matching funds.

As a condition precedent to receipt of Federal aid, airport authorities are required to make provision for the installation of specified landing aids, such as in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and high-intensity runway lighting. Federal funds for these aids may be increased to 75 percent of the cost.

A special fund of \$1,500,000 is provided for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands because of their insular status and unique reliance on air transportation. Of this amount \$600,000 is allocated to Hawaii, \$600,000 to Puerto Rico, and \$300,000 to the Virgin Islands.

Since a part of a State's quota is based on land quotas, it would be obviously unfair to base the quotas for such areas on the amount of land, because the water area that surrounds them in their vicinity would not be given any weight in the area allocation formula.

Except for special set-aside allocations, 75 percent of the remaining authorization, or \$49,875,000, is allocated to the States on the basis of their area and population, and 25 percent, or \$16,625,000, is placed in a special discretionary fund to be used in any State at the discretion of the Administrator.

The act requires the Administrator to prepare a national airport plan specifying projects considered necessary to insure a system of public airports adequate to meet the needs of the various segments of aviation.

All of these significant and desirable features of the existing law would be extended by S. 1153.

Specifically, the bill would authorize to be obligated by grant agreements during fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967 a total amount of \$225 million, or \$75 million a year for each of the fiscal years. Under the existing area population formula, \$49,875,000 a year would go to the States, \$1,500,000 a year special set-aside to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, \$7 million a year for development of general aviation airports to relieve congestion at high-density airports, and \$16,625,000 a year for use in any State at the discretion of the Administrator.

The discretionary fund would be increased by the addition of the State quotas which would not be used for the

2-year period. It would supplement the \$16,625,000 that we provide each year mandatorily to be used at the discretion of the FAA Administrator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a detailed breakdown of the allocation to the various States of Federal aid under this program.

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

Federal-aid airport program—State apportionment of \$75,000,000 authorization (75 percent State apportionment and 25 percent discretionary)

Alabama	\$806,890
Alaska	3,994,844
Arizona	950,979
Arkansas	607,329
California	3,258,755
Colorado	948,502
Connecticut	390,289
Delaware	78,332
District of Columbia	106,705
Florida	1,096,112
Georgia	946,607
Hawaii	131,613
Idaho	657,532
Illinois	1,793,445
Indiana	895,215
Iowa	763,932
Kansas	859,060
Kentucky	695,524
Louisiana	787,763
Maine	366,734
Maryland	514,350
Massachusetts	778,275
Michigan	1,742,125
Minnesota	1,057,902
Mississippi	629,166
Missouri	1,071,649
Montana	1,088,320
Nebraska	718,232
Nevada	786,796
New Hampshire	147,285
New Jersey	899,232
New Mexico	954,576
New York	2,698,477
North Carolina	989,872
North Dakota	565,565
Ohio	1,651,795
Oklahoma	796,355
Oregon	901,766
Pennsylvania	1,885,489
Rhode Island	127,824
South Carolina	542,163
South Dakota	615,385
Tennessee	781,577
Texas	3,139,146
Utah	697,789
Vermont	119,165
Virginia	837,737
Washington	873,882
West Virginia	442,155
Wisconsin	997,096
Wyoming	707,687
Puerto Rico	975,000
Virgin Islands	525,000

U.S. totals..... 49,875,000

Insular areas:	
Hawaii	600,000
Puerto Rico	600,000
Virgin Islands	300,000

Total..... 1,500,000

Discretionary funds:	
General aviation	7,000,000
Regular discretionary (25 percent)	16,625,000

Grand total..... 75,000,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Since the inception of this program in fiscal year 1947, total expenditures have amounted to \$550,609,855. Total net project funds

available amounted to \$741,723,839. Total grant agreements amounted to \$695,171,206. As of July 1, 1963, the total amount of unobligated carryover funds is estimated to be \$46,552,633.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point

a table showing the net project funds available for obligation, grant agreements and cash expenditures by fiscal years from 1947 through 1963.

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

Past Federal expenditures under the program

	Net project funds available	Grant agreements	Net project funds available	Grant agreements	Total net project funds available	Total grant agreements	Total cash expenditures
1947	\$42,750,000	\$3,041,906			\$42,750,000	\$3,041,906	
1948	30,662,500	25,490,758			30,662,500	25,490,758	\$5,148,889
1949	36,817,172	49,908,900			36,817,172	49,908,900	30,390,990
1950	36,500,000	44,049,461			36,500,000	44,049,461	33,182,519
1951	21,200,000	39,703,042			21,200,000	39,703,042	30,388,415
1952	15,850,000	19,538,231			15,850,000	19,538,231	32,808,068
1953	9,710,029	11,007,077			9,710,029	11,007,077	26,990,836
1954		—855,556				—855,556	17,481,945
1955	20,730,000	19,098,475	\$42,500,000	\$9,205,897	20,730,000	19,098,475	8,353,021
1956	20,571,525	8,588,383	63,000,000	37,491,306	63,071,525	17,794,280	16,515,871
1957		7,649,910	63,000,000	63,922,493	63,000,000	45,141,216	20,649,031
1958	1—587,887	6,403,252	63,000,000	62,412,013	63,000,000	70,325,745	42,870,387
1959			63,000,000	72,956,360	63,000,000	72,956,360	56,577,626
1960			63,000,000	82,202,876	63,000,000	82,202,876	57,113,356
1961			63,000,000	73,783,676	63,000,000	73,783,676	64,215,753
1962			75,000,000	46,381,321	75,000,000	46,381,321	56,920,716
1963			75,000,000	75,003,438	75,000,000	75,003,438	51,002,432
Total	234,223,839	234,223,839	507,500,000	460,947,367	741,723,839	695,171,206	550,609,855
Total grant agreements					695,171,206		
Available for obligation July 1, 1963					\$46,552,633		

¹ Unused appropriation which reverted to Treasury.

² Estimated.

Mr. MONRONEY. On August 18, 1963, the Administrator announced that for fiscal year 1964 the allocation for construction and improvement of 452 civil airports under the program would be \$75,911,216.

Mr. President, the committee is convinced, and unanimously agrees that \$75 million a year is fully justified and represents the minimum amount necessary to make the program effective. During recent years eligible project requests have been nearly double the current level of authorizations.

In other words, we have had requests for at least \$150 million a year of Federal funds and have had only \$75 million maximum to match those requests.

In fiscal year 1962 the eligible project requests totaled \$149,782,420; in fiscal year 1963, \$140,114,334; and for fiscal year 1964, requests amounting to over \$150 million were received by the FAA. The level of authorization is definitely below the estimate of required development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point summaries of the estimated required airport development for each of the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1967.

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

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State

FISCAL YEAR 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama	600	380	1,901	6	0	80	107	3,074	0	5	49	19	0	100	0	173	3,247
Alaska	24	3,206	2,446	228	200	250	21	6,465	0	575	0	0	0	0	12	587	7,052
Arizona	0	287	2,981	169	0	58	70	3,565	0	73	922	138	0	36	50	1,219	4,784
Arkansas	50	54	289	5	0	0	22	420	69	47	314	34	0	0	16	48	900
California	204	4,347	3,516	390	125	2,859	2,541	13,082	1,330	631	2,804	658	100	349	93	5,965	19,947
Colorado	0	48	706	107	0	890	9	1,760	2	70	330	17	0	30	33	482	2,242
Connecticut	0	268	476	54	0	60	7	865	60	166	463	247	0	40	97	1,073	1,938
Delaware	0	0	142	30	0	0	8	180	0	180	142	0	0	0	0	322	502
Florida	1	725	2,927	232	0	50	569	4,504	0	7	258	113	0	0	11	389	4,893
Georgia	7,550	220	470	112	80	50	8	8,490	53	180	392	80	0	20	14	739	9,229
Hawaii	0	447	790	179	0	600	50	2,066	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	40	2,106
Idaho	20	5	740	140	0	125	112	1,142	16	0	466	15	0	30	38	565	1,707
Illinois	1,030	822	2,599	227	240	0	15	4,933	3,797	4,697	2,303	177	0	75	120	11,169	16,102
Indiana	0	55	585	43	200	0	0	883	360	210	438	36	0	0	61	1,105	1,988
Iowa	4	35	938	30	0	0	19	1,026	51	31	851	70	0	25	1,028	2,054	3,082
Kansas	8	2	380	11	0	0	0	401	0	45	1,256	105	0	30	0	1,337	1,837
Kentucky	0	640	1,221	128	1,050	0	81	3,120	315	352	80	0	0	100	847	3,967	5,087
Louisiana	10	326	1,426	59	0	0	10	1,831	0	1,162	2,098	106	0	80	49	3,495	5,326
Maine	2	189	298	34	0	0	95	618	40	260	292	127	0	0	25	744	1,362
Maryland	260	2,560	6,457	193	0	2,000	14	11,474	523	880	846	0	0	0	40	2,289	13,763
Massachusetts	0	2,102	1,393	182	0	0	70	3,747	0	457	1,557	444	0	0	57	2,615	6,262
Michigan	113	262	973	114	0	0	10	1,562	820	75	170	50	0	50	5	1,770	2,732
Minnesota	1	147	543	74	0	845	93	1,703	179	140	348	72	0	10	36	785	2,488
Mississippi	0	1,344	775	18	0	30	35	2,202	0	42	210	0	0	0	0	232	2,454
Missouri	0	20	2,390	14	0	135	0	2,568	325	139	1,266	81	0	0	0	1,811	4,379
Montana	0	0	739	99	0	100	32	970	1	10	634	42	0	60	10	757	1,727
Nebraska	22	30	184	85	0	215	97	633	134	97	408	30	0	70	42	781	1,414
Nevada	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	20	0	5	16	53	0	0	6	80	100
New Hampshire	7	177	188	29	0	125	13	539	46	236	316	58	0	0	59	715	1,254
New Jersey	0	210	1,390	0	0	0	350	1,950	0	174	854	44	0	0	20	1,092	3,042
New Mexico	0	100	471	109	0	66	3	749	16	48	312	62	0	14	52	504	1,253
New York	45	10,121	2,388	268	0	200	4,215	17,237	0	274	1,451	66	0	0	281	2,072	19,309
North Carolina	41	335	1,780	200	0	125	42	2,523	257	310	152	57	0	0	32	808	3,331
North Dakota	0	23	201	12	0	0	0	236	40	106	117	0	0	0	10	273	509
Ohio	210	775	2,664	113	0	500	530	4,792	1,102	534	1,219	71	0	0	202	3,128	7,920
Oklahoma	0	20	125	0	240	0	0	385	89	131	870	177	0	125	1,392	1,777	2,159
Oregon	4	12	254	182	0	0	2	454	0	7	268	42	100	0	12	429	883
Pennsylvania	1,015	8,605	3,175	265	300	0	100	13,460	1,390	3,635	2,084	485	0	150	30	7,774	21,234
Rhode Island	0	35	242	50	0	200	8	535	0	22	44	56	0	0	6	128	663
South Carolina	0	235	500	80	85	830	222	1,952	98	94	0	0	0	0	15	207	2,159
South Dakota	8	24	535	16	90	0	15	688	54	56	57	0	0	0	25	192	880
Tennessee	0	0	220	58	0	2,220	0	2,498	138	268	497	81	0	0	30	1,014	3,512
Texas	0	224	3,139	163	200	3,050	44	6,820	925	454	1,609	64	0	0	473	3,625	10,345
Utah	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	32	0	0	0	34	34
Vermont	25	59	61	13	0	0	1	169	20	93	328	46	0	0	23	510	669
Virginia	80	115	1,230	161	0	0	70	1,656	100	843	1,449	120	0	0	163	2,675	4,331

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Washington.....	1,300	50	502	100	0	858	96	2,906	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	300	3,206
West Virginia.....	0	1,450	1,335	169	0	0	0	2,954	150	139	353	0	0	0	12	654	3,608
Wisconsin.....	188	438	1,518	127	150	220	70	2,711	246	93	314	0	0	0	2	655	3,366
Wyoming.....	9	16	98	60	0	0	12	195	29	47	41	15	0	0	33	165	360
U.S. total.....	12,821	41,545	60,310	5,158	3,050	16,831	9,888	149,603	12,777	18,100	31,548	4,210	200	1,164	2,545	70,544	220,147
Puerto Rico.....	0	7,000	2,770	175	0	0	0	9,945	15	0	25	5	0	0	0	45	9,990
Virgin Islands.....	0	655	290	28	0	0	0	973	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	973	973
Territory total.....	0	7,655	3,060	203	0	0	0	10,918	15	0	25	5	0	0	0	45	10,963
Grand total.....	12,821	49,200	63,370	5,361	3,050	16,831	9,888	160,521	12,792	18,100	31,573	4,215	200	1,164	2,545	70,589	231,110

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

FISCAL YEAR 1965

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama.....	0	452	370	135	200	170	40	1,367	0	3	8	0	0	0	4	15	1,382
Alaska.....	12	2,902	710	120	225	210	31	4,210	210	248	0	30	0	0	28	516	4,726
Arizona.....	0	158	1,603	80	120	480	243	2,684	1	57	688	87	0	8	21	862	3,546
Arkansas.....	25	38	210	90	120	0	24	507	6	16	91	34	0	0	8	155	662
California.....	82	1,766	9,276	358	285	6,530	2,577	20,874	50	216	1,241	443	225	921	244	3,340	24,214
Colorado.....	0	237	67	18	0	80	0	402	242	14	351	46	0	30	0	683	1,085
Connecticut.....	0	280	380	53	0	50	14	777	0	90	173	56	0	265	77	661	1,438
Delaware.....	0	6	32	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	431	0	0	0	0	431	469
District of Columbia.....																	
Florida.....	30	146	871	164	0	0	17	1,228	0	0	168	60	0	0	2	230	1,458
Georgia.....	50	5,050	890	12	0	0	15	6,017	90	215	222	6	0	0	12	545	6,562
Hawaii.....	0	0	0	95	0	1,695	0	1,790	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,790	1,790
Idaho.....	0	46	917	57	0	75	75	1,170	5	1	139	78	0	40	8	271	1,441
Illinois.....	0	35	205	306	0	125	11	682	1,028	544	1,665	117	0	0	185	3,539	4,221
Indiana.....	0	152	830	43	0	30	0	1,055	465	298	883	113	0	20	32	1,181	2,866
Iowa.....	0	0	360	21	0	0	0	381	32	25	774	33	0	0	8	872	1,253
Kansas.....	0	20	0	0	0	55	75	125	6	34	632	103	0	0	4	779	854
Kentucky.....	110	895	1,360	141	0	435	2,941	45	65	0	0	0	0	0	8	118	3,059
Louisiana.....	0	659	698	19	0	0	6	1,382	0	12	38	0	0	0	0	50	1,432
Maine.....	0	141	356	32	0	80	0	609	10	50	79	71	0	0	15	225	834
Maryland.....	0	800	2,764	202	0	0	0	3,766	0	737	827	46	0	0	33	1,643	5,409
Massachusetts.....	30	1,532	704	346	0	190	116	2,918	0	56	446	594	76	560	137	1,869	4,787
Michigan.....	127	152	605	62	0	45	10	1,001	20	555	171	120	0	15	5	886	1,887
Minnesota.....	172	203	701	58	0	480	9	1,623	211	205	431	2	0	0	37	886	2,509
Mississippi.....	0	104	2,090	63	0	0	0	2,257	0	69	23	0	0	0	1	93	2,350
Missouri.....	42	776	57	8	0	250	10	1,143	154	68	1,235	127	0	0	21	1,605	2,748
Montana.....	10	103	1,408	138	0	108	0	1,767	0	72	10	0	0	50	10	142	1,909
Nebraska.....	0	130	829	21	0	0	0	980	14	54	318	9	0	0	0	395	1,375
Nevada.....	0	0	0	0	0	50	15	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	65
New Hampshire.....	4	315	254	38	0	100	19	730	5	94	209	45	0	0	2	355	1,085
New Jersey.....	0	15	260	101	0	1,630	0	2,006	0	95	262	211	0	0	89	657	2,663
New Mexico.....	13	111	314	60	0	30	14	542	0	88	205	70	0	12	4	379	921
New York.....	410	4,696	3,714	242	0	365	982	10,409	0	110	479	174	200	110	20	1,093	11,502
North Carolina.....	90	132	1,245	48	0	38	1,553	499	678	465	98	0	0	0	64	1,504	3,357
North Dakota.....	0	1	158	33	0	0	0	212	19	45	90	0	0	0	5	159	371
Ohio.....	980	830	1,900	124	0	30	3,574	727	430	649	10	0	0	0	120	1,536	5,510
Oklahoma.....	0	1,381	3,124	105	0	20	4,630	30	90	640	5	0	0	0	29	794	5,424
Oregon.....	16	0	0	44	0	16	0	76	0	1	110	0	0	0	7	118	194
Pennsylvania.....	250	3,620	1,590	160	150	1,320	1,490	8,580	275	4,340	2,079	562	0	0	80	7,336	15,916
Rhode Island.....	0	12	16	0	250	60	12	350	30	0	30	5	0	90	10	165	515
South Carolina.....	0	150	440	0	0	345	310	1,245	45	125	138	18	0	0	27	353	1,598
South Dakota.....	0	21	925	35	0	130	0	1,111	51	52	82	22	0	0	18	225	1,336
Tennessee.....	0	0	250	0	0	0	0	250	233	135	298	60	0	75	9	810	1,060
Texas.....	20	127	1,079	60	0	150	32	1,468	233	200	778	15	150	0	56	1,432	2,900
Utah.....	0	37	136	6	0	34	0	213	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	28	241
Vermont.....	0	47	14	0	0	80	32	173	45	216	68	29	0	0	37	395	568
Virginia.....	0	20	790	188	160	0	0	1,158	220	332	324	173	150	0	138	1,337	2,495
Washington.....	0	0	0	0	600	460	0	1,060	0	0	37	52	0	0	6	95	1,155
West Virginia.....	0	37	981	44	0	45	0	1,107	0	284	175	53	0	0	36	548	1,655
Wisconsin.....	115	341	581	35	0	80	25	1,177	215	107	448	2	0	0	0	772	1,949
Wyoming.....	5	13	216	102	0	0	7	343	2	18	148	0	0	0	3	171	514
U.S. total.....	2,593	28,689	45,980	4,097	2,110	15,395	6,812	105,676	5,218	11,003	18,866	3,840	801	2,196	1,660	43,584	149,260
Puerto Rico.....	0	1,025	200	10	0	750	25	2,010	0	0	0	15	0	50	0	65	2,075
Virgin Islands.....	0	0	50	6	0	0	0	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	56
Territories total.....	0	1,025	250	16	0	750	25	2,066	0	0	0	15	0	50	0	65	2,131
Grand total.....	2,593	29,714	46,230	4,113	2,110	16,145	6,837	107,742	5,218	11,003	18,866	3,855	801	2,246	1,660	43,649	151,391

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama.....	0	125	1,925	43	235	160	17	2,505	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,505
Alaska.....	50	4,240	2,307	175	150	240	32	6,194	0	786	0	0	0	0	10	796	6,990
Arizona.....	0	30	93	63	200	1,370	6	1,762	6	20	100	50	0	132	76	384	2,146
Arkansas.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	145	1,172	202	0	0	49	1,611	1,611
California.....	40,600	156	1,040	426	400	900	767	44,289	1,750	50	753	255	1,052	523	97	4,480	48,769
Colorado.....	60	5	289	20	0	0	116	490	0	29	533	101	0	0	14	677	1,167
Connecticut.....	0	0	0	116	70	60	20	266	0	30	40	71	0	470	16	627	893
Delaware.....	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	60	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	66	126
District of Columbia.....	0	17	797	44	1,600	3,315	384	6,157	0	0	65	34	0	0	0	99	6,256
Florida.....	0	0	2,890	180	0	50	30	3,150	51	155	399	47	0	0	8	600	3,810
Georgia.....	0	1,728	1,774	155	0	0	0	3,657	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,657
Hawaii.....	0	0	443	198	260	140	25	1,066	0	1	17	18	0	115	4	155	1,221
Idaho.....	0	67	200	55	0	75	0	397	23	627	2,377	214	0	0	71	3,312	3,709
Illinois.....	0	165	285	36	0	0	0	486	40	59	293	210	0	0	0	602	1,088
Indiana.....	0	0	220	32	0	0	0	252	0	24	308	158	0	202	0	692	944
Iowa.....	0	8	397	66	0	15	0	486	34	26	561	259	0	25	14	919	1,405
Kansas.....	923	4,200	3,440	245	600	130	107	9,645	323	554	159	0	0	0	148	1,184	10,829
Kentucky.....	0	671	2,625	138	0	40	16	3,490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,490
Louisiana.....	0	152	290	39	0	140	0	621	45	106	114	34	0	150	25	474	1,095
Maine.....	85	0	800	0	200	1,000	0	2,085	0	0	76	172	0	0	10	258	2,343
Maryland.....	0	130	398	32	0	265	14	839	0	46	145	11	0	840	178	1,220	2,059
Massachusetts.....	0	30	60	0	0	40	0	130	255	80	255	70	0	25	13	698	828
Michigan.....	173	0	670	63	0	0	10	916	227	177	140	84	0	0	66	694	1,610
Minnesota.....	0	235	1,011	20	0	0	0	1,266	2	12	14	0	0	0	3	31	1,297
Mississippi.....	0	164	1,242	38	0	1,135	0	2,579	0	8	896	195	0	135	0	1,234	3,813
Missouri.....	0	10	200	271	0	720	45	1,246	0	1	16	105	0	45	0	167	1,413
Montana.....	126	428	2,071	46	0	312	8	2,991	0	0	829	52	0	60	4	945	3,936
Nebraska.....	0	190	202	25	20	50	0	487	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
Nevada.....	0	95	265	24	0	130	10	524	6	20	146	24	0	20	6	222	746
New Hampshire.....	0	0	198	124	170	1,590	72	2,154	0	0	520	209	0	30	359	1,118	3,272
New Jersey.....	0	121	1,740	137	0	225	40	2,263	0	32	220	60	0	85	12	409	2,672
New Mexico.....	100	496	2,665	421	0	164	601	4,447	0	1	181	239	0	35	20	476	4,923
New York.....	244	69	429	40	0	0	37	819	89	430	175	82	0	0	39	815	1,634
North Carolina.....	48	34	299	63	0	0	0	444	69	150	204	0	0	0	21	444	888
North Dakota.....	100	1,970	5,480	248	0	150	200	8,148	530	428	796	66	0	100	72	1,992	10,140
Ohio.....	0	499	912	64	80	0	13	1,568	94	68	649	440	0	35	1,436	3,004	4,574
Oklahoma.....	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	150	0	16	16	51
Oregon.....	370	4,910	1,895	135	0	400	875	8,585	0	675	3,070	670	0	0	0	4,415	13,000
Pennsylvania.....	0	8	74	96	0	0	40	218	0	20	20	2	0	90	0	132	350
Rhode Island.....	0	75	0	25	0	0	300	400	15	180	53	28	0	0	18	294	694
South Carolina.....	0	18	913	48	90	300	0	1,369	20	29	29	13	0	45	13	149	1,518
South Dakota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	500	85	0	39	16	726	726	
Tennessee.....	25	195	1,194	54	100	40	5	1,613	892	454	2,156	29	0	179	3,710	5,323	6,936
Texas.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	2	0	0	0	0	69	69
Utah.....	0	0	54	4	0	0	2	60	0	51	430	39	0	0	1	521	581
Vermont.....	40	0	450	50	0	140	0	680	0	169	493	210	150	0	55	1,077	1,757
Virginia.....	0	0	0	0	0	100	25	125	0	0	0	18	0	0	5	23	148
Washington.....	0	0	33	100	0	180	40	353	0	84	430	111	0	0	0	625	978
West Virginia.....	0	371	1,821	70	0	100	0	2,362	253	125	376	0	0	0	0	754	3,116
Wisconsin.....	0	5	53	120	0	0	4	182	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	15	197
Wyoming.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U.S. total.....	42,944	21,617	43,144	4,384	4,175	13,736	3,861	133,861	4,767	5,964	19,766	4,735	1,352	3,166	1,673	41,423	175,284
Puerto Rico.....	0	1,200	700	100	0	1,200	0	3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200
Virgin Islands.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Territories, total.....	0	1,200	700	100	0	1,200	0	3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200
Grand total.....	42,944	22,817	43,844	4,484	4,175	14,936	3,861	137,061	4,767	5,964	19,766	4,735	1,352	3,166	1,673	41,423	178,485

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is pertinent to note that the estimated requirements for fiscal year 1964 are \$231,110,000; as mentioned previously, the program announced for this year is \$75,911,216. By adding the matching local funds the total amount for airport development in fiscal year 1964 is roughly \$151,822,432, or \$79,287,568 short of the required needs.

All witnesses who appeared before the committee supported the \$75 million authorization as the minimum amount necessary. Many expressed the view that the amount should be increased to \$100 million annually and extended for a 5-year period. A number of the members of the committee agree that this amount could be justified. However, in view of past strong opposition to such an increase on the part of the House and because of the many other pressing demands on the Federal budget, it would not be practical this year, to press for a higher authorization. With these considerations in

mind, the committee determined it best to extend the act for 3 years rather than 5, and thus avoid freezing the program at the \$75 million level over too prolonged a period. This will enable the committee to review the program again 2 years hence. It is possible that circumstances may have changed by that time, which will make the realization of an increased level of authorization more practical.

The committee in 1961 reluctantly agreed to a House amendment changing the method of funding from contract or advance obligation authority to a system of annual appropriations. The committee was apprehensive that the past chaotic history of the appropriations system, with its attendant uncertainties, might repeat itself and render the airport program ineffective. The committee is pleased that its fears have not, thus far, come to pass.

It is not enough to authorize advance funding if authorizations are not obligated to be expended by means of ad-

vance appropriations. The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses have wisely recognized this need, and have maintained 2-year forward funding at the fully authorized level. Two years is the minimum leadtime essential to the realization of an orderly and effective program. The committee is confident that this need will continue to be recognized.

A review of the statistics clearly shows the spectacular growth of air commerce and the immense contribution this industry makes to the national economy.

The aircraft manufacturing industry ranks second only to the motor vehicle and equipment industry in terms of number of people employed, the total of which exceeds 650,000. This does not include the many people employed by industries indirectly associated with aviation; for example, aviation fuel consumed by domestic aircraft exceeded 3 billion gallons in 1962. The domestic trunk airlines alone realized revenues of \$2,250,-

281,000 in 1962 while expending \$2,174,-137,000. Domestic air carrier revenue passengers are expected to increase from 59.9 million at the outset of this year to 85 million by 1970. For the same years in terms of passenger-miles the figures are 33 and 51 billion. Particularly impressive is the growth of the 13 local service carriers which carried 18.2 percent more passengers, flew 19.6 percent more passenger-miles, and carried 14.3 percent more mail, 24.9 percent more express, and 31.4 percent more freight in 1962 than they did in 1961. They flew 7,650,000 revenue passengers, a total of 1.6 billion passenger-miles. Mail ton-miles amounted to 3.8 million in 1962, while express ton-miles were 3.8 million and freight ton-miles were 7.2 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Aircargo continues to set new records and 1962 was no exception. Total traffic carried by the airlines exceeded 1.3 billion ton-miles in 1962 for an increase of nearly 20 percent over the preceding year. It is estimated that total cargo traffic should at least double by 1970. Airfreight showed a 22.5-percent increase this year with total ton-miles amounting to 898.1 million. Air express amounting to over 70 million ton-miles showed a 14.3-percent increase over the preceding year. Airmail recorded a 12.7-percent increase with a total of 251.4 million ton-miles. First-class mail achieved a 16.4-percent increase over 1961 with the total for 1962 amounting to 88.6 million ton-miles.

This is the mail carried on a "space available" basis in the air, but carried at the regular surface cost. It is a wide open field for greater utilization of aircraft without additional cost to the Post Office Department, and also for furnishing a use for unused capacity which is now going to waste.

General aviation last year, with over 80,000 aircraft, flew approximately 3 times as many hours and twice as many miles as the domestic certificated airlines. Today, the general aviation fleet represents 85 percent of all U.S. aircraft. By 1970, their number should total well over 100,000. General aviation use is rapidly expanding for pleasure flying, business travel, air taxi service, and in agricultural and industrial applications. Operations increased from 12,129,000 in 1957 to 17,367,000 in 1962 at 270 airports controlled by FAA control towers. In terms of hours flown, general aviation flying is expected to increase from slightly over 13 million to well over 18 million by 1970. During the decade ending 1961, estimated hours flown rose from 8,186,000 to 12,800,000, while estimated plane miles flown increased from 972,-055,000 to 1,695 million.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I realize that the question I am about to pose does not relate specifically to the portion of the Senator's speech I have interrupted. Nevertheless, I regard the Senator to be such an authority on the subject of aviation that I wish to express to him a concern I have felt, and to solicit his views.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall certainly appreciate any comment by my distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, since he has always been a great friend of aviation and forward looking in meeting the needs in the air as well as meeting the needs for transportation on the ground.

Mr. GORE. I have been concerned that the aviation industry might be rushing pellmell, uneconomically, and unnecessarily into jet transportation. To illustrate my point, I find it quicker to take an Electra from Nashville, Tenn., to National Airport and then an automobile to the U.S. Capitol, than to take a jet from the same airport to Dulles Airport and then an automobile to the Capitol. In other words, I can travel by Electra from the airport in Nashville to reach my office in the Capitol quicker than I can by taking a jet, yet the jet transportation requires great expense, great investment, and I fear—if not immediately, ultimately—great Government subsidy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Oklahoma that he has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I inquire of the Presiding Officer how the remaining time stands?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-three minutes remain to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Oklahoma whatever time he needs.

Mr. MONRONEY. The jets essentially are the long-legged aircraft, which must fly longer distances to make up for the trend in airport locations generally being moved farther from the centers of cities. There is a great need for modern turboprop aircraft for shorter distances. In fitting the jet aircraft into the economic pattern, probably we shall move again to propeller-driven aircraft or lighter, lower powered jets, whose noise level will permit landings at airports closer in.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Electra will fly from Nashville to Washington, D.C., in approximately an hour and a half. The jet might reduce that time by 20 minutes. Is jet transportation justified strictly from the standpoint of time saving?

Mr. MONRONEY. It depends upon the distance. American Airlines has recaptured much of the market between Washington, D.C., and Chicago by abandoning jet service from Friendship to O'Hare, and by originating its Electra

flights to Washington National. Many friends of mine fly by jet from California to Chicago, and transfer to Electras or Viscounts at Chicago and fly to Washington National, rather than to the outlying airport, which they could do in the jets.

It depends upon the distance, largely, whether a jet is a great economy in time.

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to say anything critical of American Airlines or of any other particular airline, but I have noticed another trend. Local service is being diminished. Knoxville, Tenn., is now served by only one American flight east and one American flight west in a 24-hour period. I would rather have more frequent service by standard equipment than less frequent service by super-jets.

Mr. MONRONEY. One of the things which we must continue to watch is the abandonment of cities such as Knoxville or other good revenue towns as the equipment grows larger and the major trunk lines desire to make longer flights. There is no question that they can make more money from the longer flights with fewer stops. This is one of the reasons why they are abandoning service to intermediate size cities. It will be a danger, eventually, to service in many areas, which may have to be picked up by feeder lines or local service airlines on a subsidy basis.

Mr. GORE. I have one further point, if the Senator will permit me to proceed momentarily, though I realize his time is short. The development of which he speaks will leave the intermediate cities to be more or less hitchhiking stops.

The flights seem no longer to be scheduled from Nashville, Tenn., to New York or Washington for the convenience of passengers in Nashville, but, rather, as a convenient stopover for passengers from California to New York.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. Of course, most California-New York traffic is moving nonstop, or at least with only one stop. To get adequate revenue loads in the older days, they had to make perhaps 10 stops.

Mr. GORE. If that practice continues, what about interim cities like Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Nashville, Little Rock?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is a grave danger that the trunklines have become such supertrunklines that they do not provide adequate service for intermediate cities.

Mr. GORE. What can Congress do?

Mr. MONRONEY. Congress can, through hearings and by policy expressions, ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to require justification of how well these major lines have served intermediate points, and whether they should be rewarded in the future with long-distance transcontinental routes. I think service to each community is the yardstick by which airlines should be measured.

Mr. GORE. I do not think that yardstick is being used. For example, American had a flight out of Nashville at 6 or 6:30 in the morning for years. The patronage was good, the service convenient. People would leave Nashville early in the morning and arrive in Washington early. I could be at my office by 9 or

9:30. Now I can get no flight out of Nashville except at 2 a.m. on which I can arrive in Washington no earlier than 2:30 or 3 in the afternoon. Such service does not measure the needs of the community by the yardstick which the Senator mentioned.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. Service has diminished to such communities, and will continue to diminish unless the FAA and the CAB take this problem into cognizance.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will not need that much time.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am grateful to the Senator.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that this trouble will continue unless Congress or the Federal aviation agencies take some action. This disturbs me. What assurance can the Senator give me that the Federal Aviation Agency will do something about it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be a matter to be taken into consideration in granting extensions of additional route miles, which are often sought by major trunkline air carriers. The Senator can do, as I presume all Senators do—insist to the airline that greater service be available to the State that the Senator represents.

It is a plain fact that, if it is left strictly to economics rather than public service, the airlines will make more money serving long flights. The greater the distance, the more money there is in carrying passengers to distant points. The shorter range flights are the least profitable.

I do not understand why the airlines do not recognize that from Nashville to Washington, for example, the plane always is filled with passengers when it leaves there at 6 or 7 o'clock. There is never a seat when the plane leaves Nashville. I do not know why they do not recognize that such a flight provides a good revenue source.

I have been urging a modern replacement for the old DC-3 that would be fast and tailored to serve the communities the Senator is talking about with the frequency of service they need. That is what we are really talking about. While we can build the massive, long-legged jets and the supersonic planes that fly at three times the speed of sound, we have not yet found a replacement for the old DC-3, which today is still the standard plane for the carriage of traffic on schedules that fly to the medium sized towns.

Mr. GORE. I can reach only one conclusion, from the remarks made by the Senator from Oklahoma, namely that the CAB has not been adequately caring for the public interest.

Mr. MONRONEY. It has not paid attention to that part of the public interest represented by the towns of the size of which the Senator from Tennessee speaks.

Mr. GORE. Are there not more Nashvilles, Tulsas, and Louisvilles than there are Los Angeleses and New Yorks?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are many more. When times become hard and they are looking for revenue, the airlines will rediscover them. I have been urging that they rediscover them with frequency of service on shorter haul flights with a redesigned plane. The fault lies not only with the airlines, but with the aircraft manufacturers, who have failed to give the airlines the type of equipment we need. There is not a short range aircraft today being built in this country that the airlines can use. The DC-9 has been designed, but is not in production. The other planes are for longer hauls, generally a minimum range of 1,500 miles. They are so long legged that to stop with a 707 or a DC-8 on a short haul is totally and completely uneconomic.

Mr. GORE. I conclude by urging the distinguished chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee to haul the CAB before his committee, in public hearing, and demand of them why it has not performed the duty which Congress has vested in it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator speaks very wisely in this field. I will certainly take time to call their attention to it, and, as time permits, try to have hearings on the question. This is a real problem. I am afraid the trunklines will abandon service in towns of a size smaller than Nashville, and turn them over to the feeder lines, which will then be paid a subsidy for service to towns which the trunk lines should serve as a part of their service for being permitted to serve larger cities. This is the real problem.

Mr. GORE. I promise not to take any further time of the Senator—

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the Senator's questions. They are stimulating and important.

Mr. GORE. The end result of the trouble which the Senator has described, and for the end of which he offers little hope, is poor service for the vast majority of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. On a population basis.

Mr. GORE. It takes longer to get from Tulsa to Washington than from Los Angeles to Washington.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And at much greater expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. MONRONEY. In many parts of the country it is easier to fly backward for 300 or 400 miles. In other words, in order to go east, it is quicker to fly west from Phoenix to Los Angeles and then east to Oklahoma City, than to try to get to Oklahoma City directly from Phoenix. This is a question of scheduling that is a source of irritation to the committee. We deplore the fact that the major airlines have not tried to keep up with the public interest in this regard.

To return to my statement, arguments have been made in the past that our airport needs are static; that these needs will soon be met, that the program can be reduced drastically each year as these static needs are met. The argument is specious, and ignores, as well as denies,

the march of progress. Air traffic is exploding, speed is doubling, the general aviation fleet is increasing rapidly each year, technological advances are continually made which should be incorporated into our airport system. Mr. President, you can no more squeeze the air traffic of today into the airports of the thirties than one can expect to squeeze the traffic of the seventies into today's existing airports. This was dramatically called to the attention of the Senate Aviation Committee this very week during the hearings on New England air service. It was quite apparent that one of the major reasons for inadequate service in New England was the lack of adequate airports. I am sure that the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire would agree with me that the system is not only less than adequate, it is deplorable. This bill will continue to provide at least the minimum amount of funds necessary to improve our airports.

In this connection it should be noted that just in the past year the FAA criteria for our airports in smaller communities have been revised. In the past the criteria called for such sophisticated designs and plans and such rigid and expensive minimum requirements that many of our communities were not able to avail themselves of the benefits of the program because of prohibitive costs and unnecessary requirements. This recent development will enable hundreds of our smaller communities to qualify for assistance, properly related to their needs. The plans have been simplified and the costs cut in half. We can expect a rapid rise in the number of applications from these communities and in the amount of funds which will be needed.

Our airports are also vital and indispensable to our national defense. In World War II over 429 civil airports were made available to the Military Establishment. They are continually available to the military in times of national emergency and in peacetime as well. For example, itinerant military aircraft operations at airports with FAA control towers in 1961 amounted to 1,766,488.

Since the beginning of the program and continuously throughout its history, the primary emphasis has been on safety. This emphasis was of paramount importance in the amendments passed in 1961. It is a recognition that the single most important factor in insuring air safety is the maintenance of an adequate airport system. The need to maintain and improve our airports is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that more than two-thirds of all aircraft accidents occur either at or within 5 miles of the airport.

The act stresses and contributes to safety by imposing conditions which must be met before Federal funds can be granted. The Administrator must prepare a national airport plan specifying the projects considered necessary to insure an airport system adequate to meet aviation needs. Airports not included in the plan are not eligible for Federal assistance. Airport sponsors must operate and maintain the airport and all facilities in a safe condition. FAA approval of a master plan is required before Federal funds may be expended.

Design, engineering, and construction must be approved in advance of allocation and must further be inspected and approved during the course of construction. This system of Federal oversight over the use of millions of tax dollars—Federal, State, and local—has unquestionably contributed greatly to the unparalleled safety record of aviation in this country.

The only new provision contained in the bill will also contribute to safety, as well as help to alleviate the noise problem around our airports. This provision would require as a condition precedent to the making of a grant that the Administrator satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been or will be made to restrict the use of land adjacent to airports to make it compatible with the operation of the airport. The noise problem cannot be ignored or dismissed, especially in view of the advent of supersonic jets. The problems of approach, landing, and takeoff noise and sonic boom overpressure which are inherent in the development and use of such jets require careful study and analysis. The new provision would enable the Administrator to encourage and assist the local communities in their efforts to achieve effective zoning and land use and in preparing for the era of the super-sonic transport.

The noise problem must be met head-on. Every available means of alleviating noise must be employed. The single most important means which can be effected now is to insure adequate zoning. The proposed amendment will encourage such zoning where reasonable and practicable. However, the Federal Government can only encourage and assist. The primary responsibility and initiative rests with local governments and the Federal Government can only cooperate. Therefore, the Administrator, in interpreting this provision, must take into consideration all relevant factors including those involving economic, social, safety, and multiple-jurisdiction considerations. The prime consideration should be what makes economic sense, not what may be technically feasible or within the realm of reality. In administering this provision, the Administrator should broadly interpret the word "reasonable."

In regard to this new provision, as well as the remarks in the committee report of tailoring aircraft to fit existing airports, the goal is to improve our existing airports, build new airports, and promote safety—not price our airports out of existence.

Mr. President, Congress has always recognized the need for and supported every measure designed to improve our national transportation system—by water, rail, highway, and air. I close with the observation that until all our communities, both large and small, are accessible by air, as well as by other means of transportation, we have not achieved a national transportation system designed to fulfill the needs of the future.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to yield, if I have some time. I have practically consumed all my time.

Mr. KEATING. I need only 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has briefly discussed one of the committee amendments to this bill which is of great concern to me. I am referring to the proposed amendment to the basic Federal Airport Act which would require, as a condition precedent to any airport grant, that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency satisfy himself that appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to airports so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

Mr. President, a provision such as this has been long overdue. The aircraft noise problem and related nuisances are becoming more serious from day to day in the metropolitan areas of our country where large airports are located. As I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is aware, I have been very conscious of the devastating effect of aircraft noise in and around airports located in New York, not only in New York City but elsewhere in the State such as the Buffalo-Niagara Falls area. Now I recognize that there is no single means of tackling the problem which will solve it. Only a many-sided approach will reach longrun solutions. One certain avenue of progress lies in basic research and development into noise suppressant devices on jet engines, and I have sponsored appropriate legislation for Federal participation in such a program, which I hope will be reached for consideration by the Commerce Committee as early as possible. But in the meantime, we should not overlook, and I am gratified that the committee has not overlooked, another important and sensible approach which has now been taken in the amendment to this bill; namely, that compatible land use of adjacent land areas around airports be achieved to the extent feasible.

It is altogether true that surrounding areas of many airports are already developed to such an extent that corrective zoning is impossible. Certainly this holds true for the most part at many New York airports. However, the lack of foresight in the past to take protective action when it was feasible as a practical matter provides a lesson for what can now be accomplished at this late date with respect to new airport improvements and new airport sites in areas which remain relatively underdeveloped. Compatible land use arrangements, where legally and practically enforceable by zoning or otherwise, are a most reasonable tool to strike at aircraft noise hazards before, not after, they take their toll in human health and discomfort and in the depreciation of substantial public and private investments in and around airports.

As the committee has recognized, its amendment provides no airtight safeguard against future noise nuisance. Moreover, there are always drawbacks in delegating to an administrative agency authority and power which are unfettered by precise criteria for their exercise. Nonetheless, I have read with great care the assurances of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency which have been given the Aviation Subcommittee, and I take heart that it is his intention to work jointly with airport sponsors to influence and persuade zoning authorities and private developers to coordinate action which will protect area residents from the regrettable nuisances of airport operations.

Of course, such action must make economic sense and take into account all the relevant legal and social factors, including, most importantly, the safety of aircraft operations in and out of the airports.

Therefore, Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman and members of the Committee on Commerce for the wisdom and foresight which they have exerted in including this significant amendment in the bill now before us. It is not a panacea for the jet noise problem. Nor is it a cure-all for aircraft noise nuisances generally. But it is a giant step forward in the right direction, it will be very helpful, in my judgment, and it has my full support.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which would add a section to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Federal Airport Act is amended further by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ACCESS TO RECORDS"

"SEC. 21. (a) Each recipient of grants under this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the plan or program in connection with which such grants are given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost or the plan or program supplied by other sources and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on page 188 of the hearings on the bill there is printed a letter from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, which makes a specific request of the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I will read one or two paragraphs from that letter written by the Comptroller General. He says:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of March 27, 1963, acknowledged March 28, requests

our comments on S. 1153, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

The changes in the Federal Airport Act as proposed by S. 1153 concern matters of policy which we feel are primarily for the Congress to determine. Consequently we have no comments to offer regarding the merits of the bill.

We should like to point out, however, that although the Federal Aviation Agency has provided by regulation that recipients of grants maintain records and grant access to such records to designated representatives of the Federal Aviation Agency for audit and examination, no provision is made in the regulation nor in legislation applicable to grant programs authorized by the Federal Airport Act for access to grantees' records by representatives of the General Accounting Office. We believe that provision for such access should be made.

The proposed amendment follows at the bottom of the letter, and my amendment adopts the proposed amendment, which would give audit authority to the Administrator and the Comptroller General and place an additional section, a short two-paragraph section, at the end of the bill. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether he will accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is being done to a general degree through the Federal Aviation Agency; and whenever any doublechecking or auditing is necessary beyond its capacity, it is done by the Comptroller General. However, since the Comptroller General, in answer to our request for comment, suggested that he would like this authority, I believe it would be an extra safeguard to put the language in the bill.

Under it the Comptroller General would have the right on his own motion to make a study of any situation in which a study might be required. Therefore I am happy to accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that no time is left in support of the bill, and only 15 minutes in opposition. I have an amendment with respect to which there is a unanimous-consent agreement to have it called up on Monday, with 10 minutes of debate on each side. I should like to discuss the amendment for a half hour this afternoon. I have discussed this arrangement with the Senator in charge of the bill. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 minutes in which to discuss my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, if there is objection, it would be permissible to have the third reading of the bill now.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to have a vote on an amendment which he intended to offer on Monday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, the unanimous-consent agreement allows for a third reading, with the exception that this amendment would be considered by the Senate on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin can offer and have 1 hour on his amendment, as I understand the unanimous-consent agreement as it is printed and placed on our desks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be preferable that the amendment not be offered until Monday, because a third reading can be had now, and the Senate would be in a better parliamentary situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not understand how the third reading can be had today, and the Senator's amendment can be considered once the third reading has been had.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that the amendment may be offered after third reading in this particular situation. That arrangement was agreed to earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Chair state what the ruling was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks that the clerk read the agreement previously entered into today.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the third reading of the bill (S. 1153), to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which shall be reached today, further consideration of the measure shall be postponed until the conclusion of morning business on Monday, August 26, 1963, at which time, notwithstanding the third reading of the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], to reduce the cost of the program by one-third.

Ordered further, That debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the majority leader, or someone designated by him, to be followed by a vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is an order that has been adopted by the Senate, not a parliamentary ruling.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Unfortunately, no member of the committee was in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent request was made. I do not recall ever accepting after third reading, and by a unanimous-consent agreement, an amendment which may then be placed in the bill. I think this is causing some degree of jeopardy to the usual clarity of the Senate rules. I do not raise this question as a point of order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, because of the limited time that is expected to be taken on the amendment on Monday, be allowed 30 minutes to discuss his amendment, and

that the opposition to the amendment also be allowed 30 minutes in which to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes to a side?

Mr. MONRONEY. Thirty minutes to a side on the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin will offer after the third reading. He would be allowed to discuss his amendment now in the time I am asking for under unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that if the bill is read the third time today, there will be no further control of the time; the Senator from Wisconsin may discuss his amendment without a limitation of time.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a new parliamentary procedure to me. It may be familiar to the Parliamentarian. I want the Senator from Wisconsin to have an opportunity to discuss his amendment by whatever means it can be done under the unanimous-consent arrangement. That would allow the Senate to have the third reading of the bill, if the Senator wishes. Then I hope he might obtain the floor to discuss the amendment that will not be voted on until Monday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In view of the fact that only 15 minutes remain of the time on the bill, it seems to me that the only way I could be safeguarded—any Senator could object—would be to offer an amendment, discuss it for 30 minutes, and then withdraw it. I do not say that I will do that, but I shall offer the amendment.

Therefore, I move to strike lines 10 and 11 on page 10 of the bill. On my amendment, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for a parliamentary inquiry without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Chair whether a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered that the Committee on Commerce may file a report on a bill up to midnight tonight?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement has been entered for the filing of a report and of supplemental views.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

PROXMIRE AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. It would reduce by one-third the sums authorized in the bill. The bill provides for \$75 million a year, and \$225 million over a period of 3 years, in Federal matching grants—50-50 grants—to the 50 States. My amendment would reduce the \$75 million to \$50 million a year, or \$150 million over a period of 3 years.

I offer the amendment because, in my judgment, it is the only way that we can, on a fair and sensible basis, reduce the program. If the bill passes, the Commit-

tee on Appropriations is pretty much honorbound to vote the entire authorization. It has done so in the past; I am almost certain it would do so again. Therefore, there will be no real opportunity to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill to reduce this subsidy program.

Also, I feel strongly that if we are to hold domestic spending at its present level, it will be necessary not only to resist some new programs, but also to cut back some of the old programs. Otherwise, if we keep domestic spending level as President Kennedy suggested we shall be in the static position where we shall have no new programs at all, which I think we all agree would be wrong. Some old programs should be improved and increased. Some certainly should be reduced if we are to have any genuine efficiency in Government, and any real dynamism.

Of all the Federal subsidy programs in existence, it seems to me that this one is the least justified. It is a subsidy program for business—profitmaking business; a business that has been doing, in many areas, very well, indeed; and it is not based on any kind of need for such a program. In fact, as the committee report itself indicates, on page 16, the size of the business has become substantial. Let me read from the committee's report:

GROWTH OF AIR COMMERCE AND ITS IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

Few industries have experienced more spectacular growth or have contributed more importantly to the national economy. The aircraft manufacturing industry ranks second only to the motor vehicle and equipment industry in terms of number of people employed, the total of which exceeds 650,000. This does not include the many people employed by industries indirectly associated with aviation, e.g., aviation fuel consumed by domestic aircraft exceeded 3 billion gallons in 1962. The domestic trunk airlines alone realized revenues of \$2,250,281,000 in 1962 while expending \$2,174,137,000. Domestic air carrier revenue passengers are expected to increase from 59.9 million at the outset of this year to 85 million by 1970. For the same years in terms of passenger-miles the figures are 33 billion and 51 billion. Particularly impressive is the growth of the 13 local service carriers which carried 18.2 percent more passengers, flew 19.6 percent more passenger-miles and carried 14.3 percent more mail, 24.9 percent more express, and 31.4 percent more freight in 1962 than they did in 1961. They flew 7,650,000 revenue passengers, a total of 1.6 billion passenger-miles. Mail ton-miles amounted to 3.8 million in 1962, while express ton-miles were 3.8 million and freight ton-miles were 7.2 million.

Air cargo continues to set new records and 1962 was no exception. Total traffic carried by the airlines exceeded 1.3 billion ton-miles in 1962 for an increase of nearly 20 percent over the preceding year. It is estimated that total cargo traffic should at least double by 1970. Airfreight showed a 22.5 percent increase this year with total ton-miles amounting to 898.1 million. Air express amounting to over 70 million ton-miles showed a 14.3 percent increase over the preceding year. Airmail recorded a 12.7-percent increase with a total of 251.4 million ton-miles. First-class mail achieved a 16.4-percent increase over 1961 with the total for 1962 amounting to 88.6 million ton-miles.

General aviation last year, with over 80,000 aircraft, flew approximately three times as many hours and twice as many

miles as the domestic certificated airlines. Today, the general aviation fleet represents 85 percent of all U.S. aircraft.

WHY BIGGEST SUBSIDIES FOR AVIATION?

Why should this industry be subsidized in the gigantic, overwhelming way that it is? The overwhelming majority of Americans never fly, have never flown, and never will. It is true, a large part of the population flies, but those who do are among the more affluent in our society. It is true that some of them have modest planes; but, to quote the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who was the leader in the passage of the bill 2 years ago—in 1961—and is today, in talking about some of the modest cost of the planes that are flown:

Our Oklahoma farmers fly Piper Cubs or Tri-Pacers or Cessna 170's and similar planes. They fly planes that sell from between \$5,000 and \$20,000.

Five thousand dollars and twenty thousand dollars are modest prices for airplanes, but they are far beyond the means of the overwhelming majority of the American people, who cannot afford to pay such amounts. This occupation involves many people; and it is a fine, healthy, and pleasant occupation, and undoubtedly contributes to the pleasure of many Americans. But I cannot understand why the Federal Government should provide so large a subsidy. I am not opposed to all subsidy for it, but I do oppose a subsidy of this kind and of these dimensions.

This subsidy is increasing in two ways—first, in the rate of spending Federal funds for aviation.

SOARING SIZE OF SUBSIDY

The budget in brief, page 60 shows, under the heading "Commerce and Transportation—Aviation," that when I entered the Senate in 1957, this amount was \$219 million; but today the estimate is \$385 million—or more than 4 times as much, and it is now approaching \$1 billion.

In the other transportation areas in which there are subsidies—highways and so forth—we try to apply a user tax which enables the users to contribute a substantial part of the cost. That applies to aviation; but the fact is because of the use of jet fuel, the tax revenues from aviation gasoline have been declining. A report which I received an hour or so ago from the Treasury shows that this year about \$16 million is expected; but only last year Congress cut the tax on airline tickets from 10 percent to 5 percent—with the result that we can anticipate revenues amounting to, at best, approximately \$100 million from the tax on air transportation.

This means that whereas we are spending nearly \$1 billion in this area, we are receiving only about \$120 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin recognizes, of course, that passenger taxes were removed from all forms of transportation except aviation, does he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that. In the other big mode of transportation, the automobile, the gasoline tax is the big passenger tax, and that has not been removed. It is a very heavy tax, and it accounts for almost all of the cost of Federal highways.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is supposed to do so. Federal participation in the highway program, instead of being on a 50-50 basis, is 90 percent; 10 percent is State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But whether by the States or by the Federal Government, the users pay the cost.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is problematic. The Senator can go beyond that if he wants to. I do not believe that is true in many States. Furthermore, one who uses the Federal-State highway system uses what generally is a publicly built facility, with 90 percent coming from the Federal Government and 10 percent from the States, and he pays absolutely no tax for his transportation unless there happens to be a State tax—not a Federal tax—on his ticket. An airline user will be paying a 5 percent tax, which last year was 10 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So far as the tax is concerned, it is a matter of indifference to many people whether it is a State tax or a Federal tax. The fact is that the user of a highway pays for it, either through the gasoline tax or through the tax on automotive equipment. He pays for the entire cost of the highway—although some might dispute that, and might insist that he pays for, say, 95 percent; whereas the user of aviation—a much more affluent person, by and large—pays for about 10 or 12 percent of the cost of his subsidy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Farmers or small-businessmen have little use for aircraft as a means of pleasure—although it is a pleasure to fly; but many contractors and builders—persons, including farmers, whose operations require travel for great distances—find aviation a necessary transportation facility for their type of work.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is a wonderful way to travel.

Mr. MONRONEY. Business aircraft are necessary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why subsidize them to this overwhelming extent?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin is talking about a \$75 million program, a 50-50 matching program, for a transportation facility which today carries more passengers than all the railroads in intercity transportation and all the bus lines in intercity transportation; yet he is objecting to a \$75 million authorization which has been held level by Congress for the past 3 years, in spite of the ever-increasing volume of air traffic.

The authorization has been \$75 million for all these years, and certainly I feel that we are watching the program very closely. We require close matching for it; and in Wisconsin the actual matching has been with almost identical amounts. Over the past 5 years, 43 cities in Wisconsin have benefited to the extent of \$5,631,100; and also included in this figure, because of the use of discretionary funds by Wisconsin, was

\$1,400,000—which brings the total for that State to almost identically the amount which would be allowed per annum under this bill. Wisconsin has exceeded its State allocation by 23 percent over the past 5 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to yield more time to the Senator from Oklahoma, but my time is limited.

I should like to mention one or two things. The Senator from Oklahoma stated that the program has leveled at \$75 million for 6 years. The fact is that the committee report shows on page 7, that the funds made available in 1959 were \$63 million; 1960, \$63 million; in 1961, \$63 million; in 1962, \$75 million; and in 1963, \$75 million. So only in the last 2 years have we reached the \$75 million figure. This amount has been increasing. I was not talking about aid to airports. I was talking about the overwhelming amount of aid received by the FAA, which has ballooned into an agency which now is operating with approximately \$900 million—an increase of four times over the amount with which it operated in 1957.

HUGE INCREASE IN FAA SPENDING PER AIRCRAFT, PILOT AND MILE

Furthermore, if we relate the amount we are pouring into the aviation subsidy with the job that Agency has to do, you can see how this Agency has ballooned. For example, since 1951 the number of aircraft has increased from 88,545 to 111,580, but the FAA costs per aircraft increased from \$1,510 to \$4,375. In other words, the subsidy is costing us three times as much on a per aircraft basis and if we could bring it up to date, the case would be even more devastating.

Second, in 1951 the certificated pilots numbered 580,574. In 1960, they numbered 783,232. But the FAA cost per pilot has increased from \$230 to \$624—or nearly triple.

Take number of miles traveled. This is a good index of how much it costs to keep track of the efficiency of the operation and how much is being expended on a comparable basis: In 1951, 1½ million miles in U.S. civil aviation; in 1960, 2.8 million miles; the FAA cost per mile, in 1951, 8½ percent; in 1960, 16.8 percent—or double.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

APPENDIX 6

Air traffic system load factors, U.S. civil aircraft

Year	Number of aircraft	FAA cost per aircraft
1951	88,545	\$1,510
1952	89,313	1,397
1953	91,102	1,368
1954	92,067	1,272
1955	85,320	1,270
1956	87,531	1,560
1957	93,189	2,283
1958	98,893	3,310
1959	105,309	4,250
1960	111,580	4,375

APPENDIX 7 Certificated pilots

Year	Number of pilots	FAA cost per pilot
1951	580,574	\$230
1952	581,218	214
1953	585,974	212
1954	613,696	186
1955	643,201	168
1956	669,079	204
1957	702,519	304
1958	731,078	448
1959	758,368	592
1960	783,232	624

APPENDIX 8 Plane-miles in U.S. civil aviation

Year	Number of miles	FAA cost per mile
	Thousands	Cents
1951	1,676,975	8.5
1952	1,642,775	7.6
1953	1,780,240	7.0
1954	1,877,949	6.1
1955	2,078,788	5.2
1956	2,308,055	5.9
1957	2,516,012	8.5
1958	2,628,652	12.4
1959	2,800,353	16.0
1960	2,895,540	16.8

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that if I could bring the tables up to date—for I do not have the final record here—they would show, in each case, that in the last 3 or 4 years the pace of spending has accelerated very rapidly—far more rapidly, I am sure, than in virtually any other agency of the Government, with the possible exception of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wisconsin was in the Chamber, I believe, and listened to the colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma and myself. I have been reflecting upon the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MONROE]. It seems to me that he seemed to be saying that the trend which has prevailed for the past 2 years is likely to continue, and that the end of the trend would result in poorer service for the vast majority of cities in the interior of the United States, and yet at greater subsidy cost to the taxpayers.

Did the Senator reach such a conclusion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin, too.

Mr. GORE. Does that not disturb the Senator?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed; very much.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have any proposal to check that trend of greater cost to the taxpayer and poorer service to many of the people? The end result of the trend is that a few trunk airlines with coast-to-coast nonstop flights will be vastly prosperous, but the majority of the people in the interior part of the country will have poor service and at greater subsidies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. He has brought out an excellent point. The Senator from Oklahoma has given the best possible answer, and that is that he will hold hearings on the question. He will call the FAA and put them on the spot. He will ask them specific questions, and ask them what remedies they propose to improve the situation.

As I understand, this particular program is devoted primarily to airport construction, and it would not be part of the other FAA responsibilities that are presently related to the question which the Senator from Tennessee so constructively raised a little earlier.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I admire the tenacity with which the Senator from Wisconsin pursues a possible cut in the cost of the Federal aid to airports program. His reasoning in this instance, I believe, is unreliable. The colloquy between the astute Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is not based on what I feel are the facts. Rather than to lessen the degree of service to the smaller communities of the United States, the reverse is true. Of the approximately 577 communities that are now served by scheduled transport airlines daily, 344 are served by what are called local service airlines. This type of service has been stepped up during the past few years to that number of communities and is a clear indication that, rather than lesser service to the smaller communities, there is in fact increased service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may respond?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield once more. Since I am speaking under limited time, it will be difficult for the Senator from Wisconsin to yield much longer. I will yield once more to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps feeder lines are flying more mileage at greater subsidy. But I cite to the Senator the fact that American Air Lines used to have regular flights into the Tri Cities Airport in Tennessee, east and west. They have completely abandoned the airport. There are no flights at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are more flights now by Piedmont Air Lines than there were by Piedmont and American.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made one of my points. Nashville, Tenn., was served far more adequately by American Air Lines a short time ago than it is now. There is a tendency, which is confirmed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for the trunklines to have flights coast to coast, with fewer stops at intermediate cities, and leave to the feeder lines which have slower and more inefficient service at the bare subsidy cost to serve the vastly greater part of the country. I do not think that trend is in the public interest.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield once more to the Senator from West Virginia.

Then I shall have to stop yielding because my time has almost expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator in charge of the proposed legislation [Mr. MONRONEY] has approached the subject in a constructive manner. General aviation has continued to grow. While only 2,000 aircraft are flying on the scheduled systems, 22,000 military aircraft are using these airports of the United States. But more than 85,000 aircraft are owned by individuals and companies. This latter development is in general aviation. So when it is said that the Federal Government is continuing an airport construction program for the benefit of the so-called major airlines of the country, the statement is not true. Aviation has spread its benefits, and the figures so indicate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have again met one of the hazards that a Senator encounters when time is limited. I should like very much to yield further, but I shall not be able to do so. I understand that I have but 2 minutes remaining. I have only gone one-third of the way through my presentation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 11, line 7, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 7, it is proposed to strike the word "normal."

EISENHOWER RECOMMENDED KILL PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the history of the program has not been one of moving along on a stable level. The program has built up greatly in recent years. Furthermore, it has been a very controversial and questionable program over the years. When President Eisenhower's administration came in in 1953, the President had such reservations about that particular program that in 1954 no money was made available for it.

In 1960, after 8 years of experience, and on the basis of the best findings of his experts, President Eisenhower recommended that the country should withdraw in an orderly way from the program. He proposed an appropriation of \$50 million, then \$45 million, and then \$35 million over the 3 succeeding fiscal years. It should be recognized that the program is controversial. Many outstanding people, including the former President of the United States, disapprove of the size of the program. Some disapprove of having the program at all. All I am saying is that it ought to be reduced. The program has grown substantially and rapidly over the past few years. I should like to state to the Senate the extent of that growth on the basis of the total net project funds available:

RAPID EXPANSION SUBSIDY

In 1952, \$15 million was available.
In 1953—10 years ago—\$9 million was available.

In 1954, no money was available.

In 1955, \$20 million was available.

In 1956, \$63 million was available, and \$63 million was available over the succeeding 4 or 5 years. Then in 1962, \$75 million was made available. So the program has been expanding. It should be closely examined.

AMENDMENT PERMITS ORDERED REDUCTION

If the amendment should be adopted it would not mean a disorderly withdrawal from the program. As the committee report on page 7 points out, there is a substantial amount of money—\$46 million—in unobligated carryover funds. That amount is available to phase out the program in an orderly and careful way. Furthermore, as the total of the grant agreements and the total cash expenditures on page 7 of the report show, the program has been fairly erratic. For example, in 1962 only \$46 million was made available. There is no way in which more than \$64 million could be spent. The point the Senator is trying to stress is that the program could be cut down by a third without a drastic, radical, and unfortunate effect on the construction of airports in our country.

The Senator from Oklahoma is a great Senator. He is a friend of mine. He is an outstanding and able man. Senators all recognize that. He is thoroughly honorable, and he conducts hearings on the basis of getting the facts.

LOBBYISTS DOMINATE HEARING

Anyone who examines the record of the hearings will see exactly the reason for that tragically expensive tendency in the Federal Government to increase the size of programs and to spend more and more. Who appeared before the Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Aviation, to testify? Let me go through the list of witnesses:

Joseph P. Adams, executive director and general counsel, Association of Local Transport Airlines.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd, chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Thomas Burnard, executive vice president, Airport Operators Council.

Edward Cockerham, executive director, Air Traffic Control Association.

John O. Colonna, vice president, Municipal and Airport Division, American Road Builders' Association; director, Department of Aviation, city of Baltimore, Md.

Robert E. Commerce, president, Air Line Dispatchers Association.

And many other witnesses from the industry who of course predictably want Uncle Sam's money spent on the industry and the more the better.

Of course, Mr. Halaby, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, appeared.

The two Senators from Hawaii [Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUÉ] appeared in behalf of their State and made excellent presentations.

With the exception of the two Senators from Hawaii, who appeared with respect to their particular problems, virtually every single one of the witnesses who submitted a statement or appeared in person to give testimony was a person with a vested interest in having the program increased or expanded, either because of being a part of the industry or because of representing a county or a

city which desires more money, or part of the Federal bureaucracy which would be enhanced.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made the interesting suggestion an hour or so ago of having a taxpayer's advocate. There is a need for a taxpayer's advocate in this kind of program. The people who want the money appear and make excellent, persuasive arguments.

POLITICAL PRESSURE ON SENATORS FOR SUBSIDY

Furthermore, the difficulty is that Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are put in the position either of favoring these programs or of having difficulty with the folks at home. When a Member of Congress announces an airport, there is a feeling on the part of some people that the Member of Congress has donated the airport from his own pocket. It is a nice thing to do. The communities are grateful.

Virtually every community in Wisconsin of any large size is eager to get an airport or to have an airport improved. That is true of every State. We are all subject to this temptation. We have an obvious personal political reason to support this program. If we are honest with ourselves we will admit it.

The only way we can get any reduction in this program is to cut the money to be spent on the program. In this case I propose a one-third cut and to have the allocation distributed equally among the States.

The argument will be made, I am sure—it has already been made eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma—that this issue involves the matter of safety; that we must provide safety for those who fly in the air, both pilots and passengers.

Elsewhere in the budget there are large amounts of funds requested—which I am sure will be granted—for air safety.

THIS BILL SMALL PART OF TOTAL

For example, not in this bill but elsewhere in the budget for air traffic control the figure we are asked is \$35 million. That is \$35 million of Federal money with no matching.

For airport traffic control towers, aside and apart from this bill, \$47 million, no State matching.

For flight service stations, \$11.5 million, all Federal money.

For air navigation facilities, \$44.6 million, no State matching.

For aircraft inspection and research, \$12.2 million, strictly from Uncle Sam.

For research, test and evaluation, \$15 million, all Federal.

For research and development on air traffic control and navigation, \$41 million, all from Uncle Sam.

For aviation weather, \$4.3 million, all Federal.

For aircraft safety, \$5.9 million, all Federal.

For airports, \$1.2 million, all Federal.

For aviation medicine, \$2 million, all Federal.

For national capital airports, \$12 million, all Federal money.

For traffic management for the FAA, \$210 million, all Federal.

And all this is a direct contribution to the operation of airports. The Senator from Oklahoma said that the local people put up 50 percent. The local people put up 50 percent of the money for construction of airports, and 100 percent for terminal facilities; but with respect to the really significant safety factors, the local people put up nothing. The Federal Government provides traffic management and facilities and maintenance to the tune of \$222 million. For administration of flight standards, the figure is \$88 million. And so it goes.

All these items add up to an exceedingly expensive Federal program with which the taxpayers are burdened; ninety percent of the people who pay the cost, can get no benefit because they do not fly. The overwhelming majority of the people do not fly, and never will fly.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR \$75 MILLION FUND

Furthermore, we should recognize that while this is an able committee report, as is every report handled by the Senator from Oklahoma, there has been no reconciliation with respect to the so-called need for Federal grants of \$75 million, as set forth on page 8 of the report.

It is argued that the total eligible projects in 1962 were \$149 million, in 1963 were \$140 million, and in 1964 were more than \$150 million. This would mean that \$75 million would be needed to provide the 50 percent which the Federal Government should provide. However, when we refer to the tables which are used as the basis for compiling these needs, pages 10 through 13 of the report, we find total figures which are substantially larger, adding up to a grand total of about \$231 million for fiscal year 1964. But there is no reconciliation anywhere in the report to show how the figure of \$149 or \$150 million was arrived at.

It is true that the public-use facilities can be thrown out of the grand total. One or two other relatively minor items listed can be thrown out. It is also true, I am sure, on the basis of past experience, that some States cannot provide the matching funds necessary to meet the Federal requirement, so that the facilities which are needed can be built. Some States will have more funds available than the 50 percent they need.

So on both scores it would seem that the figure could be substantially reduced, but there is no way of telling precisely how the amount—which is crucial in the bill, and the real cornerstone for demanding \$75 million instead of \$60 million or \$50 million—has been arrived at.

LESS SUBSIDY NEEDED NOW

On the basis of past experience and on the basis of plain commonsense it would seem that less should be needed now for our airports, for very obvious, realistic, technical reasons.

The Engineering News Record reported in 1960 that 87½ percent of the total allocated under the Federal Airport Act construction program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, was for land acquisition and construction of runways, taxiways, and aprons.

I see in a document prepared by the committee the statement that 69 percent is all that is to be used for this purpose

in this program. In view of the fact that a great deal less on a percentage basis is needed now for the principal purposes, it would seem to be possible to reduce the amount needed.

As I pointed out, in 1960 there were appropriations of \$63 million, substantially less than now being asked, although the need for runways, taxiways, and aprons was substantially higher then than it is at the present time.

This would seem to argue that we do not need more money in this program, but can get along with a great deal less.

I wish to make one further point before I summarize.

MORE SUBSIDY FOR PLANT OWNERS

I understand that the FAA has eased technical requirements to qualify for the Federal grant. This will mean that more communities with airports will be able to get Federal money. I am told it will take about half as much in terms of local funds in order to get Federal money. What will that mean? That will mean that the table which is in the report now, which shows a \$231 million overall gross need, could be increased by perhaps 20 or 30 percent, for the next couple of years. That would mean that people would come to Uncle Sam and say, "We need more money."

I predict, if the bill passes in its present form—and I suspect that it will—Congress will be called upon in the future for \$100 million or \$120 million to take care of small communities which want airports for the communities.

I understand this will be true because the FAA is to permit shortened runways. Control towers will not be required with the same stringency, at least. The kinds of sophisticated navigational aids which were previously required are not to be required in the future for airports.

All this suggests that these airports would be quite a bit less useful for national defense purposes. Certainly there is no safety advantage here. It also suggests a very expensive Federal future from many States, in which small towns with 5,000 or 6,000 people, located reasonably near to a large city, will say, "We want an airport."

The mayor wants it. The bankers want it. The leading citizens want the airport. Of course they want it. We cannot criticize them for wanting it. If I were in their place, I, too, would want the airport. How can Congress say "No" under the circumstances? We can point out that now they qualify. We can point out that they can drive 10 or 15 miles and use the airport there. But I am sure this particular change in regulations will mean that we shall be requested to appropriate millions of dollars more in the future than we have in the past.

Furthermore, it is evident that although 25 percent of the funds are for general airports in fiscal 1964, in 1965 and 1966, under these regulations, the funds for general airports are going to increase very sharply.

It seems to me that funds for the general airports are the least justifiable of all. There is no justification on the basis of national defense, because they are too

small and are not susceptible to use by any kind of military aircraft.

The funds are not justified because of use by the general public, because general airports are not used by the general public. They are used by people who own, operate, or rent their own planes, planes which cost, at the very least, \$5,000 or \$7,000. To own a plane one must have a substantial amount of money. Those people are to be commended. They are engaged in a fine endeavor. But why in the world should the Federal Government subsidize them any more than the Federal Government should subsidize motherhood? Motherhood is fine, and so is babyhood. I suppose we could appropriate large amounts of money to subsidize beautiful babies, but it would be extremely expensive and ridiculous. It is just as expensive, and even more ridiculous to have a program to subsidize general aviation, which is engaged in by people in our society who can afford to pay their own way. If it is going to cost them 10 to 20 percent more, that is too bad, but it seems to me that if we are to have free enterprise and be free of Government domination, we should at least insist that people pay their own way so far as possible.

SUMMARY

To summarize, in the first place, any subsidy of this kind, amounting to more than \$1 billion a year—and that is only a part of it—should be able to demonstrate a great need. We should insist on a justification for every dollar of that kind of subsidy.

Also, it should be clear that if people are benefitting under this kind of subsidy, there should be a demonstration that they do not have the ability to pay. This is not only Robin Hood in reverse; this is a Cadillac subsidy. It provides a subsidy to people who own planes costing, at the very least, \$5,000 or \$10,000.

President Eisenhower, after 8 years of experience, called upon Congress to phase out this program, to eliminate it entirely.

Witnesses who appeared before the committee on this program were overwhelmingly people who had a special, vested interest in obtaining the subsidy. Although I favor reducing the program, I recognize that the Senator in charge of the bill, who is championing the bill, is an extremely able man. He is a great friend of aviation. He has rendered fine service. Nothing I say should in any way be considered as critical of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, over the years as aviation has grown in size, importance, and complexity, general aviation has assumed greater significance. For example, many people do not realize that our total aviation system in America includes 2,000 active air carrier aircraft that serve America's great network of commercial aviation. There are 22,000 military aircraft dedicated to the day and night defense of our Nation. But the largest and fastest growing segment of aviation is the general aviation

classification which aggregates over 84,000 aircraft.

General aviation includes business, agricultural, recreational, and instructional type flying. According to the Project Horizon Report written at the request of President Kennedy by a nationally recognized team of experts for Federal Aviation Agency Administrator N. E. Halaby, general aviation is forecast to grow to over 105,000 aircraft by the year 1970.

It is appropriate to note, too, that the scheduled airlines in the United States established new gains both in service and traffic in 1962. Flying a billion plane-miles, an increase of 4.1 percent over 1961, they offered a record of 82.6 billion seat-miles, an increase of 15 percent.

The number of passengers totaled 62½ million, an increase of 7 percent over 1961. Passenger-miles added up to 43.8 billion, a gain of 9.9 percent.

This is the 25th year since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It has since been amended and titled the Federal Aviation Act. In a recent speech in the Senate, I declared that in this 25th anniversary year of the basic aviation act, it is well that there be a reaffirmation of congressional interest in securing and strengthening scheduled air services to the smaller as well as the larger cities of the Nation.

The action of the Congress of the United States in establishing, through the Civil Aeronautics Board, a group of airlines dedicated to serving small and intermediate size municipalities and their trading areas, has proved to be a productive investment.

These carriers, known as local service airlines, provide direct and daily flights to 577 communities in this country. Three hundred and forty-four of these urban and suburban sections of small and intermediate size are dependent solely on the local service operators for their scheduled air transportation.

With these services supplementing the larger trunk airline systems, there are few points in the Nation more than a day's travel away from any part of the country.

Air transportation is therefore meeting the growing needs cited in the act, namely, those of "commerce of the United States, of the postal services, and of the national defense."

The importance of the local service airline to the economic and social development of our intermediate and smaller communities is generally recognized.

In West Virginia, three of the local service airlines—Lake Central, Allegheny, and Piedmont—serve all 10 of the State's airports where there is scheduled carrier service. Eight of these airports and scores of communities are solely dependent on these local service carriers for air transportation. And through the facilities and schedules offered by these local airlines, numerous West Virginia industries not in air trunkline cities, are accessible to the commerce of the Nation. Also, they are in better national defense status and more advantageously benefit from the movement of the mails and

cargo by air. Likewise, the markets of other States are more readily available to West Virginia.

It is vital, both from the standpoint of our State and the country, that local air services be continued and further developed, even as we strive to keep the major airlines healthy and the whole aviation industry of the United States in step with technological and commercial progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which I wrote for the magazine Air Purchasing and Traffic, issue of May-June 1963.

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

THE AIRLINES NEW FRONTIER—AIRCARGO

(NOTE.—Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator, West Virginia, was one of the sponsors of the Civil Aeronautics Act, when he was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives (1933-47). He was the author of legislation providing a nationwide survey of our airport requirements, which preceded the passage of the Federal Aid Airport Act, of which he was an active proponent. The Civilian Pilot Training Act was advocated by Representative RANDOLPH. The National Air Museum Act was authored by the West Virginian when he was in the House. He was also coauthor of National Aviation Day. He was the "father" of the airmail pickup system.)

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia)

One of the most striking aspects of today's airfreight business is the flurry of statistics that are available at the drop of an airbill.

Aircargo adherents—and I'm one—will tell you that—

It has increased by volume 50 times since 1946.

The airlines provide freight service to some 7,000 points in the United States—plus 150 major world capitals.

There are 200 long range piston powered planes now doing all cargo work. They are joined by nearly 600 turbine powered combination aircraft. And in fact, all of the scheduled airlines' 1,800 plus aircraft, from giant jets to helicopters, carry cargo.

And the first all cargo jet freighters are ready to take to the U.S. and world airways.

But these are merely statistics and don't really dramatize the breakthrough that has been occurring in the aircargo field.

My firsthand experience with the airline business has always proven to me that whatever aircargo says it will do in the next year or so, it does, and one better. For instance, while last year passenger business was increasing less than 10 percent, airfreight grew at a clip of 23 percent over 1961—almost double the growth rate of the previous year.

Although it's true that airfreight today is only a small portion of total intercity freight movement—less than 1 percent—the important fact is that it is growing and growing. In fact, it is probably one of the fastest growing businesses in the country. Here are some comparisons: * * * airfreight has increased almost 50 times while mushrooming industries such as nylon fabrics and frozen fruit juices have increased only 13 percent each.

In 1946, the real beginning of airfreight, the scheduled airlines operated 15 million ton-miles. Last year, the figure was up to 900 million, and it may top the 1 billion mark for the year 1963.

There are many reasons for this dramatic development. The increasing swings of the

commerce pendulum are only part of the reason. Also, planes are bigger now. They are faster, they go more places. And, the airlines just know more about the whole, new, and exciting airfreight business.

And, perhaps more importantly, rates are coming down to the level where they promise a real breakthrough, since they are becoming very competitive with surface transportation in a growing list of commodities.

Airfreight rates had been, for a number of years, generally pegged at 22 cents per ton-mile. The air salesmen have had to compete with surface salesmen who could offer rates that were 10 to 50 percent lower. Only in recent years have the carriers begun to lower rates with CAB approval, and now some commodities are only 10 to 15 cents per ton-mile.

But aircargo is an overall word and airfreight is just one aspect. There is parcel post, and express, and, of course, there is airmail.

YEAR 1962 VERSUS 1961

Express is a big item in the overall aircargo business. In fact, in recent years, it has achieved a phenomenal forward surge. One major reason, besides the faster jet planes and the greater capacity and schedule flexibility, is the agreement signed between the scheduled airlines and the REA Express that provides real incentives for each.

It created a complete 50-50 partnership and it has also meant that in the last few years air express has really come into its own. And as a further boost to the business, REA Express on July 1, 1961, achieved greater independence in operating its express business. Based on contractual agreements reached in 1959 with its railroad owners, REA could now, for the first time, benefit from the disciplines and incentives of a profit-and-loss accounting system.

Other important freedoms REA gained from the new agreement were freedom of routing traffic the best way to do the best job for the public at the lowest cost, and freedom of pricing * * * the right to price express services on a realistic, marketplace basis, as long as the rates are compensatory.

REA Express has come a long way since 1959, and together with its air express arm has a very promising future. The successful formula at REA, I believe, has been good service at the lowest possible prices.

Here are some figures to illustrate the point:

Year	Shipments	Revenue	Ton-miles
1959.....	5,404,721	\$48,000,000	57,471,531
1960.....	5,410,696	50,100,000	60,008,520
1961.....	6,683,501	42,000,000	62,133,213
1962.....	7,426,328	58,400,000	70,726,947

A net gain of over 10 million revenue ton miles in just the past 2 years.

An increase in annual individual shipments of over 2 million in those same 2 years.

TO 7,000 POINTS

As noted earlier, the airlines provide scheduled freight service to some 7,000 U.S. points and to important locations everywhere in the world. The high volume of domestic destinations served is made further possible by Air Cargo, Inc., an industry corporation whose job is to provide a nationwide pickup and delivery service (and, recently, air/truck).

The integrated and swift nature of air freight service is a major factor in today's distribution revolution. Distribution accounts for more than half of the total cost of goods and commodities sold, according to a Twentieth Century Fund study. In fact, the distribution cost of goods and commodities has been referred to as "the last frontier of industrial inefficiency and waste."

Distribution involves much more than the price tag on transportation alone. It includes money spent for marketing, sales, advertising, warehousing, insurance, materials handling, taxes, packaging, capital investment and inventories.

Through the use of air freight, it is impossible to reduce these multiple costs on many articles. Thus, even though air freight may result in a higher out-of-pocket transportation bill to the shipper, it can reduce the related costs by a great amount, thereby yielding the shipper a net saving. These savings improve the efficiency of the overall distribution system. In addition, they release funds for other purposes. Whether such funds go into increased research, improved production facilities, or some other area, the consumer ultimately benefits.

To help implement the distribution revolution, the scheduled airlines have developed improved materials handling systems and equipment. Modern air freight terminals have been and are being built at a number of airports. Mechanized loading systems are being developed. Progress and refinements are being made in containerization. Swift and efficient systems are commonplace for the loading and unloading of shipments carried on jets now in service.

As far as being useful to business and industry—and the public—the benefits of air freight are very much here today. The company, that is fighting the cost spiral, stands to profit by examining the distribution complex and its relationship to transportation by air.

The word "frontier" suggests the future—a goal yet to be attained. But, in many ways, air shipping has already reached the frontier; and, in some ways, it has already set foot in the "promised land" of transportation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield time to myself in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

I appreciate the kind things the Senator has said about the chairman of the subcommittee. I reciprocate by stating my affection for the Senator and also my regret that I must disagree with his position.

One of the reasons why we have been prepared to continue at an increasing level appropriations for our Federal airport system was the very point the Senator made—that President Eisenhower had no desire to continue any airport system. During the year 1954 no Federal funds were available for the then expanding aviation activities. We were just coming out of World War II with the DC-6's, and the DC-7's were just coming into being. Yet only about \$9 million or \$15 million in matching funds was available for a most inadequate program.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma had a part in trying to correct that situation, and it was corrected. Now we have an orderly program designed to advance aviation.

If the Senator from Wisconsin does not think aviation is worth advancing, by providing funds for operation of aviation on the basis of a subsidy that is matched 50-50 by the using communities—and generally the local communities have bonded and taxed themselves, because they felt that such facilities were necessary to enable them to keep pace with an America that is moving forward—I feel he is following a very pennywise and pound foolish position.

The Senator has talked a good deal about the very wealthy private aircraft pilots or owners. I see no sense in trying to arouse class prejudice. Most of the men I know who fly do not have much money. They buy secondhand planes, perhaps \$5,000 Piper Pacers that are handed down from one owner to another, and they get the plane for \$1,000 or \$2,000. So a great number of the general aviation planes that use the fields of America are modest indeed, and they are used very largely for the transaction of business. One of the largest fleets of aircraft, bigger by far than the commercial lines, is that used by men who are in small business and who are operating a taxi service, which is a rapidly growing and important part of aviation. They are truly small businessmen, and are absolutely at the mercy of our airport system, and one which should not be limited to O'Hare in Chicago, or Lambert Field in St. Louis, or Idlewild in New York. They are dependent on a nationwide airport system.

There are only 31 airports in the entire United States where air carrier operations exceed the operations of general aviation. Of these 31, general aviation operations account for almost one-half, 44 percent, of those operations. So we have a mixture.

The general rule of thumb is that, in spite of the fact that Government and military planes—Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force planes—pay no landing fees, fully 50 percent of the landing operations on major airports are by military aircraft. Today, in the dispersal of our fighting aircraft, if the tensions of possible atomic attack continue, as they existed during Cuba, the use of these commercial fields for dispersal of military aircraft is of great advantage, so that they all cannot be hit or destroyed on our military bases.

The Senator referred to the chart on page 7. Reference was made to the fact that the amount of unobligated funds on July 1, 1963, was \$46,522,000. The information before the committee was that \$15 million of that amount is in State apportionments. That amount is tied up because the State of Wisconsin or the State of Oklahoma, for example, may claim its pro rata share of those funds.

Of that amount \$28.9 million is programmed. There has been notification given to the communities that this amount of money is available to them. It takes 50 percent local money to match any Federal funds, and we want to be sure that the States have the money and that it is programmed. So all but \$3 million of the amount which the Senator said will be available has been accounted for. We might be able to scrape up more money by breaking faith with the communities that have spent money in plans and designs anticipating this money for long-awaited airports.

The amount that we would have actually available would be approximately \$3 million.

The American aviation industry is an important industry. Unfortunately, the large sums that are earned by the industry are earned by the industry in

California, where it is largely centered. It accounts for a very large export item. However, the sum that is earned in California does not come to the State of Wisconsin or to the State of Oklahoma; nor do the income taxes from Oklahoma or from Wisconsin help to apply against salaries where this money is earned. There are very few airline crews or jobs located in many of the States. Oklahoma has one facility, so we are a little more fortunate than most, from the standpoint of repair and maintenance. However, most of the States earn very little, if anything, from the airlines that fly into their airports and fly beyond. As prosperous as the airlines may be, only the Federal income tax reaches the salaries paid by them and that does not make it possible for all the beautiful figures on air transportation to be reached by the local tax system. I refer to the air transportation as related to the interstate systems.

This is one reason why I say some Federal matching money is needed. The 50-50 basis is the proper share. It is far more proper and appropriate than the 90-percent-10-percent formula which is used on our super thoroughways, which are spotting the city of Washington and many other places today. The heavy burden is placed on the Federal Government, the 10-percent burden is placed on the local community which will largely use these facilities.

I may point out that of all the forms of transportation which are interstate, aviation is the leader, because most airplane flights, particularly those on airlines, terminate in States other than those in which they originate. A tax system applicable to the commerce that is represented in the interstate system will have to be a part of the Federal tax system, both with respect to the income tax, by which our airlines pay a substantial portion, and the gasoline tax, which, as the Senator has stated, is down to \$16 million; but the gross intake from the transportation tax, the ticket tax—and this is the only form of transportation that carries a 5 percent ticket tax—of \$105 million is coming from the aviation transportation industry.

I congratulate the Senator on his appointment to the Committee on Appropriations, where his talents will be greatly appreciated. I am sure he realizes that we are not talking about the same item when we talk about air safety and the necessity of air traffic control, and all the many other factors that have gone into the expansion of aviation, when we discuss a \$75 million airport bill. We are responsible for \$75 million of expenditures on the airports. As I previously stated, about two-thirds of aviation accidents take place either on the airport or within 5 miles of the airport; therefore, a safe airport is the greatest contribution that can be made, both for airline safety and for general aviation safety. It is not fair for the Senator to charge the airports with the funding necessary to scan airways with radar or to protect our airports with weather information, and to collect in a network the latest information on weather ahead, or with all the many other necessary

items, including accident investigation and servicing and inspection of aircraft. All those items are examined by the Appropriations Committee in connection with the Independent Offices appropriation bill. It will be before the Senate one of these days. The committee is only halfway through with its consideration. These things are taken up item by item. However, it is not fair to charge the safety features of air traffic control and other matters to the airport bill, any more than it is fair to charge all the highway patrols and police and ambulance and other services on the U.S. Interstate Highways System against a \$40 billion construction program for our Interstate Highway System.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin was pointing out that the Federal Government pays all of the \$35 million cost of air traffic control centers, and all \$47 million of the cost of airport traffic control towers, and so forth. I thought I made it clear that this was not a part of the \$75 million bill, but that it was a separate item. The Federal Government makes this total contribution itself, in addition to the 50 percent matching on airport construction.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; but the Senator asked why we should ask for \$75 million, when we are spending \$800 million for air traffic control. This is a program that I believe is absolutely necessary. America wants to move ahead, and we must move ahead. Aviation is here to stay. It cannot succeed unless we have adequate landing fields and unless we have places for the planes to get into safely. The CAB is surveying the State of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, in the North Central Area Investigation case, to see if the local service can be extended into more towns, to bring into the area of better service not only metropolitan areas such as Milwaukee, but also the Ashlands, the Green Bays, the Oshkoshes, and all the other points.

It is necessary to enlarge runways and to "beef up" the taxiways. The expansion of runways costs money. I wonder where the Senator thinks we would be in the jet age if we had not had \$63 million and \$75 million a year for the past few years to have the airport runways lengthened.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There was a time when it was necessary to spend a great deal of money, upon the advent of the jet aircraft, to lengthen the runways. This was the justification for setting up the program for \$63 million. While all this will never be completed, most of the work has been done. It has tapered off, and the statistics show it. Less is now going into runways and less into aprons. How can we justify such an overwhelming subsidy to the aviation industry? We do not subsidize automobiles or banking or groceries or skiing or baseball.

This is amusement and business. Why should there be such an overwhelming subsidy to aviation, not only for safety, which I strongly favor, but also for construction, which should be a community affair or a business affair or an amusement enterprise?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are about 4,700 privately owned airports out of 8,025 airports in the country. Only 728 of such airports are so-called air carrier airports. I know of no airport in the United States, excepting those that have large operations and are vast air traffic centers, that are able to carry their own weight by the landing fees charged for the aircraft that use them, whether it be the commercial planes or the private planes. They are all charged for landing.

Yet all of them generally ran in the red. Few, if any, airports are making money. If we expect to have service, just as the Senator from Wisconsin expects to have service from Milwaukee to Chicago, it is necessary to have airports that can take care of the dozens of flights a day and the shuttles that fly back and forth constantly. At the time terminals were built, there was Federal participation. We have eliminated all of that assistance to the point where Federal aid now is limited only to those items which contribute to safety. There are no Federal funds for restaurants, bars, lunchrooms, or even hangars. We do provide funds for the aprons and runways, and the sheds where fire equipment and snowplows are housed; but we do not contribute, as we once did, to the plush aircraft terminals that were built in the earlier days.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator knows perfectly well, first, that we are greatly expanding and increasing the amount of Federal dollars going into aviation. The budget figures indicate \$219 million in 1957 and \$585 million in 1964. Furthermore, the FAA has now loosened the regulations so that in the future the airport program will be bigger, because in the future it will take only half as much money for an airport to qualify. The runways may be shorter; less safety equipment is required. This program may be reduced in some ways, but it is expanding in ways that cost money; and the arithmetic of dollars spent proves irrefutably how rapidly it is expanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin talks about the total cost only. Many things are being done in aviation today. The Senator knows we are talking about Federal airports. In 1952, we started with \$63 million. We have expanded only to \$75 million. We have carefully husbanded funds because of the increased cost of buying the same type of materials today. This has accounted for the large dollar increase, one which we do not want to have slide forward. But we do not want to see a worse airport system than we had in 1955.

The aviation industry will continue to grow. The airspace is becoming more crowded all the time. Vast sums of money are required to keep aviation safe. The jet age has required new

flight levels. Whereas planes once operated at 19,000 feet, they now operate at 50,000 feet. Complete radar surveillance and expensive equipment are required to keep air traffic separated. Military aviation is now required to fly according to the same safety rules as civilian aviation, and under air traffic control.

I am glad the government has decided to try to make the multi-billion dollar aviation industry safer. It is a record of which we can be proud.

We should not mix in some of the costs of safety features and the air traffic control system. We are trying to provide, with \$75 million of matching funds, a national airport system.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is a part of the same basic program. Former President Eisenhower not only criticized the program, but proposed to abolish it. It seems to me it makes sense to point out that in 1951 the FAA cost per aircraft was \$1,500; by 1960 it was \$4,300; while today it is probably \$6,000.

These statistics have been arrived at carefully, on the basis of facts. It may be pointed out that planes fly at 50,000 feet instead of 30,000. The jet age has created new problems; but it seems to me that the expensive program that is proposed will require a great deal of justification, which we cannot find in the hearings or the committee reports.

Mr. MONRONEY. We were not holding hearings on that budget in the Committee on Commerce. The Senator from Wisconsin will be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which will hold hearings on the Federal Aviation Agency's budget. The Committee on Commerce held hearings on the Federal aid to airports program; it had nothing whatever to do with control stations or with the air traffic control system. I do not believe those operations can be charged to the airport program.

During the war, we neglected completely the development of airports, to the extent that they were becoming worse and worse. They had not been equipped with radar—either air traffic control radar or weather radar. That is why for years, after 1951, we were seeking to spend more money to try to make up for the lag that had taken place in that period. The Senator from Wisconsin was not in this body when this situation was explained. That was the reason why the Civil Aeronautics Administration was succeeded by the Federal Aviation Agency. Congress determined to provide modern equipment and to improve the air traffic control system.

We cannot go back to 1951. If we tried to do that today, so many airplanes would be falling around the country that it would not be possible to count them, because planes are flying faster and at greater heights. The problems of air traffic control at the terminals have grown immensely, as is shown by figures submitted earlier.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the fact remains that this particular program has skyrocketed. The budget figures show that the average was around \$20 million

in 1947, \$21 million in 1951, \$15 million in 1952, \$9 million in 1953, and none in 1954. Now it has jumped up to \$75 million. It is true that the amount has been at a fairly high level ever since 1956; but it has climbed very sharply in the past decade.

This airport construction program—this bill—is one phase of aid to aviation which, it seems to me, can be reduced without seriously affecting safety.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is talking about the time when we had no airport program, and is comparing it with a time when we had a satisfactory airport program, although about one-half is accounted for by the matching funds that would be available from local communities.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COTTON. I welcome the endeavors of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for economy in Government. Some of us who have been struggling through the years on this subject are happy to have his enthusiasm, zest, dedication, and devotion to the noble cause of economy.

I am also happy to learn that the Senator from Wisconsin has been assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, where he will have an opportunity to exercise his talents in that direction and to help do the things that we feel it is necessary to do.

But my mind goes back over a few years. As a member of the Subcommittee on Air Transportation of the Committee on Commerce, I remember standing on the floor of the Senate, for 2 or 3 years in succession, fighting against the use of Federal subsidies for the portions of airports that had to do with—I remember and others will remember the phrase so well—keeping passengers dry; in other words, providing them with waiting rooms.

One thing that cannot be stopped, is the ever-growing number of airports. There are sections of the country—and mine is one of them—that are starving because of a lack of air transportation. There is no possibility of comparing this program with grants-in-aid to other forms of transportation. The Federal Government subsidizes the motor vehicle industry by the building of immense highways. Perhaps we should provide more aid for the railroads.

However, there is no Member of the Senate who flies—and I daresay that nearly the entire membership flies constantly—who has not been in a plane and seen the weather changing, seen the clouds gathering, looked out into nothing but fog and "soup," and wondered how many more planes were flying near us.

Imagine what would happen if suddenly out of the fog came another plane and a collision occurred. We know what would happen. The Governor of our State would be naming another Senator.

There is not one of us who has not realized that transportation in the air

assumes proportions that no other form of transportation has ever assumed.

We need to safeguard those who are flying—including the families with small children who use planes. We need more good airports, so that if a plane goes off course and needs to make an emergency landing, there will be as much safety as possible—especially in the more remote sections of the country.

I regret to say that in New Hampshire there are not the air safety devices that are needed. We are now struggling to obtain them—among them being an instrument landing system at one of our airports, a weather station which can warn and predict, and other safety equipment. I regret that payment of the cost of some of this equipment cannot be authorized by this measure. But, Mr. President, when we consider the airports which today dot the country, and into which planes are flying; when we consider the traffic; and when we consider the number of Americans who at this very moment, while we discuss this matter, are in planes, it is obvious that \$75 million to aid in safeguarding the lives of the American public who travel by plane is a mere pittance, when compared with some of the expenditures Congress authorizes.

The amount authorized in this airport bill has not been increased. We have continued it at the same figure, and every year we have been narrowing it down to the things which are essential to safety—not luxuries. The people of my section are dependent on air service. We have no passenger service, to speak of, on the railroads. We are almost completely dependent, for our small industries, our resorts, and for the life of the State, on air travel. It is the lifeblood of the industries of this country, and we need it.

A certain rich man endowed one airport in our State, and it has the first modern airport building we have had. It was built by community money and by endowment. The endowment came from a wealthy citizen who had an incurable disease, and wanted to put some of his money where it would help and where it would remain a benefit to his community; and he put it into a terminal at Manchester, N.H., which ever will stand as a credit and a monument to him.

So the money is being raised. We are not leaning on the Federal Government. I doubt that many Members of the Senate have raised their voices more frequently than I have against needless expenditures. But in joining the Senator from Oklahoma in the committee in voting to report this bill to the Senate, I had as clear a conscience as any Senator could possibly have.

The CAB reports periodically to our committee the details of air accidents. Unfortunately, they still occur, and always will to some extent, because air service cannot be made perfect. But when I think of those in the past 2 or 3 years, and think of the reports we have received on them and the reasons for them, and think of the changes made under pressure to control and channel

the air traffic, it is clear, Mr. President, that this authorization bill will result in good economy. It provides for human safety and for the saving of lives.

I second everything the chairman of the subcommittee has said.

Although I sincerely admire the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin along these lines, in this particular instance I hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

The Senator from New Hampshire is a fine, able Senator, and an outstanding advocate of economy. However, the fact is that 90 percent of the money authorized by this bill will be spent, according to the summary and breakdown of the Federal aid airport program—for land for runways, taxiways, and aprons.

The FAA has eased the technical requirements, so that the runways can be shortened. Will that result in greater safety? Of course not. Furthermore, control towers will not in the future be required to function with the same stringency. Will that produce greater safety? No, far less safety. Sophisticated navigational aids will not be required as before to qualify for Federal aid. More and more and more of this money under these policies will be used for airports without such equipment. I do not say it is necessarily wrong to build these airports. It is fine to build them. But can one justify a 50-percent Federal gift for them on the basis of saying this is the only way we can obtain safety in air traffic? That simply does not make sense.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that what he is talking about is the small airport program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are trying to obtain more of the small airports, not built to metropolitan airport standards, as regards the thickness of the runways or the length of the runways. The Senator certainly would not expect us to enlarge the program for the airport for a very small town beyond the requirements of the traffic which will use it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not.

What I am saying is that we seem determined to spend more money on this program in the future. The authorization is \$75 million now. I think we should cut down on the authorization and cut down on the appropriation. I think we should spend less money, and should not apply it to the general airports. They are marvelous; they serve a fine purpose; but they do not properly relate to the national needs or the national defense or safety.

Mr. MONRONEY. What the Senator from Wisconsin is criticizing is the fact that we are trying to get more value for the man who operates a plane out of a small-town airport, and therefore less is going into the small airport than would have been required by the former FAA regulations. This is what has happened. We have been pushing them to

get reasonably priced airports. So I think the FAA should be congratulated, instead of being condemned, for trying to limit the cost of these airports.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Once a number of airports are constructed around a city, I know I shall be pressured even more by mayors and bankers and other fine people who want an airport in their small town and want the Federal Government to help pay for it. But if they had to drive 10 or 20 miles to reach a town with a larger airport with longer runways and with greater safety features, from a safety standpoint that would be even better. This is why I maintain that although there may be justification for building more general-noncommercial airports, they cannot be justified on the basis of safety or national defense if those who use them will not pay for them in full. If the users cannot afford to pay for them, they should not be built. Why make the Federal taxpayer the victim who has to pick up the tab for amusement or business?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks on the Proxmire amendment a table showing a comparison between the funds provided in the committee bill and the funds which would be provided under the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

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

Comparison table

State	Committee bill	Proxmire proposal (%)	Difference
Alabama.....	\$806,890	\$540,620	\$266,270
Alaska.....	3,994,844	2,676,545	1,318,299
Arizona.....	950,979	637,176	313,803
Arkansas.....	607,329	406,910	200,419
California.....	3,258,755	2,183,366	1,075,389
Colorado.....	948,502	639,496	309,006
Connecticut.....	390,289	261,494	128,795
Delaware.....	78,332	52,482	25,850
District of Columbia.....	106,705	71,492	35,213
Florida.....	1,096,112	734,395	361,717
Georgia.....	946,607	634,227	312,380
Hawaii.....	131,618	88,184	43,434
Idaho.....	667,532	440,546	226,986
Illinois.....	1,793,445	1,201,608	591,837
Indiana.....	895,215	599,794	295,421
Iowa.....	763,932	511,834	252,098
Kansas.....	859,060	575,570	283,490
Kentucky.....	695,524	466,001	229,523
Louisiana.....	787,763	527,801	259,962
Maine.....	366,734	246,712	120,022
Maryland.....	514,350	344,615	169,735
Massachusetts.....	778,275	521,444	256,831
Michigan.....	1,742,125	1,167,224	574,901
Minnesota.....	1,057,902	708,794	349,108
Mississippi.....	629,166	421,541	207,625
Missouri.....	1,071,649	718,005	353,644
Montana.....	1,088,320	729,174	359,146
Nebraska.....	718,232	481,215	237,017
Nevada.....	786,796	527,153	259,643
New Hampshire.....	147,285	102,691	44,594
New Jersey.....	899,232	602,485	296,747
New Mexico.....	954,576	638,566	316,010
New York.....	2,698,477	1,808,120	890,357
North Carolina.....	989,872	663,114	326,758
North Dakota.....	565,565	378,929	186,636
Ohio.....	1,651,795	1,106,703	545,092
Oklahoma.....	796,355	533,558	262,797
Oregon.....	900,766	604,183	296,583
Pennsylvania.....	1,885,489	1,263,278	622,211
Rhode Island.....	127,824	85,642	42,182
South Carolina.....	542,163	363,249	178,914
South Dakota.....	615,385	412,308	203,077
Tennessee.....	781,577	523,657	257,920
Texas.....	3,139,146	2,103,228	1,035,918
Utah.....	697,789	467,519	230,270
Vermont.....	119,165	79,841	39,324
Virginia.....	837,737	559,084	278,653
Washington.....	873,882	585,501	288,381

Comparison table—Continued

State	Committee bill	Proxmire proposal (%)	Difference
West Virginia.....	\$422,155	\$282,843	\$139,312
Wisconsin.....	997,096	668,054	329,042
Wyoming.....	707,687	474,150	233,537
Puerto Rico.....	975,000	653,250	321,750
Virgin Islands.....	525,000	351,750	173,250
U.S. total.....	49,875,000	33,416,250	16,458,750
Insular areas:			
Hawaii.....	600,000	400,000	200,000
Puerto Rico.....	600,000	400,000	200,000
Virgin Islands.....	300,000	200,000	100,000
Total.....	1,500,000	1,000,000	500,000
Discretionary funds:			
General aviation.....	7,000,000	4,670,000	2,330,000
Regular discretionary (25 percent).....	16,625,000	10,138,750	6,486,250
Grand total.....	75,000,000	50,000,000	25,000,000

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the amendment I am withdrawing is an amendment which would merely eliminate the word "normal" in one line of the bill. It is not the principal amendment which I intend to offer on Monday. For parliamentary reasons, it seemed better to offer the amendment on Monday.

I withdraw the amendment relating to the word "normal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, so that I may understand the situation correctly. The bill has been read the third time—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Wisconsin first asked that he might make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to make sure that he understands the parliamentary situation correctly. Earlier today the Senate arrived at a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill would be considered on Monday, and that, even though third reading of the bill had already been had, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would be considered at that time, with 20 minutes on the amendment, 10 minutes on a side before the Senate votes on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator understands the parliamentary situation correctly. The Senate will dispense with further consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. FONG obtained the floor.

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

Mr. FONG. I yield.

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

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

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, our Declaration of Independence proclaims that all men are created equal. But in many areas of American life we have not practiced this principal tenet of our democracy.

America's agonizing reappraisal of her racial policies and practices is manifest in our Birmingham and Cambridges, our New Yorks and Chicagos, in the demonstrations and disturbances stirring many communities across the Nation.

In America's brief 180 years of life, we have made tremendous progress toward that ideal of equality and undoubtedly we shall attain it.

But we still have a distance to go. At home we are now attempting to revise our laws and practices to wipe out the last vestiges of racial discrimination against our own citizens.

As we reappraise the relationship of citizen to citizen, is it not also good for us to reexamine this same relationship of man's equality to man with other peoples of the world?

For as we move to erase racial discrimination against our own citizens, we should also move to erase racial barriers against citizens of other lands in our immigration policies and laws, which are replete with racially discriminatory provisions.

This is an issue of fundamental national policy, because the racial restrictions inherent in our present immigration laws disparage our democratic heritage. They directly contradict the spirit and principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our traditional standards of fairness and justice.

Racial immigration restrictions began in 1875 and reached their peak in 1924. Public sentiment in 1924 was summarized by Senator David A. Reed, who said:

I think most of us are reconciled to the idea of discrimination. I think the American people want us to discriminate; and I don't think discrimination in itself is unfair. We have got to discriminate. The only question that I think worries the committee is [which method] is the more plausible method of attaining that discrimination. Practically all of us are agreed that [racial discrimination] is an end that should be attained.

However, since 1924, we have made tremendous progress toward removing racial restrictions in our immigration policies and practices. An outstanding

milestone was the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. It was a far-reaching step forward in the relaxation of the racial curbs in our immigration statutes. It wiped out total exclusion against Japan and other Asian nations and for the first time allowed many nations a long-denied quota of immigrants.

Progressive as that 1952 law was, today it is very obsolete. More than 10 years have now passed since its enactment. Since then, our Nation and the world have witnessed revolutionary changes in almost every phase of life. Many areas emerged from colonial status to full nationhood. Many nations have changed their form of government. There is greater clamor for freedom, liberty, and justice, and, worldwide, peoples are on the march seeking equality. Economic interdependence has shaken traditional economic, social and political patterns.

At home, we have wiped out racial barriers in our armed forces, in interstate transportation, in our institutions of higher learning, and in many areas of our economy. We are making significant progress in desegregating our public schools, housing, business, and public accommodations, and protecting the voting rights of all citizens. It is imperative that we, as a Nation, recognize this great upheaval in our Nation and throughout the world for equal status.

Repeatedly America has been accused that it has been unfair in its immigration laws. We have erected racial barriers that deny equal dignity and respect to more than one-half of the world's population. These racial barriers are bad for America. They hurt America's image as the leader of the free world.

For example, do Senators know that under present American immigration quotas for Asia and the Pacific areas more than 50 percent of the people who populate our newest State could be almost totally excluded from the United States?

That Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia, with a population of nearly 1½ billion?

That the quota for tiny Switzerland is greater than the quotas for the entire African Continent?

That Rumania—a Communist nation—has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but this is nearly a third more than our quota for non-Communist India and the non-Communist Philippines combined?

Do Senators know that the immigration quotas of nearly every nation in the Asia-Pacific area are so small that Japan's waiting list stretches all the way to 1989 or beyond; the quota for Chinese persons is for all practical purposes exhausted in perpetuity, according to State Department officials, because immigrants already admitted into the United States have been charged against it; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other Pacific dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind, and only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open, since these are countries which

generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders?

The 1960 platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties recognized the need to eliminate the racial features of the law.

The relevant excerpts of the Republican plank on immigration read as follows:

Republican conscience and Republican policy require that the annual number of immigrants we accept be at least doubled; obsolete immigration laws be amended by abandoning the outdated 1920 census data as a base and substituting the 1960 census; and the guidelines of our immigration policy be based upon judgment of the individual merit of each application for admission and citizenship.

The Democratic platform in relevant part states:

We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policy to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.

The national-origins quota system limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation. It is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man.

The revision of immigration and nationality laws we seek will implement our belief that enlightened immigration, naturalization, and refugee policies and humane administration of them are important aspects of our foreign policy.

We shall have to act with greater resolve to implement these pledges with legislation.

I am very pleased to see the junior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. HART] in the Chamber at this time. He is one of the greatest advocates of revision of our immigration laws. The junior Senator from Michigan is the author of an immigration bill, S. 747, which has won the endorsement of every community organization which is interested in immigration. This bill has been cosponsored by a bipartisan group of 37 Senators.

The distinguished and able junior Senator from Michigan has been in the forefront of the battle to end racial discrimination in our immigration laws and policies. The bill which the Senator has introduced seeks a comprehensive reform of our immigration laws. The Senator from Michigan has worked zealously and untiringly toward such reforms. He has a reputation for deep sincerity, fairness, justice, and fair dealing, and his efforts to tell the Nation about unfair and discriminatory immigration laws have been unflagging. He is without a doubt one of the Nation's leading experts in the field of immigration. I am most delighted and pleased that he is in the Chamber this afternoon, and I am most happy to help him in the enactment of a sound and fair immigration law.

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

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HART. It should be no surprise that I ask for this opportunity, first, to thank the Senator from Hawaii for some very kind remarks; and, second, to say that in the brief time I have been a Member of the Senate the most moving speech I have heard on this floor was

one—it was not long—delivered by the senior Senator from Hawaii late in an evening. It was one of those times—which are too few, unfortunately—when the Senate was performing in the fashion that kindly historians of the Senate describe.

I cannot express adequately to the Senator my appreciation for his kind comments about me. With the Senator from Hawaii, I hope that the day will soon come when we as a people may remove from the basic approach to our immigration policy a bar which has no justification in logic or tradition in this country. When that day arrives the Senator from Hawaii will be the first to be saluted by the rest of us.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished and able junior Senator from Michigan for his kind and laudatory remarks. I hope our joint efforts and the efforts of other Senators in this Chamber will be sufficient to cause enactment of a very comprehensive and fine immigration bill.

THE ORIENTAL EXCLUSION ACTS

The racial strictures of the present immigration laws have their genesis in the 19th century, when more than 19 million immigrants arrived in this country. The first restrictive law passed by Congress was the act of March 3, 1875, which empowered consular officials to investigate Chinese and Japanese immigrant labor contracts for evidences of any lewd or immoral purposes. It established penalties for U.S. citizens who transported subjects of China or Japan without free consent for a term of service and rendered such contracts void. Immigration officers were required to inspect all vessels and certify their compliance.

Because of the tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants—200,000 from 1850 to 1880—following the discovery of gold in California, Congress enacted the first of the Chinese Exclusion Acts in 1882. The act suspended immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States for 10 years, although Chinese already in the country on November 17, 1880, were allowed to leave and reenter.

Two years later, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was tightened even further. Not only was the period of suspension of Chinese immigration extended another 10 years in the act of 1884, the stricture was made applicable to all Chinese, wherever their birth or whatever their national allegiance.

While the Chinese Exclusion Act of March 12, 1888, allowed entry of Chinese officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for pleasure or curiosity, legislation of October 1, 1888, took away from Chinese laborers the right of reentry into the United States, unless they had reentered before the date of the act.

These exclusion laws were extended again in 1892, and in 1902; in 1904 they were extended without limitation.

Partly because immigrants continue to pour into the United States—some 14½ million between 1900 and 1920—and partly because of a sharp rise in Japanese immigration during that peri-

od, there arose in Congress insistent demands for Japanese restriction. The Japanese Government protested vigorously. President Theodore Roosevelt, who was not in sympathy with Japanese restriction, pressed for passage of an act allowing Japanese to become naturalized citizens. Nevertheless, Congress in 1907 passed an immigration act authorizing the President to negotiate international agreements regulating immigration. As required by the law, President Roosevelt signed a gentlemen's agreement with Japan in 1907, limiting the volume of Japanese immigration to the United States.

Then, based on the 1907 law, the President later that year issued a proclamation excluding from the United States, Japanese or Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled, who have received passports to go to Mexico, Canada, or Hawaii and come therefrom.

Seventeen years later, the House Committee on Immigration, reporting on the quota law of 1924, pointed out that the real intent of the gentlemen's agreement was to restrict Japanese immigration and thus check any further growth of U.S. Japanese population, which was considered unassimilable and ineligible for citizenship.

Under the gentlemen's agreement, between 1907 and 1924 over 53,000 Japanese immigrants were brought to Hawaii to work on the pineapple and sugar plantations. Total immigration of Japanese to Hawaii up to that time was 180,000.

With passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, all Japanese immigrants as well as other persons of Oriental descent were barred. In desperate need of cheap labor, Hawaiian planters turned to the Philippines, until 1946 an American possession, as an alternative source of labor supply. Between 1910 and 1932, over 100,000 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii. This represented the last large wave of Oriental migration to the United States.

Opposition to free immigration gained momentum during World War I and, on February 5, 1917, Congress passed the progenitor of our present immigration law, codifying all previous exclusionary acts and going the rest of the way in laying the basis for our present Asia-Pacific Triangle: it declared inadmissible all natives of China, India, Burma, Siam, the Malay States; the eastern part of Russia; part of Arabia and Persia; Afghanistan; most of the Polynesian islands; and the East Indies. Instead of calling it a triangle, the act labeled the area a barred zone.

Seven years later, Congress passed the 1924 Immigration Act, which not only continued exclusion of the barred zone peoples but also brought to an end the gentlemen's agreement, thereby excluding Japanese immigration to the United States.

This exclusionary law of 1924 elicited vehement protests, especially from the Japanese Government, and many have said that this was one of the circumstances that brought on World War II.

Mike M. Masaoka, national legislative director of the Japanese American Cit-

zens League, testified in the 1951 Joint Hearings on the Immigration Act as follows:

To the Oriental, Congress divided the world into two parts in 1924 when it approved an immigration law prohibiting the entry of Asiatics into this country for permanent residence. In effect, Congress informed the peoples of Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere that they were considered "superior," "desirable," welcome to immigrate to the United States, while condemning the peoples of Asia and the Pacific islands as "inferior," "unfit," "undesirable," "not good enough."

Included in this act was the concept of the national origins system in American immigration policy, which was first proposed for legislative enactment by Congressman John Jacob Rogers as an amendment to the immigration bill then being considered by the House. Mr. Rogers, defining the system, made the following statement on the floor of the House:

We should * * * proportion our admission of immigrants, not to the numbers of racial or national representatives composing the alien colonies or foreign groups now in the country but to the quantities of the various racial and national elements which have passed the refining test of the melting pot and have become amalgamated in the structure of the American Nation (65 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 6226).

Mr. President, you will remember that Senator Reed made the very same observation, which I quoted you earlier.

The national origins system, according to Oscar Handlin, "ranked all the nations of the earth according to the order of precedence and assigned the largest number of admissions to those that were presumed to be closest in racial heritage to the original settlers of the United States." Its avowed purpose was concerned not with the immigrant's individual worth, but with his place of birth.

Our policies since the passage of the 1924 law to the present time have not been basically altered. While Chinese exclusion was repealed in 1943, and Filipinos and natives of India were declared admissible and eligible for naturalization in 1946, natives of the Asia-Pacific triangle area continued to be singled out under present immigration policies as deserving of very meager consideration for entry.

RACIAL STRICTURES OF THE 1952 IMMIGRATION ACT

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, testifying before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization shortly after the passage of the 1952 act, advised the Commission that:

The lifting of the bar of exclusion caused deep gratification in Asia when the [1952] act was passed, but the racial discrimination apparent in the triangle provision can be expected to keep alive some feelings of resentment. * * * The combination of very small quotas for Asia and the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions still furnish ground for Asian suspicion of U.S. motives.

While the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 did eliminate the last of the absolute bars against the admission of persons from the Asiatic barred zone and permitted their naturalization, spe-

cial provisions were written into the law to carefully hold the total number of immigrants coming from the barred zone to an infinitely small fraction of total allowable annual immigration: 2,390 of 154,887, or 1.53 percent. The 154,887 figure is, according to the law, one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population.

In our present immigration laws, we may count at least eight racially discriminatory provisions.

First. In 1924 the national origins system was conceived and annual quotas were allotted only to white nations. Polynesians, orientals, and Negroes were totally excluded. In the 1952 provision, the national origins system was continued for white nations, while oriental and Polynesian countries and the newly emerging nations of Africa were given minimal quotas of about 100 each.

Because nonwhite nations were excluded from the system, annual quota calculations were based only on the white population in the United States in 1920. As an example of how this annual quota was allocated to white nations, based on the 1920 census, there were about 39 million persons who derive their ancestry from the United Kingdom; one-sixth of 1 percent of 39 million is equal to about 66,000 persons, which is, then, the annual British quota.

One reason advanced during the debates over the 1952 act for excluding the African Negroes from the national origins computation was that the geographical origins of American Negroes could not be determined. This assumption was sharply challenged, however, by State Department geographers, who were able substantially to pinpoint their origins by tracing the original African railroad routes and the port of embarkation from which the Africans were transshipped to the United States.

While the natives of Africa were not enclosed in a triangle, there do exist special provisions, discussed below, that are designed to prevent Negro immigration to the United States—even from areas in the Western Hemisphere.

Second. Under the 1952 act only 1.53 percent of the total annual immigration quotas was attached to the Asia-Pacific triangle, where more than one-half of the world's population live. In addition, involved regulations based on race have been issued by the administering agencies to carry out the requirements of the complicated triangle provisions.

The Asia-Pacific triangle, created by the 1952 law, comprises that area bounded by the meridians 60° east and 165° west longitude and by the parallel 25° south latitude. When traced on a map, the area actually appears as a triangle embracing all the Far East, southeast Asia, and all Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand—almost all of Polynesia and small portions of Micronesia and Melanesia.

The 21 quota areas of the Asia-Pacific triangle, largely independent nations, are as follows: Asia-Pacific—which I will explain later—Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Chinese persons—which I will explain later—India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaya,

Nauru, Nepal, New Guinea, Pacific Islands—trust territories—Pakistan, Philippine Islands, Thailand, Vietnam, and Western Samoa—newly created.

Also included in the triangle are the following subquota areas, largely colonies and dependencies: Christmas Island, Cocos—Keeling—Island, and the territory of Papua, Australian dependencies; New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, French dependencies; the British Solomons, Brunei, Fiji, Gilbert, and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Maldives Islands, North Borneo, Sarawak, Singapore, and Tonga, all British dependencies; the Ryukyus, presently under American administration; the Cook Islands, a New Zealand dependency; Macao and Portuguese Timor, dependencies of Portugal.

Both the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the State Department administered the 1952 law.

By issuing special regulations on the triangle, for example, the State Department sought to delineate the races indigenous to the area within the triangle as well as those not indigenous. Those considered indigenous were the Dyaks of North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei; the Melanesians of the Fijis, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Solomon Islands, and Nauru; the Micronesians of the Carolines, Marshalls, Marianas, Guam, and Gilbert Islands; the Negritos of Netherlands, New Guinea, Papua and New Guinea; the Parsees of India, the Pathans of Afghanistan and Pakistan; and the Sindi of Pakistan.

According to the same regulations, the Turkic race is not considered to be indigenous, while the Polynesian race in itself—including the Maoris—is not regarded as being either indigenous or not indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. This depends entirely on the place of birth, the regulations explain:

A Polynesian born in Papua, which lies wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, is chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota, but an alien of Polynesian ancestry born in French Oceania [which is outside the triangle] is chargeable to the subquota for French settlements in Oceania within the immigration quota established for France.

This regulation illustrates how involved and complex our present immigration policies really are.

Since all quota areas, except for Japan with a quota of 185 and that for Chinese persons of 105, are limited to the minimum quota of 100 guaranteed by the act, the total allowable annual immigration from the Asia-Pacific triangle is only 2,390—only 1.53 percent of the total yearly immigration to the United States of 154,887.

But that figure of 2,390 was only recently established.

Until September 26, 1961, when Congress passed Public Law 87-301, the Asia-Pacific triangle had been limited to a ceiling quota of 2,000. Had there been any more than 20 quota areas in the triangle, any newly established quota would have reduced the quota of other nations and dependencies proportionately. Section 9 of Public Law 87-301 repealed this inequitable ceiling.

Still, the fact that more than one-half of the world's population live in the triangle area does not square with an annual allotment of only 2,390 immigrants. The effect of these provisions is to permit the great majority of quota immigrants—over 81 percent—to come from northern and western Europe, and to allow more than 98 percent from Europe.

The unfairness of this system is nowhere more evident than in the fact previously stated that, for example, Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia; that we take more people from Switzerland than we do from the entire African Continent; that Rumania, a captive nation of the Iron Curtain, has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but is nearly a third more than our quota for India and the Philippines combined.

Because of the very small quotas assigned the triangle nations, according to the quota report of the State Department dated February 1963, the quotas of nearly every area within the triangle are heavily oversubscribed. For example, short of an extraordinary act of Congress, or the passage of immigration reforms, the nonpreference quota for Chinese persons is so heavily mortgaged into the future—by immigrants already admitted into the United States—that State Department officials say that for all practical purposes, it has already been exhausted in perpetuity. Japan's quota is filled up at least until the year 1989; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind. Only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open—since these are countries which generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders.

Third. While place of birth determines the quota under which a white person would fall, race, or ancestry is determinative for Polynesian and oriental persons.

Normally, each nation's quota may be used only by persons born there. Present or past residence or citizenship is irrelevant. A person born in Italy, for example, will be eligible for only the Italian quota, even if he has become an English citizen and has worked and lived in England for many years.

But the 1952 Immigration Act's provisions spell out special, rather complicated stipulations applicable to oriental persons wherever born. Orientals born outside of Asia are rendered ineligible for the quota of their birthplace. Instead, anyone deriving as much as half his ancestry from persons who were born in or whose race is indigenous to the Asiatic area is eligible only for one of the tiny Asiatic quotas. If the country of his oriental ancestors can be determined, he is eligible for only its quota. For example, a person born in London to an English father and an Indian mother would have to wait his turn under India's annual quota of 100, even if he had lived all his life in London; under present oversubscribed quota con-

ditions, he would have to wait for at least 138 years.

Yet, if a person's ancestry cannot be traced, or is traceable to more than one quota area, he is eligible for only the special quota of 100 allotted to "Asia Pacific," a quota created for such people, and to cover the 20 colonies and dependencies—called subquota areas by the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952—in the triangle area. For example, a person born, say, in Brazil of a Korean mother and a Japanese father wishing to enter the United States would be assigned to the so-called Asia Pacific quota; an immigrant born in Germany of a Malayan father and a German mother is charged to the Asia Pacific quota.

Fourth. Section 202(b)(1) of the act established a special Asia Pacific quota of 100 to which thousands of oriental and Polynesian peoples living all over the world and in over 20 dependencies in the triangle area must be assigned.

The Asia Pacific quota is, geographically speaking, a general quota, not tied down to any specific area.

Who, then, must be assigned to the quota of 100 persons?

Not immigrants born within a separate quota area situate wholly within the triangle, for such persons must be charged to the quota of the separate quota area in which he was born. For example, a Japanese born in Japan must come under the Japanese quota.

Not immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is attributable by one-half to an ethnic group indigenous to not more than one separate quota area in the triangle, since these persons would fall under the quota of that quota area. For example, an Indonesian born in Germany of an Indonesian mother and a German father would be attributed to the Indonesian quota.

Persons chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota fall into three categories:

(1) Immigrants whose ancestry is 50 percent or more Asian, except Chinese, and who were born in a colony or other dependent area located in the triangle, are allocated to the Asia-Pacific quota. They are specifically excepted from the provisions of section 202(c)(1), which allows persons born in colonial areas to draw from the quota of the governing nation to the extent of 100 persons. This provision is available only to white persons born in those dependencies. For instance, Tonga, an archipelago of 150 islands in the south-central Pacific and a British protectorate, may not have a separate quota for Tongans or Asians born in the Tongas. Its subquota of 100, taken from the British quota, is available only to white persons born there. Only by a determination of the Secretary of State that it is an independent country may Tonga have its own quota. As the law presently stands, Tongans and Asians born in Tonga must share the Asia-Pacific quota of 100 with 19 other subquota areas and an indeterminate number of persons born outside the triangle.

The Ryukyus, however, provide a rather complex problem in this regard. Those islands are now assigned to the Asia-

Pacific quota by administrative determination of the State Department and are under U.S. administration and jurisdiction assigned by the United Nations Trusteeship Council. While Japan now has residual sovereignty, should the United States relinquish its administrative rights and full sovereignty revert to Japan, would the Ryukyus still fall under the Asia-Pacific quota, or would it be assigned to that of Japan? Presumably, if they are deemed a colony of dependency, the Ryukyus would remain under the Asia-Pacific quota. But if they are considered wholly a part of the sovereign nation of Japan, of course, they would be a part of that quota area.

(2) Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is one-half attributable to a people indigenous to one or more colonies or other dependent area located in the triangle must be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota. For example, a person born in Spain who is one-half Spanish and one-half Tongan must be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota.

(3) Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry may be traced to peoples indigenous to two or more separate quota areas in the triangle, except Chinese persons, must be attributed to the Asia-Pacific quota. That is, a person born in France who is one-half Filipino and one-half Japanese would be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota.

Fifth. There are two quotas for China—100 for the few white persons born in China and only 105 for the millions of Chinese persons, wherever born. One quota, designated the China quota, is reserved for persons born in Manchuria, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, Tibet, Taiwan, and the area of the Chinese mainland bounded by the 1938 boundaries. A second quota of 105 was established for Chinese persons.

The reason for this lies in the history of the exclusion of Chinese from American shores. Prior to the repeal of Chinese exclusion in 1943, since Chinese persons were ineligible for entry into the United States, the quota for China was used for white persons born on the China mainland. The 1952 immigration law specifically provided in section 201(a) that: "the quota existing for Chinese persons prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall be continued." Thus, the practice of allotting the China quota to whites was continued and necessitated the creation of a second quota—for Chinese persons.

To assign a quota of 100 to the few thousand, at most, white persons born in China and only 5 more quota numbers to the entire Chinese world population speaks loudly as to the extremes our law has gone in discriminating against a people.

To the quota of Chinese persons were allocated all persons with as much as one-half Chinese blood, wherever born. This would be true, according to the State Department, even if the Chinese person were born in a sub-quota area located in the Asia-Pacific triangle. It matters not one whit whether his family had lived in the United Kingdom, Brazil, or in Tonga for generations; if he is one-half Chinese,

he is mandatorily allocated to the Chinese persons quota.

Sixth. Although present immigration law grants nonquota status to persons born in the Western Hemisphere, this is greatly diminished by two racial provisions:

(1) The special restrictions on orientals apply with equal measure to orientals born in hemispheric nations. For example, a native of Canada born of a Japanese mother and a Canadian father is not a nonquota immigrant, although he is a native of an independent country located in the Western Hemisphere. He must be charged to the quota for Japan.

(2) Nonquota status is denied persons born in colonies of the Western Hemisphere. The immigration law provides that each colony or other dependent area is limited to a quota of 100 a year to be taken from its parent country's quota. As several witnesses to the 1951 joint hearings pointed out, plainly, this provision is aimed squarely against the Negroes of Jamaica, Trinidad, other West Indian and Latin American areas, who make up most of the immigrants from those areas. These immigrants formerly could take advantage of the consistently unfilled quotas of their mother countries. This was true particularly of the British quota, which had been utilized more by West Indians than by other British subjects. The Immigration Act of 1952 has effectively restricted such immigration.

Seventh. Our present law clearly discriminates, not only against Orientals and Negroes, but also against persons of Eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Mediterranean origins. The combined quotas for Greece, Turkey, and Spain, for example, come to 783, which is roughly one-third of the quota we allot to Norway.

Moreover, oversubscription plagues the quotas of nations from these areas as it does nations and dependencies in the triangle. Italy's quota is subscribed for some 47 years; Yugoslavia's for 35 years; Iran's for 86 years; Israel's for 157 years; Lebanon's for 31 years. Were it not for the fact that, by special legislation in 1957, Congress forgave the mortgages charged against nations from which immigrants entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, Latvian and Greek quotas, for example, would have been mortgaged until the years 2274 and 2014, respectively.

Eighth. Under the 1952 act, an Asian family of mixed blood may be separated in migration if the wife is accountable to an oversubscribed quota, although her husband is chargeable to an open quota. On the other hand, a non-Asian wife accountable to an oversubscribed quota may be given the quota of her immigrant husband, if he is fortunate enough to have access to an open quota.

SENATE BILLS 747 AND 1932

Two bills are now pending before the Senate which would basically change American immigration policies. I have cosponsored them both.

The two measures would eliminate the national origins quota system, the Asia-

Pacific triangle, and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

Senate bill 1932, the administration's proposal, would establish a series of priorities for admission: First, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to individuals already in the country; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving less than 200 or more than 10 percent of previously established quotas.

Existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The power to redistribute quota numbers lies entirely in the hands of the President, with the advice and help of a new seven-man Immigration Board. An extraordinarily wide latitude of discretionary power is thus lodged in the hands of a single person.

Senate bill 747, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], which a bipartisan group of 37 Senators have sponsored, and of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, are the primary cosponsors, proposes to eliminate all of these discriminatory policies from American immigration law. This bill is a comprehensive revision of our immigration laws.

It revises the present national origins quota system by providing a two-part formula based on population ratios and patterns of actual immigration to the United States during the past 15 years. It would authorize a total of 250,000 quota visas annually, of which 50,000 are to be made available to refugees and escapees without regard to quota areas. The remaining 200,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries in the following way: First, 80,000 quota visas are to be divided among countries in proportion to the size of their population to world population, but no one country is to get more than 3,000 under this category; and, second, 120,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries based in the same proportion as their immigration to the United States over the past 15 years bears to the total of all immigration to the United States for the same period.

No quota area shall get less than it got under the old law, except that the maximum is 25,000, and the minimum 200. Quotas are allocated to applicants either by country of birth or by country of citizenship, provided he has been domiciled for 10 years or more in the place of citizenship. All unused quota numbers at the end of the year are pooled and divided among quota areas having a backlog of applicants waiting for immigrant visas. No quota area shall get from this pool a number of visas greater than its regular annual quota and no more than 100,000 numbers may be used from the pool in any one year.

Quotas under the bill will be revised every 5 years, based on latest data. Within the quotas, 60 percent are available to "blood relatives of a citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the third degree of consanguinity, their spouses, and children." The remaining 40 percent is available to other qualified immigrants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comparative table which shows the figures for recent immigration levels and the quotas proposed under Senate bill 747, for the principal countries contributing to recent immigration, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE I.—Comparative table of recent immigration levels; and quotas proposed under S. 747, principal countries contributing to recent immigration

	Present quota	Average immigration, 1951-60	Proposed quotas
EUROPE			
Austria.....	1,405	2,968	2,595
Belgium.....	1,297	1,292	1,710
Czechoslovakia.....	2,859	2,850	3,357
Denmark.....	1,175	1,370	1,293
Finland.....	566	668	792
France.....	3,069	3,802	6,172
Germany.....	25,814	34,545	25,000
Greece.....	308	4,844	3,458
Hungary.....	895	6,455	4,556
Ireland.....	17,756	6,455	17,756
Italy.....	5,666	18,700	15,648
Latvia.....	235	1,913	2,292
Lithuania.....	384	1,186	1,841
Netherlands.....	3,136	4,719	3,902
Norway.....	2,364	2,467	2,364
Poland.....	6,488	12,798	13,848
Portugal.....	438	2,043	1,892
Rumania.....	289	1,743	2,441
Spain.....	250	1,072	2,614
Sweden.....	3,295	1,886	3,295
Switzerland.....	1,698	1,719	1,698
Turkey.....	225	684	2,367
United Kingdom.....	65,361	20,887	25,000
U.S.S.R.....	2,697	4,650	6,487
Yugoslavia.....	942	5,866	5,295
ASIA			
China.....	205	3,274	5,335
India.....	100	314	3,233
Indonesia.....	100	1,012	3,789
Iran.....	100	291	1,586
Iraq.....	100	190	468
Israel.....	100	935	810
Japan.....	185	4,467	5,378
Jordan.....	100	511	507
Korea.....	100	702	2,616
Lebanon.....	100	337	365
Philippines.....	100	1,809	2,913
AFRICA			
Morocco.....	100	216	694
Tunisia.....	100	137	259
Union of South Africa.....	100	232	1,243
United Arab Republic.....	100	618	1,670
OCEANIA			
Australia.....	100	500	1,344
New Zealand.....	100	189	397

ments to limit or render virtually nil immigration from those areas are eradicated.

The enactment of this bill would be a signal contribution in obtaining a long overdue revision of our immigration laws.

Although I feel that both S. 747 and S. 1932 are meritorious and deserve the most careful examination, I feel that S. 747 is preferable, for two reasons.

First, S. 747 would allot each nation a definite quota, figured according to a formula and revised and updated every 5 years. This quota cannot be reduced unless all other quotas are readjusted under the same formula.

Second, S. 747 does not provide for as much administrative discretion, so that there is less room for the law to be administered in a discriminatory way.

Mr. President, opposition to revising our statutes are based on two arguments: First, the fear that the admission of more immigrants to the country would exhaust our economic resources and add to our already serious employment problems; and, second, the fear that too many persons of Oriental background would be admitted into the country, upsetting traditional patterns of American life. Reasonable analysis of both arguments, however, shows them to be quite unfounded.

Let us analyze each of these in turn.

IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

First, let us look at the impact of immigration on our economy. We have not introduced S. 747 without thoughtful and thorough consideration of our economic situation and the hard facts about our complex technologically-oriented economy. It is our belief that the immigration program proposed by our bill would enhance our economic growth, help stimulate our economy, and generate new employment opportunities. The best data unquestionably supports this assertion.

Based on statistics and facts supplied by the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, and the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations, both of the U.S. Department of Labor; the Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department, six points stand out with respect to the impact of immigration on our economy.

First, under S. 747, total annual immigration to the United States is limited to 250,000, plus perhaps 100,000 nonquota admissions a year, totaling about 350,000, a figure which is only slightly higher than the number we actually have been admitting over the past 10 to 15 years. See tables 6, 6A-6E, 7, and 7A, Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Report, 1962, pages 23-36. See also Population Bulletin, November 1962, page 137. This somewhat startling situation can be accounted for by the fact that Congress, recognizing the inadequacy of our present immigration laws, has repeatedly passed special short-term immigration and refugee legislation—the cumulative effect of which has so modified our immigration practice that the act of 1952 no longer represents our immigration quota policy.

Of the 1½ million quota immigrants authorized during the fifties, only a million actually entered the United States. But 1½ million nonquota immigrants were admitted during the same period. In short, out of a total immigration of 2½ million, 3 out of 5 persons were admitted outside the quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Congress, through special laws enacted every year since 1952, and through thousands of private immigration bills, has drastically revised the pattern of immigration envisioned by the act of 1952. Nations with very small quotas have been among the most substantial contributors to recent immigration. Italian immigration, for example, has been three times greater than its quota allotment. Japanese immigration has been over 20 times greater. Immigration from Greece and China has been 16 times the very small number permitted by their quotas. (See table I.)

The second noteworthy fact is that immigration has been a sharply declining factor in the increase of U.S. population. In the last 30 years immigration has accounted for an average of 5.1 percent of our population increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table II, showing the components of U.S. population growth from 1870 to 1960.

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

TABLE II.—Components of U.S. population growth, 1870-1960

Period	Population			Natural increase		Net immigration	
	Beginning of period	End of period	Increment	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1870-80.....	39,818	50,156	10,337	8,063	78.0	2,274	22.0
1880-90.....	50,156	62,948	12,794	8,302	64.9	4,490	35.1
1890-1900.....	62,948	75,995	13,047	10,516	80.6	2,531	19.4
1900-10.....	75,995	91,972	15,978	10,689	66.9	5,289	33.1
1910-20.....	91,972	105,711	13,738	10,537	76.7	3,201	23.3
1920-30.....	105,711	122,775	17,064	13,974	81.9	3,089	18.1
1930-40.....	122,775	131,669	8,894	8,787	98.8	1,067	1.2
1940-50 ¹	131,669	150,697	19,028	18,153	95.4	875	4.6
1950-60 ²	151,326	179,323	27,997	25,337	90.5	2,660	9.5

¹ Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

² Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Population Bulletin, November 1962.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, persons born in the Western Hemisphere remain nonquota. Also, nonquota status is expanded to include the parents of a U.S. citizen and persons with special skills, including spouse and children.

The bill automatically eliminates the Asia Pacific triangle and all its concomitant provisions.

Thus, all nations of Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East, southern and eastern Europe, and Africa are treated according to the same standards as other nations. All complex and special arrange-

(At this point Mr. THURMOND took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. FONG. Table II shows how immigration has been a declining proportion in the growth of our population.

In earlier decades, immigration ranged between 18 and 35 percent of our population growth. But in the 30 years since 1930, the comparable rates were 1.2 percent between 1930 and 1940, 4.6 percent between 1940 and 1950, and 9.5 percent between 1950 and 1960—an average of 5 percent over the 30-year span.

This data is taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's population bulletin of November 1962.

From table II figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 1 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Third, the number of immigrant workers entering the United States in any single year during the postwar period represented a very small fraction of the total work force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table III, showing immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force for the years 1957 and 1961.

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

TABLE III.—Immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force, selected year

Occupational group	1961			1957		
	Labor force ¹ (thousands)	Immigrants ²	Immigrants as percent of occupation	Labor force ¹ (thousands)	Immigrants ²	Immigrants as percent of occupation
Total with occupation.....	66,796	123,688	0.19	65,016	152,986	0.24
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	7,705	21,455	.28	6,468	24,489	.38
Farmers and farm managers.....	2,711	3,002	.11	3,329	3,506	.11
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	7,119	5,363	.08	6,703	6,127	.09
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers.....	14,300	25,198	.18	13,280	25,897	.20
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	8,623	17,679	.21	8,664	26,976	.31
Operatives and kindred workers.....	11,762	13,288	.11	12,530	19,362	.15
Private household workers.....	2,317	8,811	.38	2,098	11,457	.55
Service workers, except private household.....	6,323	8,399	.13	5,534	8,761	.16
Farm laborers and foremen.....	2,459	4,799	.20	2,730	4,885	.17
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	3,477	15,694	.45	3,680	21,826	.59

¹ Labor force figures are monthly averages for 1961 and quarterly averages for 1957.

² Data are for fiscal years.

Source: Labor force data—1961, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings"; 1957, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Annual Report on the Labor Force." Immigration data: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. Table III shows that in 1961, for example, our total labor force was about 66.7 million, including 123,688 immigrants—so that immigrants

were less than one-fifth of 1 percent of our labor force. In that year this proportion did not exceed one-half of 1 percent in any occupational category rang-

ing from the professional and technical workers to clerical, operatives, and unskilled laborers.

This data comes from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

From table III figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 2 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Between 1947 and 1962, our labor force expanded by about 13 million persons, while the total number of immigrants was only 3.8 million. But not all of these immigrants could or did enter our labor force. About 20 percent were housewives, 20 percent were children under 14 years old, and 7 percent were students.

Thus, in any single year, only about 50 percent of the immigrants who came to this country could have entered our labor force—for instance, in 1962 about 142,000 of the 284,000 immigrants, or less than a quarter of 1 percent of our employed labor force, could have entered our labor force.

Although their numbers are small, these immigrants have made important contributions to our economy and society. Before they arrived, they had been fully trained and possessed talents and skills urgently needed in our economy. One of our most serious occupational shortages has been a lack of engineers. During the last 10 years, some 31,000 immigrant engineers entered the United States, which was only 5.6 percent of all domestic graduates in engineering and science.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table IV, showing the relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal year 1951 to 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE IV.—Relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal years, 1951–61

Group	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
1. Immigrant scientists and engineers.....	1,561	3,204	2,718	3,200	2,862	3,790	5,823	5,190	5,081	4,326	3,922
2. Domestic graduates in engineering and science ¹	93,793	72,646	60,834	57,883	57,066	62,534	71,594	79,677	86,474	89,443	* 93,000
Percentage of group 1 to group 2.....	1.7	4.4	4.5	5.5	5.0	6.1	8.1	6.5	5.9	4.8	4.2

¹ Includes earned bachelor's degrees in the natural sciences and engineering. Social sciences are excluded.

² Estimated.

Source: "Scientific Manpower From Abroad," by National Science Foundation, 1962.

Mr. FONG. Table IV shows that, for example in 1960, 4,326 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States compared with 89,443 domestic graduates in those fields or a percentage of 4.8.

In 1961, 3,922 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States compared with 93,000 domestic graduates in those fields, or a percentage 4.2.

This data is taken from the publication "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," by the National Science Foundation, 1962.

From table IV figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 3 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

We are all aware that there is a great need for engineers and scientists, and that we are able to employ many, many more. This sharply accelerated demand for engineers, paralleling steeply increased demands for scientific and technical personnel, is attributed to increases in research activities, defense spending, and a speed-up in industrial technological advances. These trends are expected

to continue—see Manpower Research Bulletin, August 10, 1962; "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," National Science Foundation, 1962; "Current Labor Market Conditions in Engineering, Scientific and Technical Occupations," Department of Labor, August 1962.

The range of our unemployment in the last 10 years has been between 4 and 5 million jobless persons, who comprised 5.5 to 6 percent of the labor force according to Labor Department figures—see manpower report, March 1963, pages 33–38.

However, high unemployment rates in this country are not to be found among professional and technical workers, where it was less than 2 percent in 1962. Highest unemployment was concentrated in the relatively unskilled groups—the

nonfarm laborers, operatives, and service workers—which had rates well in excess of the 1962 total—see table 5 below.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table V, showing unemployment rates of the unemployed, by major

occupation groups, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE V.—Unemployment rates of the unemployed, by major occupation group: Annual averages, 1947-62, persons 14 years of age and over

Major occupation group	Unemployment rate														
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1947
Total.....	5.6	6.7	5.6	5.5	6.8	4.3	3.8	4.0	5.0	2.5	2.7	3.0	5.0	5.5	3.6
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.6	.9	1.0	1.5	2.2	1.9	1.9
Farmers and farm managers.....	.3	.4	.3	.3	.6	.3	.4	.4	.4	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.0	.8	.9	1.2	.9	.7	1.0	1.6	1.5	1.2
Clerical and kindred workers.....	3.9	4.6	3.8	3.7	4.4	2.8	2.4	2.6	3.1	1.7	1.8	2.1	3.4	3.8	2.9
Sales workers.....	4.1	4.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	2.6	2.7	2.4	3.7	2.1	2.5	2.8	4.0	3.5	2.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	5.1	6.3	5.3	5.3	6.8	3.8	3.2	4.0	4.9	2.6	2.4	2.6	5.6	5.9	3.8
Operatives and kindred workers.....	7.5	9.6	8.0	7.6	10.9	6.3	5.4	5.7	7.6	3.2	3.9	4.3	6.8	8.0	5.1
Private household workers.....	4.9	5.9	4.9	4.8	5.2	3.7	4.2	4.1	5.0	2.5	3.2	3.8	5.6	5.2	3.4
Service workers, except private household.....	6.4	7.4	6.0	6.4	7.4	5.1	4.8	5.8	5.2	3.6	3.7	4.3	6.8	6.1	4.7
Farm laborers and foremen.....	4.3	5.7	5.2	5.1	6.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.2	2.5	2.3	2.1	5.0	3.9	2.7
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	12.4	14.5	12.5	12.4	14.9	9.4	8.2	10.2	10.7	6.1	5.7	5.6	11.7	12.9	7.5

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

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

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the very careful and well thought-out analysis of the immigration bills before us which he is now presenting. The Senator represents a State in which there are relatively few civil rights problems because of that wonderful spirit of aloha which permeates not only his State but also the actions of our colleagues from Hawaii in this body. He is doing a particularly outstanding job in refuting the argument with which we who favor a change in our immigration laws are so frequently confronted; namely, that increased immigration will increase unemployment in our country.

I think the Senator in his presentation is demolishing that argument. It is a fact, based on our most recent experience, that immigration to the United States for permanent residence has increased employment opportunities for our people rather than diminished them. I shall cite only one example.

In my home city of Rochester, N.Y., a lot of men's clothing is made. Rochester is a clothing center. For many years, skilled cutters have been very hard to find. They could not be obtained in this country. Finally, about 100 skilled cutters were obtained from Italy. I was told by executives of the firms involved that for each one brought in, jobs were made for 10 or 12 other people. This was because there was a bottleneck in the factories. They could not produce what they wished to produce because of the shortage of skilled workers at a crucial stage of production. So in this case each person brought in made work for 10 or 12 native Americans.

The Senator has obviously studied this problem carefully. He is a cosponsor, with me, of S. 747. We have also both

considered S. 1932, more recently introduced.

I wish all Senators could hear the outstanding and careful analysis the Senator is presenting. I hope that all those interested in the problem will read the RECORD tomorrow to educate themselves, as indeed I shall be educated by the remarks of my colleague the Senator from Hawaii today.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from the State of New York for his kind remarks. I also wish to thank him for alluding to the aloha spirit of my State. It is a fine spirit. We are trying to export that spirit of aloha, of brotherhood, of amity, and of concord. I hope that eventually all America will have the aloha spirit.

The Senator is correct in saying that when skilled people are brought to the United States as immigrants additional jobs are created for our own people. We are indeed in very short supply of all the professional, technical, and kindred personnel, particularly in all scientific categories—chemists, physicists, nurses, and physicians. Actually, we are inveigling other countries, by enticing the intelligentsia to our country. We should view it as an asset to America, rather than a detriment to our country. It is in that light I am presenting my argument today.

The distinguished Senator from New York also has been in the forefront of those seeking to solve the Nation's immigration problems. He has worked hard to reform our immigration laws. He has presented arguments for the reform of the laws many times on the floor of the Senate. I know that the Senator from New York and other Members of the Senate, working with me, will be able to work out something acceptable to all our citizens and the people of the world.

Mr. KEATING. I sincerely hope so, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table V shows that higher unemployment rates continued to be found among blue-col-

lar workers and among the less skilled, in 1962. While the total unemployment rate was 5.6 percent of the work force, unemployed unskilled nonfarm laborers to those employed in that group was 12.4 percent; blue-collar operatives, 7.5 percent; and service workers, 6.4 percent. The unemployment rate for professional and technical occupations was only 1.7 percent.

The source of this data is the 1963 President's Manpower Report.

From table V figures I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 4 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Since only an extremely small number of immigrants who are unskilled workers are admitted annually, immigration has only a minimal effect, if at all, on unemployment.

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, it has been increasingly clear that labor has been displaced largely by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity.

It has been estimated that about 1.8 million jobs are affected each year by technological change, and that approximately 18 million jobs will be affected in the decade 1960-70—see population bulletin, November 1962, page 144.

Output per man-hour in private industry since 1947 has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947—see table VI. See also the Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 67-72.

I ask unanimous consent that table VI, showing "Indexes of Output Per Man-Hour and Related Data: Annual Averages, 1947-62" may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE VI.—Indexes of output per man-hour and related data: ¹ Annual averages, 1947–62

[1957–50=100]

Output, employment, and man-hours	1962 ²	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR																
Total private.....	113.4	108.9	105.3	103.3	99.6	97.2	93.9	93.8	89.7	88.2	84.7	82.9	80.9	75.5	73.4	70.9
Agriculture.....	121.8	117.9	109.3	102.8	103.0	94.2	88.3	86.4	83.4	77.8	69.9	64.0	64.7	56.8	59.6	50.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	112.1	107.9	104.8	103.1	99.4	97.5	94.9	95.3	91.4	90.0	87.6	86.5	85.1	80.8	77.9	76.3
Manufacturing.....	114.9	110.7	106.1	103.7	98.9	97.2	97.1	96.0	89.8	90.6	86.4	85.2	83.7	78.5	76.8	74.8
Nonmanufacturing.....	110.6	106.8	104.2	102.7	99.7	97.6	93.4	94.6	92.0	89.0	87.8	86.8	85.6	82.0	78.2	76.8
HOURS PER UNIT OF OUTPUT																
Total private.....	88.2	91.8	94.9	96.8	100.4	102.9	106.5	106.6	111.5	113.4	118.0	120.6	123.7	132.5	136.2	141.1
Agriculture.....	82.1	84.8	91.5	97.3	97.1	106.2	113.2	115.7	119.9	128.6	143.1	156.3	154.5	175.9	167.9	199.3
Nonagricultural industries.....	89.2	92.6	95.4	97.0	100.6	102.5	105.4	105.0	109.5	111.1	114.1	115.5	117.5	123.8	128.4	131.0
Manufacturing.....	87.0	90.3	94.2	96.5	101.1	102.9	103.0	104.1	111.4	110.4	115.7	117.4	119.4	127.4	130.2	133.8
Nonmanufacturing.....	90.4	93.7	96.0	97.4	100.3	102.4	107.0	105.8	108.7	112.3	113.9	115.2	116.8	122.0	127.9	130.2
OUTPUT																
Total private.....	114.4	108.6	106.9	104.1	97.0	98.9	97.0	95.0	87.2	88.6	84.4	82.0	77.3	70.8	71.2	68.4
Agriculture.....	107.2	106.2	104.8	100.0	100.5	99.0	100.5	102.9	97.6	93.7	90.4	87.0	92.8	88.0	92.8	81.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	114.9	108.8	107.0	104.3	96.8	98.9	96.8	94.5	86.6	88.3	84.1	81.7	76.4	69.8	70.0	67.7
Manufacturing.....	117.3	108.6	107.1	105.0	94.2	100.7	102.1	99.5	88.1	97.3	88.4	85.7	78.3	67.6	72.6	71.1
Nonmanufacturing.....	113.6	108.9	107.0	103.9	98.1	98.0	94.1	92.0	85.8	83.7	81.9	79.6	75.5	71.0	68.7	65.9
EMPLOYMENT																
Total private.....	101.7	100.8	101.9	100.7	97.9	101.3	101.5	98.9	95.2	97.6	96.2	95.2	91.9	90.2	92.1	91.0
Agriculture.....	87.9	91.2	95.6	97.6	97.9	104.5	110.5	113.2	109.6	110.8	120.5	125.3	133.5	142.1	140.4	145.0
Nonagricultural industries.....	103.2	101.8	102.6	101.1	97.9	101.0	100.5	97.4	93.7	96.2	93.6	92.0	87.5	84.7	87.0	85.2
Manufacturing.....	101.0	98.1	101.1	100.3	96.2	103.5	103.9	101.8	98.4	105.8	100.4	99.0	92.0	87.2	94.0	93.8
Nonmanufacturing.....	104.2	103.4	103.2	101.4	98.7	99.9	99.0	95.5	91.6	91.9	90.6	89.0	85.5	83.6	83.9	81.4
MAN-HOURS																
Total private.....	100.9	99.7	101.5	100.8	97.4	101.8	103.3	101.3	97.2	100.5	99.6	98.9	95.6	93.8	97.0	96.5
Agriculture.....	88.0	90.1	95.9	97.3	97.6	105.1	113.8	119.1	117.0	120.5	129.4	136.0	143.4	154.8	155.8	161.8
Nonagricultural industries.....	102.5	100.8	102.1	101.2	97.4	101.4	102.0	99.2	94.8	98.1	96.0	94.4	89.8	86.4	89.9	88.7
Manufacturing.....	102.1	98.1	100.9	101.3	95.2	103.6	105.2	103.6	98.1	107.4	102.3	100.6	93.5	86.1	94.5	95.1
Nonmanufacturing.....	102.7	102.0	102.7	101.2	98.4	100.4	100.7	97.3	93.3	94.0	93.3	91.7	88.2	86.6	87.9	85.8

¹ Output refers to gross national product in 1954 dollars; man-hour estimates are based primarily on establishment data.

² Preliminary.

Source: The President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table VI shows the close, positive relationship between productivity increases and expanding output; as output per man-hour showed impressive gains, output—as measured by gross private product in 1947 dollars—rose at about the same impressive rates. At the same time, while output rose by about 59 percent, employment rose only by 11 percent. Total man-hours worked rose by even less—only about 3 percent.

So that well over 80 percent of the increase in aggregate output from 1947 onward can be explained by increases in output per man-hour.

This data comes from the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Form table VI figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 5 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet, 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas—see Manpower Research Bulletin, March 1963, pages 9–10. There is no doubt that one

of the major causes of unemployment is the rapid technological changes in our economy.

Unemployment, then, does not always mean that there is a job shortage. It may also indicate a shortage of persons who have the kinds of skills, knowledge and abilities required by the economy. Labor economists in the United States are discovering that it is possible for large numbers of unemployed to exist, even while innumerable job openings go unfilled. To quote from the Labor Department's 1963 Manpower Report:

Despite the large supply of unused manpower, serious shortages exist in essential occupations * * *. Jobs remain unfilled because they require different skills from those possessed by the unemployed. Moreover—

The report continues—existing market mechanisms and educational programs have not overcome the imbalance of requirements and resources.

Shortages of qualified workers are particularly acute in the scientific, engineering, teaching, technical, health, and other professional fields—see the President's Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 30–32; and, as the Manpower Report points out, these ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. To meet these shortages, extensive education and training are required; retraining and re-

education of our existing manpower resources cannot be accomplished except over a prolonged period of time.

Where, then, are these highly trained and skilled workers to come from? One important source has been immigration. These immigrants, according to Labor Department officials, have not increased the number of persons on our unemployment rolls, because they possessed the skills and training our economy required. Even if it were possible immediately to retrain and reeducate 150,000 or 200,000 unemployed persons—a relatively small proportion—to give them skills needed by the economy, there can be no doubt that the economy would be significantly stimulated. Precisely the same thing may be said about the entry of skilled and highly trained immigrants into the economy. Of all immigrant workers arriving since 1947, about one of every three reported a professional, technical, or skilled occupation. Approximately half of the 3½ million immigrants who entered the United States between 1947 and 1961 were reported as having occupational attachments—see table VII—the remainder were primarily housewives, young, and retired persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables VII and VIII be received and made a part of the RECORD. Table VII shows the number and percentage

distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947-61 and for selected years. Table VIII shows the

number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952-61.

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

TABLE VII.—Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947-61 and for selected years

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1961		1961		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted.....	3,542,189	100.0	271,344	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation.....	1,671,003	47.2	123,688	45.6	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation.....	1,871,186	52.8	135,704	50.0	112,067	53.8	81,709	55.5
No occupation reported.....	(1)		11,952	4.4	(1)		(1)	
With occupation ²	1,671,003	100.0	123,688	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	263,018	15.7	21,455	17.3	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers.....	87,083	5.2	3,002	2.4	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	83,346	5.0	5,363	4.3	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers.....	283,432	17.0	25,198	20.4	16,018	16.7	13,961	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	268,555	16.1	17,679	14.3	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers.....	238,141	14.3	13,288	10.8	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers.....	129,643	7.8	8,811	7.1	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household.....	95,851	5.7	8,399	6.8	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen.....	53,792	3.2	4,799	3.9	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	168,142	10.1	15,694	12.7	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

¹ "No occupation" includes "No occupation reported" group.

² Includes immigrants age 14 years and over.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE VIII.—Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952-61 ¹

Occupation	[Fiscal years]										
	Total, 1952-61	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952
Biological scientists.....	420	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23	34	27
Chemists.....	4,899	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383	276	401
Dentists.....	1,271	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116	103	198
Engineers.....	30,373	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391	2,059	2,381
Geologists and geophysicists.....	474	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34	31	30
Mathematicians.....	243	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14	22	21
Nurses.....	28,235	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502	1,796	1,866
Physicians and surgeons.....	14,340	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040	845	1,210
Physicists.....	1,096	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74	73	58
College professors and instructors.....	3,147	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184	252	317
Teachers, not specified.....	19,278	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356	1,227	1,828
Technicians.....	12,217	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804	602	889
Machinists.....	9,025	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488	583	737
Toolmakers, diemakers and setters.....	7,250	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760	675	506
Pattern and model makers, except paper.....	501	26	34	25	63	123	118	60	32	13	7

¹ The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1961: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice. 1952 through 1958: Data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. Between 1953 and 1961, over 166,000 immigrants entering this country possessed skills in such critical job areas as physics, nursing, medicine, teaching, engineering, and other kindred fields. These are occupations declared to be in short supply by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the Labor Department, occupations which are used by the Selective Service in determining deferments in the national interest. Some 12,680 immigrant physicians and surgeons, and about 25,376 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained persons in the critical medical field in the 1952-61 period; about 4,448 chemists, 4,036 natural scientists, and 19,894 technicians—vitaly needed workers who support scientists and engineers—were admitted in that same period.

I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed in the RECORD table IX, showing the selected professional, technical and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959-61, and total, January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE IX.—Selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959-61, and total Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961

	1961		1960		1959		Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961	
	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹
Total.....	21,453	100.0	21,940	100.0	23,287	100.0	166,413	100.0
Engineers.....	2,868	13.4	3,338	15.2	3,936	16.9	27,142	16.3
Natural scientists.....	376	1.7	401	1.8	428	1.8	4,036	2.4
Physicists.....	151	.7	162	.7	155	.7	-----	-----
Mathematicians.....	24	.1	31	.1	29	.1	-----	-----
Other natural scientists.....	201	.9	208	1.0	244	1.0	-----	-----
Chemists.....	551	2.6	504	2.3	645	2.8	4,448	2.7
Physicians and surgeons.....	1,683	7.8	1,574	7.2	1,630	7.0	12,680	7.6
Dentists.....	119	.6	110	.5	99	.4	-----	-----
Nurses.....	3,449	16.1	3,828	17.4	3,620	15.5	25,376	15.2
College professors and instructors.....	500	2.3	367	1.7	340	1.5	1,921	1.2
Teachers (not specified).....	2,688	12.5	2,532	11.6	2,670	11.5	17,998	10.8
Technicians ²	2,138	10.0	2,350	10.7	2,740	11.8	19,894	12.0
Other professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	7,085	33.0	6,936	31.6	7,179	30.8	52,918	31.8

¹ Professional, technical, and kindred workers.

² Includes draftsmen.

³ Includes designers, draftsmen, radio operators, surveyors, medical and dental technicians, testing technicians, and technicians not specified.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. It is important to note here that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has increased significantly in the past decade—see tables VII and VIII. For instance, there were 20 percent more engineers entering in 1961 than in 1952, and 84 percent more technicians. It should be noted further that special legislation was passed during the 87th Congress to permit nonquota admission of several

thousand highly trained and skilled immigrants.

Virtually every study projecting the occupational structure of our economy in the decade of the sixties shows a shift of employment toward occupations requiring high levels of skill, training, and education. While unskilled jobs are not expected to expand at all in terms of absolute numbers, professional and technical positions will be the fastest growing occupations. This simply re-

flects the continuation of scientific and technological advances and of trends which were becoming increasingly evident as early as 1947.

I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table X which shows employed persons by major occupation group, annual averages, 1947-62.

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

TABLE X.—Employed persons by major occupation group; Annual averages, 1947-62, persons 14 years of age and over

Major occupation group and sex	Number (in thousands)															
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
BOTH SEXES																
Total employed.....	67,846	66,796	66,681	65,581	63,966	65,016	64,928	62,997	61,160	61,778	60,989	60,854	59,648	58,489	59,307	57,843
White-collar workers.....	29,901	29,124	28,726	27,798	27,056	26,451	25,597	24,585	23,891	23,614	23,070	22,413	22,373	21,636	21,400	20,185
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	8,040	7,705	7,475	7,143	6,961	6,468	6,096	5,792	5,588	5,448	5,092	4,788	4,490	4,028	3,977	3,795
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	7,408	7,119	7,067	6,935	6,785	6,703	6,552	6,450	6,201	6,396	6,182	6,220	6,429	6,433	6,344	5,795
Clerical and kindred workers.....	10,107	9,861	9,783	9,326	9,137	9,152	8,838	8,367	8,168	7,991	8,122	7,655	7,632	7,438	7,438	7,200
Sales workers.....	4,346	4,439	4,401	4,394	4,173	4,128	4,111	3,976	3,994	3,779	3,674	3,750	3,822	3,737	3,641	3,395
Blue-collar workers.....	24,278	23,862	24,211	24,162	23,510	24,874	25,179	24,771	24,167	24,991	24,802	25,009	23,336	22,770	23,888	23,554
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	8,678	8,623	8,566	8,561	8,469	8,664	8,693	8,328	8,311	8,558	8,742	8,434	7,670	7,625	8,119	7,754
Operatives and kindred workers.....	12,041	11,762	11,986	11,858	11,441	12,520	12,816	12,762	12,253	12,747	12,352	12,623	12,146	11,780	12,396	12,274
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	3,559	3,477	3,665	3,743	3,600	3,680	3,670	3,681	3,603	3,656	3,707	3,952	3,520	3,365	3,573	3,526
Service workers.....	8,802	8,641	8,349	8,040	7,809	7,632	7,609	7,106	6,755	6,949	6,488	6,533	6,535	6,266	6,040	5,987
Private household workers.....	2,341	2,317	2,216	2,197	2,204	2,098	2,124	1,946	1,760	1,850	1,805	1,869	1,883	1,757	1,754	1,731
Service workers, except private household.....	6,461	6,323	6,133	5,843	5,605	5,534	5,485	5,160	4,995	5,099	4,683	4,664	4,652	4,509	4,286	4,256
Farmworkers.....	4,866	5,170	5,395	5,582	5,591	6,059	6,544	6,537	6,348	6,224	6,632	6,900	7,408	7,819	7,881	8,120
Farmers and farm managers.....	2,595	2,771	2,780	3,019	3,083	3,329	3,655	3,739	3,853	3,842	3,963	4,025	4,398	4,703	4,668	4,995
Farm laborers and foremen.....	2,271	2,459	2,615	2,563	2,508	2,730	2,889	2,798	2,495	2,382	2,669	2,875	3,015	3,116	3,213	3,125
Percent distribution																
Total employed.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar workers.....	44.1	43.6	43.1	42.4	42.3	40.6	39.4	39.0	39.0	38.2	37.7	36.8	37.5	37.0	36.1	34.9
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	11.9	11.5	11.2	10.9	10.9	9.9	9.4	9.2	9.1	8.8	8.3	7.9	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.6
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	10.9	10.7	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.3	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.4	10.1	10.2	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.0
Clerical and kindred workers.....	14.9	14.8	14.7	14.2	14.3	14.1	13.6	13.3	13.4	12.9	13.3	12.6	12.8	12.7	12.5	12.4
Sales workers.....	6.4	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.5	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.1	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.4	6.1	5.9
Blue-collar workers.....	35.8	35.7	36.3	36.9	36.7	38.3	38.8	39.2	39.5	40.4	40.7	41.1	39.1	38.9	40.4	40.7
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	12.8	12.9	12.8	13.1	13.2	13.3	13.4	13.2	13.6	13.9	14.3	13.9	12.9	13.0	13.7	13.4
Operatives and kindred workers.....	17.7	17.6	18.0	18.1	17.9	19.3	19.7	20.2	20.0	20.6	20.3	20.7	20.3	20.1	20.9	21.2
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.1	6.5	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.1
Service workers.....	13.0	12.9	12.5	12.2	12.2	11.7	11.7	11.3	11.1	11.3	10.7	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.2	10.4
Private household workers.....	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0
Service workers, except private household.....	9.5	9.5	9.2	8.9	8.8	8.5	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.3	7.7	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.2	7.4
Farmworkers.....	7.2	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.7	9.3	10.1	10.5	10.4	10.1	10.9	11.3	12.5	13.3	13.3	14.0
Farmers and farm managers.....	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.6	6.0	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.6	7.4	8.0	7.9	8.6
Farm laborers and foremen.....	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.7	5.1	5.3	5.4	5.4

EMPLOYMENT, BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1960-75

Major occupational group	Actual, 1960		Projected, 1970		Projected, 1975		Percent change		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1960-70	1970-75	1960-75
Total.....	Millions 66.7	100.0	Millions 80.5	100.0	Millions 87.6	100.0	21	9	31
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	7.5	11.2	10.7	13.3	12.4	14.2	43	16	65
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	7.1	10.6	8.6	10.7	9.4	10.7	21	9	32
Clerical and kindred workers.....	9.8	14.7	12.8	15.9	14.2	16.2	31	11	45
Sales workers.....	4.4	6.6	5.4	6.7	5.9	6.7	23	9	34
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	8.6	12.8	10.3	12.8	11.2	12.8	20	9	30
Operatives and kindred workers.....	12.0	18.0	13.6	16.9	14.2	16.3	13	4	18
Service workers.....	8.3	12.5	11.1	13.8	12.5	14.3	34	13	51
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	3.7	5.5	3.7	4.6	3.7	4.3	—22	—7	—28
Farmers, farm managers, laborers, and foremen.....	5.4	8.1	4.2	5.3	3.9	4.5	—22	—7	—28

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Monthly Labor Review, March 1963; President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Table IX, which I have already introduced, shows selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States from 1959 to 1961 and the total number of such workers admitted between January 1, 1953, and June 30, 1961.

The total admitted in that 8-year period was 166,413, of which 21,455 were admitted in 1961, 21,940 in 1960, and 23,287 in 1959.

Table IX relates directly to table X, which shows employment by type of occupation between 1947 and 1962, and the percent change in employment projected to 1970.

Table X shows that the demand for professional, technical, and other skilled workers is expected to continue to rise in the future. But unskilled occupation groups are not expected to grow at all; in fact, they may decline.

These materials are drawn from the Monthly Labor Review, March 1963, and the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

From the figures in tables IX and X, I have prepared two charts which I refer to as charts 6 and 7, showing graphically what I have just introduced.

The large unfilled need for personnel in the professional, technical and other skilled occupations are expected to continue into the foreseeable future. This fact was underscored particularly in the President's 1963 Manpower Report. Immigration will therefore continue to be our best source of supply of highly trained people.

The fourth point is tied to the third—the fact that many American economists and social scientists are beginning to recognize the tremendous economic value of educated people. They see that much of the wealth attributable to resources and capital equipment really has its roots in education.

For example, a person born in 1956 who subsequently completes high school would earn a lifetime income of \$253,631, computed on the basis of the average income of male high school graduates in 1956. A substantial increase in lifetime income corresponds with each additional year of schooling completed, so that, for instance, on a basis of 1958 data a college graduate could expect to earn about \$435,000 during his lifetime, compared with \$258,000 for the high school graduate.

Mr. President, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table XI, which shows estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years.

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

TABLE XI.—Estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years

Years of school completed	Income from age 18 to death				Income from age 25 to 64			
	1939	1949	1956	1958	1939	1949	1956	1958
Elementary:								
Total	(1)	\$113,330	\$154,593	\$154,114	\$37,172	\$91,932	\$127,047	\$127,286
Less than 8 years	(1)	98,222	132,736	129,764	(1)	79,654	108,310	106,449
8 years	(1)	132,683	180,857	181,695	(1)	106,889	148,033	149,687
High school:								
1 to 3 years	(1)	152,068	205,277	211,193	53,011	121,943	169,501	175,779
4 years	(1)	185,279	253,631	257,557	67,383	148,649	208,322	215,487
College:								
1 to 3 years	(1)	209,282	291,581	315,504	73,655	173,166	243,611	269,105
4 years or more	(1)	296,377	405,698	435,242	104,608	241,427	340,131	366,990

¹ Not available.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

Mr. FONG. To cite one set of figures from table XI, in 1958 a person with elementary school education can expect to earn \$154,114 from age 18 to death, and \$127,286 from 25 to 64; with a college education, \$435,242 from 18 to death, and \$366,990 from 25 to 64.

Data is taken from the Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

From the figures in table XI, I have prepared a chart which I have referred to

as chart 8 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Since most higher-paying jobs require a high degree of training and education, it is not surprising that persons having more education are employed in better jobs. As of March 1962, the median years of schooling for professional and technical workers was 16.2, as compared to 12.5 for clerical employees, and 8.5

to 10.1 for unskilled persons. (See table XII.)

Mr. President, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table XII, which shows median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952-62.

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

TABLE XII.—Median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952-62

Major occupation groups	Both sexes				Male				Female			
	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962
All occupation groups	10.8	11.7	12.0	12.1	10.4	11.2	11.7	12.1	12.0	12.1	12.2	12.3
Professional and managerial workers	12.9	13.2	13.5	13.9	12.8	12.9	13.2	13.5	14.0	14.4	14.0	14.7
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	16.4	16.4	16.2	16.2	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.4	16.1
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.3	12.2	12.4
Farmers and farm managers	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Farm laborers and foremen	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	(1)	(1)	(1)
Farm laborers and foremen	7.5	8.2	8.3	8.5	7.2	7.4	7.7	8.3	7.9	8.7	(1)	(1)
Clerical and sales workers	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.5
Clerical and kindred workers	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Sales workers	12.3	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.7	12.0	12.0	12.2	12.1
Craftsmen, operatives, and laborers, except farm and mine	9.2	9.7	10.0	10.4	9.1	9.7	10.1	10.4	9.4	(1)	9.8	10.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	11.5	11.3	11.2	9.2
Operatives and kindred workers	9.1	9.5	9.9	10.1	9.0	9.6	10.0	10.2	9.3	9.3	9.7	9.9
Laborers, except farm and mine	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.9	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.9	8.5	(1)	(1)	10.0
Service workers, including private household	8.8	9.0	9.7	10.2	(1)	(1)	(1)	10.3	8.8	9.0	9.5	10.2
Private household workers	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7
Other service workers	9.2	9.6	10.3	10.8	8.8	9.0	10.1	(1)	9.7	10.2	10.5	11.1

¹ Not available.

² Median not shown where base is less than 150,000 in 1957 or less than 100,000 in other years.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FONG. Table XII shows that workers with more education are employed in better jobs.

In March 1962, the highest paid workers were professional, technical, and kindred personnel, who completed a median level of 14.7 years of schooling, while unskilled workers, with a median level of 8.7 years of schooling, were the lowest paid.

Data were drawn from the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics.

From the figures in table XII, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 9 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

While the proportion of workers with less than 5 years of schooling fell during the past decade from 7.3 to 4.6 percent of the labor force, this 4.6 percent represents 3.1 million workers who are considered "functional illiterates" by the Government. See "Manpower Report," March 1963, pages 12-13. By contrast, less than 1 percent of the immigrants to the United States are illiterate.

Although the rate of unemployment is high among all young people, it is far higher for youngsters who dropped out of school before graduating. For example, 27 percent of the dropouts in 1961 were unemployed, as compared with 18 percent of the high school graduates. The high dropout rate in previous years

is expected to continue into the 1970's, so that at least 7.5 million or 30 percent of all young people entering the labor force in this decade will lack a high school education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIII showing employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959-61, be received and made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE XIII.—Employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959-61

(Thousands of persons 16 to 24 years of age)

Sex and color, and marital status	June high school graduates							School dropouts						
	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force
		Total		Em- ployed	Unemployed				Total		Em- ployed	Unemployed		
		Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force			Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force	
1959														
Total ¹	790	634	80.2	549	85	13.5	156	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Male.....	304	279	91.7	239	40	14.3	25	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Female.....	486	355	73.0	310	45	12.8	131	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Single.....	418	331	79.2	291	40	12.1	88	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Married and other marital status ²	68	24	(?)	19	5	(?)	43	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
1960 ³														
Total.....	921	706	76.7	599	107	15.2	215	344	214	62.2	175	39	18.2	130
Male.....	348	308	88.5	262	46	14.9	40	165	126	76.4	102	24	19.0	39
Female.....	573	398	69.5	337	61	15.3	175	179	88	49.2	73	15	(?)	91
Single.....	473	359	75.9	308	51	14.2	114	110	71	64.5	60	11	(?)	39
Married and other marital status ²	100	39	39.0	29	10	(?)	61	69	17	(?)	13	4	(?)	52
White.....	848	653	77.0	568	85	13.0	195	273	163	59.7	133	30	18.4	110
Nonwhite.....	73	53	(?)	31	22	(?)	20	71	51	(?)	42	9	(?)	20
1961														
Total.....	916	730	79.7	599	131	17.9	186	354	239	67.5	175	64	26.8	115
Male.....	345	297	86.1	242	55	18.5	48	179	150	83.8	108	42	28.0	29
Female.....	571	433	76.8	357	76	17.6	138	175	89	50.9	67	22	(?)	86
Single.....	482	392	81.3	326	66	16.8	90	119	75	63.0	55	20	(?)	44
Married and other marital status ²	89	41	(?)	31	10	(?)	48	56	14	(?)	12	2	(?)	42
White.....	814	651	80.0	545	106	16.3	163	283	189	66.8	134	55	29.1	94
Nonwhite.....	102	79	77.4	54	25	(?)	23	71	50	(?)	41	9	(?)	21

¹ Data not available by color.

² Not available.

³ Other marital status includes widowed and divorced persons, and married persons with spouse absent.

⁴ Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

⁵ Data include Alaska and Hawaii beginning with 1960 and are therefore not strictly comparable with data for 1959.

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XIII shows that dropouts have significantly higher rates of unemployment than high school graduates.

While the unemployment rate for high school graduates in 1961 was a high 17.9 percent, the comparable rate for youths who had dropped out of school was a very high 26.8 percent.

Data was taken from the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

From the figures in table XIII, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart

10 showing graphically what I have introduced. It also contains a chart showing school grades of youths leaving before high school graduation.

In addition to the monetary value of an education, the underlying philosophy of the Peace Corps well illustrates the point: the United States sends skilled, professional and technically proficient persons to developing nations whose economic and cultural levels may thereby be lifted and improved. The great success of this Peace Corps idea abroad may be

said to operate with equal success in the reverse—that skilled technicians and knowledgeable persons from other countries can and have helped improve the American economic and cultural levels.

There is no doubt that every educated immigrant admitted into the country adds immeasurably to our economic and social wealth. The training of professional and technical workers is a costly undertaking and represents a substantial national economic investment.

It has been estimated that it costs \$35,000 to raise a child and send him through college. If this estimate is correct, then the immigrant scientists and engineers who came here since 1952 represented an investment in human capital of approximately \$1.25 billion. Together with other highly trained and educated immigrants, the United States has received about \$3.5 billion in human capital since 1952 because of immigration.

Thus, because a large number of immigrants to this country are fully trained when they arrive, the United States, as the receiving country, benefits greatly from the education and training acquired in the nation of the immigrants' origin. Not only do they bring with them a wide diversity of knowledge, education, and training which is badly needed throughout our economy, but they also bring with them a willingness to work.

The fifth point regarding the impact of immigration on the economy is that, particularly during the coming decade, immigrants can help us make up for a shortage of people in the central age ranges, from 25 through 44. We are in-

deed in critically short supply of workers in this age bracket, because during the depression years of the 1930's the number of children born in the United States fell off sharply. The 1930 babies are now in the 25-to-44 age bracket, a group which normally supplies many of the skilled workers, technicians, and middle management personnel and a group relied on heavily by employers. In 1960 only about 26 percent of the U.S. population was in that age range—considered by economists the prime years of a person's working life.

Census Bureau figures show that an increasingly high proportion of immigrants admitted to the United States in recent years has been in the 25-to-44 age range.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XIV shows that a large proportion of immigrants, both male and female, in that period were in the 25-to-44 age bracket—about 1 million of about 2.5 million.

Source of this data is the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

From the figures in table XIV, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart II showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Mr. President, Labor Department projections for the 1960's, shown in the following table, indicate how significantly immigration could contribute to alleviate the worker shortage in the central age range:

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]		
	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages.....	12.6	11.1
Under 25.....	6.2	5.9
25 to 34.....	1.6	1.1
35 to 44.....	-3	-7
45 and over.....	5.1	4.8

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIV entitled "Immigrants Admitted, by Sex and Age: Years Ended June 30, 1953-1962," be received and made a part of the Record at this point.

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

TABLE XIV.—Immigrants admitted, by sex and age, years ended June 30, 1953-62

Sex and age	1953-62	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Number admitted.....	2,599,349	170,434	208,177	237,790	321,625	326,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763
Males.....	1,185,440	73,073	95,594	112,032	156,410	155,201	109,121	114,367	116,687	121,380	131,575
Under 5 years.....	117,489	7,226	8,708	9,587	14,087	15,766	11,976	11,511	12,299	13,203	13,126
5 to 9 years.....	95,053	6,273	7,769	8,783	12,419	13,452	9,488	8,960	8,570	9,604	9,735
10 to 14 years.....	75,817	4,345	5,513	6,730	9,323	9,898	7,694	7,775	7,731	8,295	8,313
15 years.....	13,805	732	870	1,303	1,847	1,764	1,304	1,363	1,493	1,446	1,683
16 to 17 years.....	33,321	1,761	2,211	3,104	4,581	4,247	3,190	3,237	3,565	3,537	3,888
18 to 19 years.....	45,839	2,103	2,890	4,226	6,204	5,953	4,294	4,739	4,879	5,171	5,380
20 to 24 years.....	154,531	7,777	10,341	13,986	20,537	20,114	13,782	15,999	15,836	16,618	19,541
25 to 29 years.....	184,987	11,922	15,447	17,625	23,783	23,986	17,493	17,306	17,788	18,349	21,288
30 to 34 years.....	144,130	9,661	13,543	14,950	19,883	19,637	12,841	12,487	12,919	13,063	15,146
35 to 39 years.....	98,270	6,788	8,456	9,106	12,581	12,652	8,840	9,199	9,969	9,802	10,877
40 to 44 years.....	72,124	5,141	6,950	8,492	11,311	9,745	5,836	5,721	5,827	6,247	6,854
45 to 49 years.....	56,076	3,587	4,975	6,128	8,523	7,166	4,545	5,346	5,369	5,326	5,111
50 to 54 years.....	37,831	2,404	3,560	3,703	5,306	4,561	3,076	3,784	3,762	3,865	3,810
55 to 59 years.....	24,389	1,511	2,046	2,065	3,035	2,917	2,050	2,752	2,646	2,652	2,715
60 to 64 years.....	14,508	830	1,107	1,100	1,433	1,579	1,268	1,772	1,801	1,756	1,862
65 to 69 years.....	8,897	508	636	587	813	892	737	1,168	1,187	1,218	1,151
70 to 74 years.....	4,600	277	309	289	407	445	390	579	592	732	580
75 to 79 years.....	2,295	118	159	143	209	214	176	317	294	322	343
80 years and over.....	1,235	99	86	109	99	130	105	129	146	168	164
Not reported.....	243	10	18	16	29	83	36	23	14	6	8
Females.....	1,413,909	97,361	112,583	125,758	165,215	171,666	144,144	146,319	148,711	149,964	152,188
Under 5 years.....	112,371	7,162	8,188	9,065	13,661	14,950	11,172	11,005	11,799	13,001	12,368
5 to 9 years.....	92,591	6,107	7,429	8,342	11,958	13,102	9,239	8,800	8,953	9,320	9,341
10 to 14 years.....	74,742	4,331	5,639	6,684	9,173	9,326	7,753	7,811	7,655	8,139	8,231
15 years.....	14,571	840	989	1,355	1,961	1,882	1,498	1,401	1,395	1,536	1,734
16 to 17 years.....	44,997	2,878	3,189	4,187	5,440	5,421	4,709	4,621	4,690	4,915	4,947
18 to 19 years.....	86,695	4,950	6,263	8,060	9,704	9,386	9,091	9,465	9,968	9,825	9,983
20 to 24 years.....	282,251	18,996	22,126	24,466	30,897	31,244	29,253	30,119	31,838	31,366	31,946
25 to 29 years.....	213,844	16,317	18,730	19,921	24,852	26,050	22,181	21,384	21,755	21,209	21,445
30 to 34 years.....	144,848	10,323	12,230	13,299	17,571	18,827	14,698	14,585	14,829	14,211	14,275
35 to 39 years.....	93,150	6,783	7,224	7,756	10,364	11,418	9,376	10,073	9,989	10,071	10,096
40 to 44 years.....	69,074	5,460	6,131	6,823	9,062	8,984	6,656	6,431	6,232	6,497	6,798
45 to 49 years.....	57,592	4,162	4,821	5,303	7,158	6,883	5,703	6,071	5,941	5,756	5,794
50 to 54 years.....	45,016	3,437	3,722	3,977	5,043	5,114	4,397	4,949	4,633	4,746	4,998
55 to 59 years.....	33,156	2,386	2,487	2,710	3,606	3,831	3,405	3,737	3,610	3,499	3,885
60 to 64 years.....	21,881	1,422	1,538	1,669	2,161	2,355	2,253	2,729	2,515	2,484	2,755
65 to 69 years.....	13,395	890	894	1,053	1,260	1,409	1,303	1,699	1,565	1,649	1,773
70 to 74 years.....	7,527	500	502	610	703	761	818	872	767	997	997
75 to 79 years.....	3,886	273	293	315	384	404	406	414	386	512	499
80 years and over.....	2,031	137	164	164	227	233	181	220	175	226	304
Not reported.....	291	7	24	19	30	86	62	33	16	5	19

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XV entitled "Changes in Total Labor Force, by Age and Sex, 1950-

75," be received and made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE XV.—Changes in total labor force, by age and sex, 1950-75

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and sex	Actual		Projected		Change, 1950-60		Change, 1960-70		Change, 1970-75	
	1950	1960 ¹	1970	1975	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Both sexes:										
14 years and over.....	64,749	73,081	85,703	93,031	8,332	12.9	12,622	17.3	7,328	8.6
14 to 24 years.....	13,331	13,697	19,861	21,787	366	2.7	6,164	45.0	1,926	9.7
25 to 44 years.....	29,263	31,878	33,235	37,023	2,615	8.9	1,357	4.3	3,788	11.4
25 to 34 years.....	15,145	15,099	16,709	20,806	-46	-3	1,610	10.7	4,097	24.5
35 to 44 years.....	14,118	16,779	16,526	16,217	2,661	18.8	-253	-1.5	-309	-1.9
45 years and over.....	22,156	27,506	32,607	34,221	5,350	24.1	5,101	18.5	1,614	4.9
45 to 64 years.....	19,119	24,127	29,128	30,510	5,008	26.2	5,001	20.7	1,382	4.7
65 years and over.....	3,037	3,379	3,479	3,711	342	11.3	100	3.0	232	6.7
Male:										
14 years and over.....	46,069	49,563	56,295	60,916	3,494	7.6	6,732	13.6	4,621	8.2
14 to 24 years.....	8,668	8,731	12,594	13,782	63	.7	3,863	44.2	1,188	9.4
25 to 44 years.....	20,996	22,394	23,003	25,671	1,398	6.7	609	2.7	2,668	11.6
25 to 34 years.....	11,044	10,940	11,990	14,916	-104	-9	1,050	9.6	2,926	24.4
35 to 44 years.....	9,952	11,454	11,013	10,755	1,502	15.1	-441	-3.9	-258	-2.3
45 years and over.....	16,405	18,438	20,698	21,463	2,033	12.4	2,260	12.3	765	3.7
45 to 64 years.....	13,952	16,013	18,414	19,083	2,061	14.8	2,401	15.0	669	3.6
65 years and over.....	2,453	2,425	2,284	2,380	-28	-1.1	-141	-5.8	96	4.2
Female:										
14 years and over.....	18,680	23,518	29,408	32,115	4,838	25.9	5,890	25.0	2,707	9.2
14 to 24 years.....	4,663	4,966	7,267	8,005	303	6.5	2,301	46.3	738	10.2
25 to 44 years.....	8,267	9,484	10,232	11,352	1,217	14.7	748	7.9	1,120	10.9
25 to 34 years.....	4,101	4,159	4,719	5,890	58	1.4	560	13.5	1,171	24.8
35 to 44 years.....	4,166	5,325	5,513	5,462	1,159	27.8	188	3.5	-51	-9
45 years and over.....	5,751	9,068	11,909	12,758	3,317	57.7	2,841	31.3	849	7.1
45 to 64 years.....	5,167	8,114	10,714	11,427	2,947	57.0	2,600	32.0	713	6.7
65 years and over.....	584	954	1,195	1,331	370	63.4	241	25.3	136	11.4

¹ Alaska and Hawaii are included beginning with 1960. The 1960 estimates for the labor force differ slightly from those derived from the monthly labor force survey because they were adjusted to be consistent with the revised 1960 population estimates published by the Bureau of the Census in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 241.

NOTE.—Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, figures drawn from table XV show that the shortage of workers in the critical 25-to-44 age bracket is expected to continue to 1970.

From these figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 12 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

There would be 700,000 fewer workers in the 35-to-44 age group in 1970 than in 1960 if there were no immigration. But with immigration continuing at present levels, this key age group would be only 300,000 fewer by 1970.

The sixth point about the economic implications of immigration is that, by and large, adjustments in the timing of admissions of immigrants with different skills to U.S. employment levels and needs may perhaps best be handled administratively. When we are in short supply of medical technicians, for example, at a particular time and have an adequate supply of machinists, then we should adjust our immigration priorities to admit more medical technicians and temporarily suspend admission of machinists. Australia and Canada, nations which have embarked on ambitious programs of immigration, so administer

their immigration, and with remarkable success.

J. L. Marion of the Canadian Immigration Office said:

I should emphasize that immigration is for Canada an economically stimulating factor and hence we feel that some immigration is desirable even in periods of economic recession although at such times extra care must be taken to insure that the migrants are well qualified and will not enter into competition with unemployed Canadian workers.

Figures provided by the Canadian Labour Congress show that when immigration was high in relation to the labor force, unemployment was low; on the other hand, when immigration was low in relation to the labor force, unemployment was high.

Exclusions based on economic as well as social factors, administered flexibly and pragmatically, are justified. But to arbitrarily exclude skilled or gifted persons needed in this Nation merely because he is a Polynesian, a Negro, or an oriental, or because the country of his birth has a small quota—our experience under the 1952 Immigration Act has been precisely this—is to effectuate un-

democratic as well as economically wasteful policies.

As the New York Times editorialized on July 25, 1963, "each immigrant's worth is best judged by personal qualities and skills, not by group stereotypes."

One of our oldest and most emotional arguments against changing our immigration laws is the fear that an increase in the number of Asian immigrants would upset the historical and cultural patterns of American life. An objective examination of the facts dispels this fear as groundless.

According to the 1960 census, the population of the United States included 464,332 persons of Japanese ancestry, twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population, 237,292 persons of Chinese ancestry, thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent; 176,310 persons of Filipino ancestry, nine one-hundredths of 1 percent; and 218,089 in a category designated "All others," including persons of Korean, Indian of the Far East, Polynesian, Indonesian, and other non-white ancestries except Negroes and American Indians, about twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population.

There were, then, in the United States in 1960 only 1,093,023 persons of oriental and Polynesian extraction, or sixty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent of a total of 180 million people—an extraordinarily small minority—not even 1 percent of our total population; in other words, a little more than one-half of 1 percent of our population. And as envisaged under our proposed immigration bill, the total allotment for nations of Asia and the Pacific would be 26,990, or only 10.8 percent of the total immigration annually—surely a small enough proportion, since the Asia Pacific area contains over half of the world's population.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT AND A SOURCE OF STRENGTH

Contributions of our American citizens of Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Polynesian ancestry, and others whose antecedents are native to the triangle area in the building of our country have been significant. They have achieved distinction in nearly every field of endeavor: artistic, scientific, political, socioeconomic, religious, military, financial, industrial, and otherwise.

Once thought to be unassimilable, today they are as much a part as any other ethnic group in the mainstream of American life. They have contributed economically and culturally to our Nation and are great assets in the American body politic. In addition, they serve well as bridges of understanding between our people and the peoples of Asia and the Pacific, for in sharing common ethnic origins, they are able to reach much better the peoples of the triangle area with their messages of good will, democratic freedom and individual dignity.

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Historically, the United States is an immigrant country. The world came to regard us as a haven where freedom was to be found. Since the first settling of this land, over 40 million people have migrated to America. There is no part of our society which has not been refined by the contributions of "aliens" who have come to make their home in the United States. This is the essence of our Union. It is its strength. The unequalled economic prosperity and vigorous culture of the Nation is due to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, hard labor and ideals of people of several score of nationalities—but all American.

Oscar Handlin writes:

Our remarkable national development testifies to the wisdom of our early and continuing belief in immigration. Our growth as a nation has been achieved, in large measure, through the genius and industry of immigrants of every race and from every quarter of the world. The story of their pursuit of happiness is the saga of America. Their brains and their brawn helped to settle our land, to advance our agriculture, to build our industries, to develop our commerce, to produce new inventions, and, in general, to make us the leading nation that we now are.

In 1959, President Eisenhower said in a message to Congress:

The strength of this Nation may be measured in many ways—military might, industrial productivity, scientific contributions, its system of justice, its freedom from autocracy, the fertility of its land and the prowess

of its people. Yet, no analytical study can so dramatically demonstrate its position in the world as the simple truth that here, more than any other place, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter and establish their homes and raise their children.

To the extent possible, without dislocating the lives of those already living here, this flow of immigration to this country must be encouraged. These persons who seek entry to this country seek more than a share in our material prosperity. The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts. Their real concern is with their children, and as a result those who have struggled for the right of American citizenship have, in countless ways, shown a deep appreciation of its responsibilities. The names of those who make important contributions in * * * almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which the immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them.

To understand the message of these paragraphs, we need only point to the 15 U.S. Nobel Prize winners in physics and chemistry who were immigrants to this country; we need only to think of a few immigrants—Noguchi, a poor Japanese peasant who became one of the world's greatest scientists in the United States; Japanese artist Yasuo Kuniyoshi; Lin Yu Tang, Chinese philosopher and author; Dr. Chen Ning Yang and Dr. Tsung Dao Lee, who jointly won the Nobel Prize for Physics while engaged in research in the Princeton Institute of Advanced Studies; D. S. Saund, an Indian who was elected Congressman from California; Jiddu Krishnamurti, Hindu poet and philosopher; Wernher von Braun and the entire team of scientists whom Dr. von Braun brought with him from Germany to work for the U.S. Government at the Redstone Arsenal; England's Samuel Gompers of the labor movement; the German physicist, Albert Einstein; Ireland's Father Flanagan, founder of Boys' Town; the great Spanish philosopher, George Santayana; Hungary's journalist Joseph Pulitzer; Austrian-born Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter; Polish pianist Artur Schnabel; the brilliant Italian atomic physicist Enrico Fermi; the great maestro of the Philadelphia Orchestra, Hungarian Eugene Ormandy—to name a few who have made notable contributions in American culture and thought. See, for example, "Scientific Manpower From Abroad," National Science Foundation, 1962.

As a nation of immigrants, we have developed a racially heterogeneous society in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American dream a reality.

We live in brotherhood; we believe in it, for we know it has real prospect for success nationally and internationally, and it has the force of logic.

Believing in this ideal and constantly working to achieve it, we cannot but write from our books the discriminatory quota provisions of the Immigration

and Nationality Act, which give offense to many peoples of the world.

During my tour of the Far East and southeast Asia, I was asked many questions about our immigration policies. I was pressed again and again to explain the small quotas we allot inhabitants of those nations. These people feel greatly the sting of discriminatory treatment.

America's role of leadership in the free world is one of great sensitivity, and our position is hardly enhanced by an immigration policy which implies that some nationalities and some ethnic groups are less desirable members of the American family.

Many countries of Asia and the Pacific have traditionally sought more than a token of immigration to the United States. These are the countries that will play a large and vital role in determining the future course of world events. Their friendship is crucial to all those who are fighting to preserve freedom.

The problem of immigration is no longer merely a domestic issue; on the contrary, it has great international significance.

While Secretary of State in 1956, John Foster Dulles said:

My primary concern as Secretary of State is that whatever overall quota is adopted by the Congress be apportioned equitably. Our quota restrictions should not discriminate among persons merely on the basis of their national origin, nor should the restrictions discriminate unfairly against any of the friendly nations which have an interest in common with us in the defense of the free world. The present system of determining quotas is offensive on both counts.

America's struggle with totalitarianism is a struggle to vindicate democracy's belief in the individual worth of human beings, as opposed to the totalitarian concept that individuals have no identity except as components in the political and economic structure of society.

The racial incongruities of our present basic immigration law should be deeply troubling to the national conscience.

Until the many provisions of our immigration laws which discriminate against certain national and ethnic groups are eliminated, our laws needlessly impede our struggle for global peace.

Our forebears, coming to America from all corners of the world, have worked together to transform a vast continent of wilderness and desert into a powerful bastion of freedom and opportunity.

Mr. President, our Nation is the great pilot demonstration of the most influential principles and ideals in history. Our tenets of equality irrespective of race, creed, or color have inspired freedom-loving people everywhere to look to America as a beacon in their struggle to win freedom and independence. Our opportunity is to live up to these ideals.

Since 1924 we have come a long way in our immigration laws. Let us go the final mile in writing a fair and just law. We will then be demonstrating to the whole world that we practice what we preach, and that all men are equal under law.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the statement by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Hawaii, is a valuable con-

tribution to the current discussions of immigration policy. This is not the first time the Senator has spoken so responsibly to the conscience of the Senate on immigration matters. But certainly it is one of his most eloquent and vigorous statements. I commend him for it, and thank him particularly for his unflinching support of legislation I introduced earlier in this session.

I was struck especially, Mr. President, by the Senator's definitive discussion of the discriminatory clauses of our basic immigration statute, and the irrational pattern of the national origins quota system. An immigration policy with different standards of admissibility for different racial and ethnic groups, a policy with unjust strictures against family unification, in short, a policy with built-in bias, should have no place on our statute books. It is contrary to our credo of democracy. It tarnishes our claimed position of world leadership.

We need a new formula for the admission of immigrants—one based on equality and fairplay, and applied without exception to the people of all nations. It is one reason I introduced reform legislation earlier this year, which, as the Senator from Hawaii points out, is widely supported in Congress and throughout the country.

Mr. President, as Senators know, the strictures and bias of our current basic statute have necessitated many special enactments in the last 10 years. The argument is made these special measures have brought refinement to our immigration policy. But have they really? I think not. For these efforts stop short of the point where a stable and permanent policy comes into question.

A brushfire approach to immigration matters does not satisfy the requirements of a useful immigration policy. The foreign policy aspect is a case in point. Despite the special enactments of the past decade, our immigration policy, a basic expression of America abroad, is still defined by the discriminatory contents of the Act of 1952.

The act is widely and unfavorably known; the exception which temporarily modify it beyond recognition and make it contemporarily workable are not. We thus suffer needless stigma, and furnish grist for the propaganda mills of Moscow and Peking—to the detriment of this country and the ideals we cherish. Without question, our basic immigration law is at variance with the foreign policy we pursue in accordance with these ideals. The situation generates skepticism relative to America's practice of democracy.

There is no yardstick with which to measure the impact of our immigration policy upon our foreign relations and the reputation of America abroad. But it would not seem outlandish to suggest that in the long run this impact may well equal that of our economic aid programs.

Mr. President, the Senator's comments on the economic impact of immigration are most useful and valuable. He lays the facts on the line in great detail. I hope his statement is widely read and appreciated by Members of Congress and citizens in all parts of the country. The legislation already mentioned has eco-

nomic value. The best data available substantiates this fact. The Senator from Hawaii points it out clearly, as others of us have attempted on other occasions.

Certainly we must attack the problem of unemployment and underemployment in this Nation. This is a high priority in President Kennedy's program. The solution lies—in part at least—in training the unskilled, in removing racial bars to equal employment opportunities, and in expanding the economy through sound tax reform and fiscal policies designed to stimulate economic growth. Selective immigration, on a new basis, can assist this growth.

It serves no useful purpose to make immigration the scapegoat for the problem of unemployment. Such reasoning only generates confusion, perpetuates our problems, creates a false issue, gives cause for doubt among our friends, and ammunition to our enemies on the claimed vitality of our democratic society.

What is being said here today reminds me of President Kennedy's words at Yale University over a year ago. They have a real relevance, Mr. President, to the current discussions on immigration policy.

Mythology distracts us everywhere—

He said.

We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new difficult essential confrontation with reality.

And he is right. The presence of racial, ethnic, social, economic, and political myths—in any segment of public policy—can only stifle America's growth and keep us from broad areas of potential achievement, including that of a just and practical immigration policy.

There are morally sound and practical reasons to overhaul our basic immigration statute. The Senator from Hawaii has ably discussed some of these reasons today. And, again, I thank the Senator for his forthright discussion.

The situation lays upon the Congress and the President a responsibility to make every effort to effect reform legislation. It is part of the total effort for the security of freedom.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am a Californian and I am very much interested in hemispheric solidarity. I am a supporter of the Alliance for Progress program, and I have supported that program under the Eisenhower administration and under the Kennedy administration.

I bring some facts to the attention of the Senate which I consider deeply disturbing.

On Monday, August 19, 1963, U.S.-flag tuna vessels *Ruthie B.* and *Intrepid* were fishing approximately 38 miles off the northern coast of Peru. The *Ruthie B.* was accosted, boarded, and forced to deliver a crewmember to a Peruvian naval vessel identified as "No. 69." In addition, the patrol vessel seized possession of the ship's docu-

ments. With the crewmember as a hostage and with the ship's documents of the tuna vessel, the captain of the Peruvian patrol vessel ordered the *Ruthie B.* to follow him into a Peruvian port. Prior to this maneuver, the Peruvian patrol vessel fired across the bow of the *Intrepid*. I am also reliably informed that the patrol vessel was ordered to seize the U.S. tuna vessels *Nautilus*, *Lexington*, and *Hornet*. This is even confirmed by accounts in Lima newspapers. The incidents are but a few of many that have occurred in the past year. You will recall the seizures on the high seas of the tuna vessels *Western King* and *Chicken of the Sea* by Peruvian authorities in November 1962. The owners of the vessels were fined \$15,000 by the Peruvian Government. The seizures also involved a shooting episode. It is my understanding that an official report on this incident was prepared by a U.S. naval attaché and members of the State Department.

In May of this year, an Ecuadorian gunboat seized two vessels, the *Ranger* and the *White Star*. This seizure was dramatized by the fact that some 20 other tuna boats fishing in the area escorted the seized vessels as they were taken into the Ecuadorian port. Despite this demonstration of solidarity and despite protests from the Department of State, these two vessels were fined over \$20,000 before they were released.

Again, even while these events were taking place in Ecuador, the same Peruvian gunboat "No. 69," boarded the vessels *Freedom* and *Ruthie B.* This continuing harassment of our fleet has the fishermen who operate these vessels greatly worried that sooner or later there will be some loss of life or a boat sunk by some trigger-happy Peruvian or Ecuadorian sailor.

Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress is a two-way street. I raise my voice in the Senate this afternoon, and ask our friends in Peru and Ecuador and in all of South America to bring to a halt the harassment of decent American fellow citizens, whose vessels are engaged in tuna fishing on the high seas in this hemisphere. I intend to raise my voice again on this subject. Within a few weeks the Senate will have before it the mutual security bill. At that time I intend to go into the matter further, because the American people do not want their fellow citizens harassed by gunboats of friendly allies.

I asked the State Department in writing a number of weeks ago to bring this matter before the Organization of American States. I regret to say that the State Department declined to do so. I urge that that action be taken again. More particularly, let the Government demonstrate that we will not allow our fellow Americans to be kicked around.

ON CANCER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last May 1, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] spoke here about the specter of cancer which continues to menace the lives of millions of

people in this free, progressive, and otherwise healthy land of ours.

Citing the need for an overall, well-coordinated and integrated plan to combat this dread disease, Senator KEATING also introduced Senate Resolution 133, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should call a White House Conference on Cancer to meet that need, harnessing all scientific and medical talent and knowledge in this field, as well as all resources available from private and governmental sectors.

I do not attempt to match our colleague's eloquent plea. Rather, I would merely complement what he has said by inviting the Senate's attention to an article entitled "One, Quite Small, Statistic" from the pages of the *Cancer News*.

The article contains the story of a young American boy who fell victim to cancer, as told by his mother. It is deeply touching, and I believe it will evoke among my colleagues a feeling of sympathy and compassion and a sense of urgency in the need for action.

Let us all remember that the U.S. Senate itself, within the last decade, lost two of its able, dedicated, and competent Members, the late Robert A. Taft and the late Richard Neuberger, both of whom were victims of cancer. Let us bear the memory of this loss in mind as we contemplate the case of this unnamed American boy who, had he lived, might have looked forward to a long and happy and constructive life.

I ask that the article "One, Quite Small, Statistic" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

ONE, QUITE SMALL, STATISTIC
(Condensed From *Cancer News*)

(NOTE.—A mother who wishes to remain anonymous opens her heart, so that others may open theirs during this month's cancer drive: "I do not want the sympathy of friends," she has said. "The little children need it so much more.")

Once we were a family of four. We had two fine boys and the usual assortment of bills, problems, love, and happiness. I felt strongly, however, that there was one more child flitting around heaven just waiting to come to us. He was ours, only we didn't have him yet.

Getting him wasn't easy. Seven years of doctors, prayers, disappointments, and two miscarriages went by before we finally gave away the clothes that I had saved for him.

Then the miracle—I was pregnant again. When a little boy was born, I could find no name that meant direct gift from God, so I settled for the good name of Mark, and within me I knew him as something very special.

He was, too. This child, as he grew, awakened our family. As so often happens with a later child, he reopened our eyes and hearts to rich new depths of love and happiness. Our older boys quickly fell into the role of young fathers—learning lessons of patience, understanding, and a joyful tolerance of this young upstart who gleefully managed to keep us a bit off balance most of the time.

His first nickname was Sir Sprout, quickly followed by Sad Sack, Geronimo, then finally by Little Chum, which he loved. Whenever he awoke from a nap, some member of the family would sound tornado alert, for life was seldom peaceful as Mark learned to cope

with the world. He did quite well, too. Once, when he was 2, as I picked him off the top of our upright piano, I thought, "Little boy—owner of the world." His was a will and spirit so intense and vital I hoped the world could never tame it, for to us it was as refreshing and free as a cool breeze.

Many times during those first years I looked at him—button nose, smiling mouth, quick blue eyes, blond hair—and I thought, "I'll remember you always, just like this."

He loved roly-poly bugs, puppies, hotdogs, puzzles and, most of all, trains. When he was 4 he decided to become a train driver, so he could give free rides to all little children.

Then one day, shortly before he was 5, he became ill. We were told that he had leukemia—blood cancer—and was going to die. That afternoon my husband assembled the tricycle we had hidden away for Christmas, and together we watched him happily ride it for a short while before we left for the hospital.

After 3 weeks of needles, pain, transfusions, and pills, we were able to bring him home. Then began the endless blood tests and the deadly game of trying to keep this child alive, with the one hope that a cure would be found in time.

Looking into the bright, confident eyes of a beloved child with the certain knowledge we had, listening to the pain of treatments which could not cure, watching this beautiful creation of God's slowly die—this was unbearable. But he died for a whole year, and no help came.

Our great love for this child protected him from nothing. When he cried, "Mama, help me," I could not. As his body swelled, I gave him love instead of healing medicine. As he went blind, I told him stories to ease the pain. Through the last days, as parts of his body became forever cold, I covered them with blankets. As he hemorrhaged and was racked by convulsions, I said good-bye for a while. After he was dead, I closed his eyes.

So we are four again. We know once again that there is a child in heaven who is part of us. But we were fortunate enough to know him. Mark's light will shine through the rest of our lives.

Yesterday, as I shopped, I noticed on the store counter the familiar container labeled "Give to cancer." One dime lay on the bottom, and it somehow made the container seem more empty than if there had been none. I longed to reach the hearts of the people who passed it by and help them understand.

If this can help you know that your money can someday give to other children, perhaps to yours, what we were unable to give to our little boy, then Mark's light may also shine on them.—The mother of one, quite small, statistic.

CIVIL RIGHTS: A VOICE FOR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is tragic indeed to note that 187 years after our country's independence, some of our fellow citizens are not able to participate in our way of life solely because of the color of their skin or their country of origin. All Americans who view this problem with a conscience and with a sense of humanity must realize that the patience of some of our fellow Americans has been sorely tried. Yet, if this quest for equality of opportunity and attainment of the privileges granted to all our citizens by our Republic and its Constitution is to be successful, I urge all our citizens to let the rule of reason predominate rather than the rule of

force. I recognize the constitutional right of petition. My views on civil rights are those of a lifetime. I urge those who are going to exercise their constitutional right of peaceful assembly to proceed with meticulous care. It would, indeed, be a tragedy if progress which has been so long in the making were to be damaged by the actions of a few.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has appropriately commented on this matter as follows earlier this week:

The march to Washington, therefore, is an American cause. And its method also is thoroughly American. The Constitution safeguards the right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition Congress for redress of grievances. The march to Washington will be a basic exercise of these fundamental rights. The freedom to demonstrate in this fashion is undeniable.

With freedom, however, come its responsibilities. The civil rights movement has a tremendous responsibility both to itself and to the people of Washington and to the Congress to maintain peace and order here on August 28. Any incident or outbreak of violence connected with the demonstration could do grave damage to the civil rights cause. It would furnish a spurious but convenient pretext to the enemies of civil rights to delay or scuttle the pending legislation. It could also mean a setback for the techniques of nonviolent action which up to now have had great success in winning valued concessions to Negro rights in many parts of the country without active Government intervention.

I seek equal treatment under law for all Americans—no matter from what nation they came, no matter the color of their skin, no matter their economic condition, or religious practices.

I was particularly impressed with the comments recently made in the Senate by one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Here is a Senator whose votes on civil rights legislation, I feel sure, will be precisely the same as those cast by myself and by many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have fought for years for legislation to assure the equality of opportunity under law for all our people.

Both Senator RIBICOFF and Senator KEATING, incidentally, made a real contribution to this great debate earlier this week when they offered a joint amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act which would bar discrimination under Federal grant-in-aid programs. I have been glad to join with them as a co-author of this amendment.

Senator RIBICOFF's recent remarks reiterated the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln who said in his Cooper Union address over a century and 3 years ago:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

The junior Senator from Connecticut is a Democrat. The junior Senator from New York and I are Republicans. As Americans, we have not only coauthored the President's civil rights legislation now before Congress, but authored what we regard as additional and needed measures in this controversial area as well. In taking this position, we have not

acted in the belief that law alone will right the wrongs of long generations. In taking this position, we have not acted in the belief that a solution promulgated in Washington will alone remedy the acts of discrimination which take place in North as well as South, in the East and West. Indeed, such discrimination must be eradicated wherever it occurs in communities throughout our land—not only against members of the Negro race, but also the Indian, who was the “first American,” those of Mexican descent, of Japanese descent, indeed, all of our great heterogeneous population of 180 million.

The Senator from Connecticut has called in this Chamber for responsibility by both “white and Negro, citizen and legislator.” He has recognized that while “discrimination in hiring can and must be ended” that “there must also be trained Negroes to apply for jobs.” He correctly stated that it is equally indefensible to give one a job because of his race—whatever his race may be—as it is to deny him one because of it.

Mr. President, a perceptive observer of the Washington scene and student of the Senate, Mr. William S. White, has called attention to Senator RIBICOFF's excellent address in his syndicated column which was carried several weeks ago in the Los Angeles Times. Mr. White noted in part:

For Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, has made a contribution of memorable decency and commonsense to what should be a high national dialog of self-restraint and responsibility. This national problem needs not the screams of demagogues but the sober consideration of self-controlled men honestly in search of fair and sensible solutions.

Months ago, I joined with several of my colleagues in the Republican Party in introducing the most forward-looking proposals now before the Senate having to do with the equality of opportunity in the fields of voting, education, housing, public accommodations, employment, and the administration of justice. The administration recently recommended proposals in some of these areas.

Now is the time for sound legislative progress to be made by Members in both parties acting simply as decent Americans. Let us also remember that the question of human and civil rights is not merely one of law. It is a question of morality and of conscience. To build a better America, in which all our people can actively participate, will require great exertions by each of us. This effort cannot take place in Washington alone. It must take place in every community in our land. The times require not bullheadedness or softheadedness. The times require levelheadedness and good will.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 7 and August 15, 1963, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various editorials and other documents expressing concern about and criticism of the proposed Moscow test ban treaty. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion

of these remarks the following materials on this subject:

An editorial from the Dallas Morning News dated August 21, 1963, entitled “Look Who's Talking.”

A front-page editorial from the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N.H., dated August 21, 1963, entitled “The Death Trap.”

An article by Mr. Holmes Alexander, as printed in the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., entitled “Taking a Backward Look on United States-Russian Relations.” It is dated August 21, 1963.

A broadcast editorial, dated August 20, 1963, over Station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C.

A recent editorial from the Indianapolis Star entitled “What's Behind the Treaty?”

An editorial from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of August 20, 1963, entitled “The Test Ban Tragedy.”

A recent article, by Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, published in the Miami Herald, entitled “Peril Is in Believing All Is Sweetness.”

A recent article by David Lawrence, published in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., on August 19, 1963, entitled “Strange Pleas Being Lodged for Test Ban.”

An article by David Lawrence, published in the Evening Star on August 20, 1963, entitled “Too Late for Senate To Advise: Chamber Believed Given No Chance for Constitutional Role on Treaty.”

Research Institute Recommendations, dated August 9, 1963.

Manion Forum weekly broadcast, dated August 11, 1963, by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, entitled “The Risks Involved in the Test Ban Treaty.”

An advertisement, by Robert B. Dresser, published in the Providence Journal of Providence, R.I., on August 16, 1963, entitled “The Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Should Not Be Ratified.”

An editorial, by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., dated August 15, 1963, entitled “Communists Bringing Gifts.”

An article by George Todt, published in the Los Angeles Evening Herald-Examiner of recent date entitled “A Chilling Document.”

An article, by Bill Pugh, published in the Oakland Tribune on August 20, 1963, entitled “Knowland Would Vote Against Pact: Ex-Senator Warns Soviets Break Treaties.”

An article, by David Lawrence, published in the Sumter Daily Item on August 20, 1963, in Sumter, S.C., entitled “Top Brass Afraid To Incur Disfavor on Nuclear Pact?”

An article, by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, published in the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., on August 20, 1963, entitled “Don't Trust Them—GRUENING.”

An article, by Constantine Brown, published in the State, of Columbia, S.C., on August 17, 1963, entitled “Nonaggression Pact To Be Second Step: Test Ban Regarded as Meaningless.”

My weekly newsletter, dated August 26, 1963, entitled “The \$64 Question.”

An article, by Eric Sevareid, published in the Evening Star of August 22, 1963, entitled “NATO, After Treaty Is OK'd: Lulling Our Alliance-Strengthening Effort Believed Soviet Goal in A-Accord.”

An editorial, from the Evening Star of August 22, 1963, entitled “Test Ban Critics.”

An article, written by Clarence E. Manion, published in the Newberry Sun of Newberry, S.C., on August 22, 1963, entitled “Test Ban Fatal to U.S. Interests.”

An editorial, from the Aiken Standard and Review of Aiken, S.C., dated August 21, 1963, entitled “Seduction?”

An editorial, from the Indianapolis News of August 19, 1963, entitled “It All Fits.”

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

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 21, 1963]

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

A national citizens committee has been formed to support the nuclear test ban treaty. This newspaper has just received a mailing put out for that committee by a New York public relations firm. Along with a summary of arguments in support of the treaty, the mailing contained a long list of prominent citizens who have endorsed the test ban agreement and are urging the U.S. Senate to do the same.

These citizens committees—formed on both sides of every major issue—are usually much alike. Many of the names crop up time after time, and probably not many people pay a lot of attention of them. Particularly interesting about this one is the nature of the subject on which its members are offering their advice and the experience—or lack of it—in that particular field.

The test ban treaty is essentially a complicated military subject. Its success or failure of ratification will have primary effect on our national security. Though every citizen—whatever his competence in these matters—certainly has a perfect right to express his opinions, the weight of those opinions most certainly should be judged upon competence.

This particular citizens committee lists 166 sponsors. Broken down by professions, the list includes 37 ministers and religious leaders, 39 professors and educators, 20 writers and novelists, 15 business leaders, 10 playwrights and producers, 9 artists, 8 composers and conductors, 7 architects, 7 government officials, 5 poets, and 9 persons of miscellaneous background.

The list includes such well-known names as: Steve Allen, Fannie Hurst, James Jones, Elia Kazan, Dr. Martin Luther King, Archibald MacLeish, Arthur Miller, Walter Reuther, Dore Schary, Irwin Shaw, John Steinbeck, Mark Van Doren, and Roy Wilkins.

On the entire list of 166 names there is not one person known as a military leader of military authority. That's amazing, considering the nature of the subject. We're always interested in hearing what Arthur Miller, Steve Allen, or John Steinbeck has to say on any number of other issues. But on the subject of a nuclear test ban treaty, we'd rather listen to the experts—and we hope the Senate will do the same.

One of those experts, SAC Chief Gen. Thomas S. Power, has flatly opposed the treaty as “a great mistake” in testimony before the Senate. Power added that ratification of the treaty “is not in the best interest of the United States.”

Several days ago, Dr. Edward Teller, the “father of the H-bomb,” took a similar view. He said the treaty could cost us our nuclear superiority over the Russians.

Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff have now endorsed the treaty, they were obviously reluctant and there is something a little bit fishy about the endorsement. A short time ago the Joint Chiefs were unanimous in their opposition to this kind of treaty. What changed their minds?

Perhaps the testimony of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, is a clue. LeMay said that if the treaty were still in the proposed stage he would recommend against it.

As a matter of fact, he did. LeMay still says there are net disadvantages to the treaty from a military standpoint, but that these may now be offset by advantages in the political field.

Just what this political field encompasses is not clear. Is it strictly the politics of international diplomacy, or does domestic politics enter in? Some months ago, the Kennedy administration and its allies in Congress raised a fuss about Pentagon generals engaged in politics—and they weren't talking about just domestic politics.

The famous Fulbright memo and followup orders by Secretary McNamara in effect told military leaders they could be seen but not heard, except on strictly military matters. All that now seems to have been changed.

[From the Manchester (N.J.) Union Times, Aug. 21, 1963]

THE DEATH TRAP

Read and shiver at the article by the famed Washington columnist, Holmes Alexander, which starts on this page today (see headline, "Better Look This Treaty in Mouth"). Learn that one U.S. Senator was so carried away by the possible nuclear test ban that he wanted to cut our arms budget \$5 billion a year. Five other Senators joined him in slobbering over the illusion of peace. They died in panic from reality.

If this is not enough to frighten any American who wants to see his children grow up in freedom and his Nation remain out of the slave pit of communism, let him consider the double-page advertisement carried last week in the New York Times and, presumably, other large metropolitan newspapers in support of the nuclear test ban. It was signed by 45 of what the advertisement describes as successful businessmen and industrial leaders who, according to the ad, were not given to wishful thinking.

Of course these businessmen have not been trained in the field of atomic or hydrogen bombs or in military strategy but, nevertheless, because they are successful in business, they would presume to know all the answers in regard to the Nation's foreign policy.

In contrast, Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb and an expert on nuclear matters, told the U.S. Senate last week that it would be most dangerous for the United States to agree to the proposed test ban treaty.

Dr. Teller has no job to protect, as have the chiefs of the armed services and the chief of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is not running for the U.S. Senate nor is he trying to help the Democratic Party build up a phony appearance of being the father of universal peace, and thus gain votes.

From Germany, Constantine Brown, the long-experienced foreign correspondent, reports that knowledgeable European observers, with an understanding of history, see a complete similarity between the proposed Moscow treaty and the one signed by the fat-headed and futile British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, with Hitler a quarter of a century ago.

Those of us who remember, shudder when recalling the silly Chamberlain standing at the airport in London, shaking his umbrella in one hand and holding the treaty in the other and saying: "Peace in our time." We remember all the American boys and the

boys and families of every nation who perished during "peace in our time."

Writing from another part of Europe, Henry J. Taylor, columnist and former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, reports the same apprehension on the part of realistic Europeans, who see the United States being sucked into a phony peace trap which, in reality, is a death trap.

Unfortunately, the average citizen in this country, busy at his job and taking care of his or her family, is indifferent, believing that our leaders in Washington know best. They should but, unfortunately, they don't.

The British leaders at Munich didn't know best, as the Britishers who subsequently died under a rain of Nazi bombs—many of them right in their own beds—found out.

U.S. leaders and British leaders didn't know best at Yalta or Teheran, as the enslaved millions of Eastern Europe now know, as every morning they awaken to another grim, endless round of futile toil as slaves of the Soviet Union.

In the end it will be average American citizens, all of us, who will pay for the present administration walking into the death-trap of a test ban with the Russians.

This test ban will allow the Russians to continue testing in the field where they are weakest. It will prevent the United States from conducting atmospheric tests where we are weakest. It will prevent the United States from developing an adequate defensive missile which could protect us from the horror of hydrogen and atomic bombs being dropped on our homes.

Since it is we who will suffer in the end, it is up to us to make our representatives in Washington know how we feel in this matter. The average U.S. citizen understands that the Russians are playing to win and that any agreement they enter into in the meanwhile is merely a misleading tactic on the road to ultimate victory for the Russians.

Since we will suffer, let us speak out now. Write or wire your Senators who will be voting on whether or not the United States should ratify the test ban treaty. Tell them how you feel about the treaty. Tell them you don't want to be led into a deathtrap.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Aug. 21, 1963]

TAKING A BACKWARD LOOK ON UNITED STATES—RUSSIAN RELATIONS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator Bourke Hickenlooper, a senior and essential Republican in the nuclear test ban treaty debate, has in his possession volume 78, part 1, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a 29-year-old document of historic pertinence to the latest can-we-trust-Russian debate.

Back in 1933 President Roosevelt used his Executive authority to recognize Soviet Russia. The Congress had nothing to do with this decision, but in January 1934, after Roosevelt nominated William Christian Bullitt to be Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., the Senate assumed the same advise-and-consent responsibility that it now has in the nuclear treaty.

The late Senator Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, did just what HICKENLOOPER has now done. Both these Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee demanded to see the correspondence between the President and Russian negotiators. Roosevelt did submit the letters in question. President Kennedy at this writing has not complied. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, now in HICKENLOOPER's possession (and read by me), contains the Roosevelt-Litvinoff correspondence which was the subject of debate in January 1934, during the 2d session of the 73d Congress. Only three Senators—HARRY BYRD, HAYDEN, and RUSSELL—have careers that span the three turbulent decades.

Vandenberg told the Senate that, while not certain he'd have voted for recognition, he felt constrained to agree that we should send an Ambassador—now that the correspondence was before the Senate.

"But," he added, "I should have declined to proceed in the absence of these all-controlling documents."

We shall see in a moment why Vandenberg believed, as HICKENLOOPER does today, such documents to be "all-controlling" in the Senate's decision to ratify the President's action. But first, let's note that Vandenberg was acting from vigilance, not from fear, in this early dealing with Soviet Russia.

"I want to make it perfectly plain," said Vandenberg, "that I am not in the slightest degree fearful of any raid by communism on America * * * But fear does not need to precede vigilance. I have been raised on the theory that vigilance is the price of liberty. Therefore, it has seemed to me that complete, effective and conclusive defense against the infiltration in America by subversive propaganda was a prerequisite to any relationships of an official nature with Moscow."

Vandenberg, a little too overconfident of his country in one respect, said he agreed with Stalin that communism could not be exported to America, yet he insisted that the Senate see for itself what pledges were given. The key pledges were contained in a letter dated Washington, November 16, 1933, from People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Maxim Litvinoff to F.D.R. It reads in its substantial part:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relationship between our two governments, it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

"1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life * * * in its own way and to refrain from interference in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States.

"2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons * * * from any act, overt or covert, liable in any way whatever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, and security of the whole or any part of the United States.

"3. Not to permit the formation or residence * * * of any organization or group * * * which * * * makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of the United States; not to form, subsidize, support, or permit * * * groups having the aim of armed struggles against the United States.

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence * * * of any organization * * * which has as an aim the overthrow or * * * the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the United States."

Such was the Soviet Union's solemn vow of live-and-let-live. It was given to the President, the Senate, and the American people at a time when we had relatively little experience in Communist trustworthiness.

But today, after nearly 30 years of Russian perfidy, the Senate has the same question before it: What good is any diplomatic arrangement with Red Russia?

[From WOKE Radio, Charleston, S.C., Aug. 20, 1963]

WOKE EDITORIAL

Regardless of whether we Americans like it or not, the U.S. Senate is going to ratify the treaty and the citizens of the United States are going to get a test ban treaty, not on the merits of such a treaty, but strictly on the power of the Kennedy administration to enforce its will on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and the witnesses appearing before congressional committees.

Even before the two members of the non-governmental Council on Foreign Relations, Presidential appointee W. Averell Harriman

and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, left for Moscow to try and "sell" the test ban treaty idea to the one that it favored, the national news media was stating that it would be ratified by the U.S. Senate. This before the treaty was even initiated or signed in Moscow. Since the actual signing of the test ban treaty, certain members of the U.S. Congress have been keeping up their barrage of victory statements, some saying that the Senate vote would be 80 to 20 in favor of the ratification. All of these gauged, evidently to sell grassroots America on the idea that this test ban treaty will avert nuclear war. The horrors of such a calamity have been overplayed in order to convince the American people that a test ban treaty is the only way to combat communism and our deadly enemy and to discourage grassroots America from sending a vocal barrage of its own in the form of letters, wires, and phone calls.

We recall that on August 13 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara reversed his earlier testimony, before South Carolina's own Senator Strom Thurmond, that the Russians have developed an antimissile system. In support of the administration's drive for a test ban treaty, McNamara told the Senate that the Communists had not developed an antimissile missile. The Defense Secretary was placed in a quandary when that great American patriot, Senator Thurmond, reminded him of his earlier testimony. So there you have a directed contradiction of what Defense Secretary had told the Armed Services Committee earlier. Anything goes, just as long as the test ban treaty is ratified by the U.S. Senate. But, the Secretary of Defense is not the only person who has reversed his testimony or conviction since the power of the administration has been turned loose on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and governmental witnesses appearing before various congressional committees. The Joint Chiefs of Staff reversed their earlier testimony that they oppose the test ban treaty. One of our military leaders said that he would have stood in opposition to the test ban treaty if he had been given the opportunity before the actual signing. One military leader has come out solidly against the treaty but others, reluctantly, have endorsed the test ban treaty, with some reservations. Yes, the power of the administration has been brought to bear on the participants in the ratification of the treaty, not on the merits of the test ban treaty, but on the power of the administration to enforce its will on those participating in the hearings.

In the Scott and Allen report of August 14, commenting on the reversal of the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, these two newsmen pointed out that "This dramatic, backstage, about-face by the top military leaders was brought about by the President's using both his personal prestige and great power as Commander in Chief. (The President told the Joint Chiefs) 'If by some chance the Senate would fail to ratify this treaty it would be the worst blow to this country's prestige since the Russians launched their Sputnik.' Repeatedly the President assured the Joint Chiefs that he would not let the treaty undermine the country's military strength."

The apparent result of the President's insistent assurance that the test-ban treaty would not be detrimental to the security of our country is the reversal of the earlier testimony by the top military leaders of our Nation. This is just another in a long list of decisions that the President and his circle of civilian "whiz kids" advisers have made, without consulting qualified people in the Government. Rather than seeking their advice before such decisions are made, the administration goes ahead and makes the commitments and then depends on its power of persuasion.

This power of enforcing its will on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and the witnesses appearing before congressional investigative committees will give the people of our beloved United States a test-ban treaty, unless they have the will to resist the will of the administration and instruct the Members of the U.S. Senate to refuse to ratify the treaty so that we might complete nuclear tests in the atmosphere, perfect our antimissile missile and provide the necessary protection of our cities and citizens from the Russian-launched missiles.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

WHAT'S BEHIND THE TREATY?

One of the questions that will be asked when the Senate begins debating the nuclear test ban treaty is whether there are secret agreements made under the table on which the treaty was negotiated. If so, what are they?

There is an unsubstantiated report that 40 or more notes passed back and forth between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev during the negotiations. W. Averell Harriman, the chief U.S. negotiator, has said that he did not see such notes and doesn't know what was in them, if they existed.

That statement makes even more pertinent the question of whether the notes really did course back and forth. Is it possible that the treaty was negotiated by a U.S. representative who was being kept in the dark about views being exchanged directly by the two heads of state?

The question of secret agreements—and intentions—behind the treaty takes on one concrete aspect in the proposal for disposition of nuclear material which has now been advanced by the United States in the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva. Proposed is an immediate agreement that the United States and the Soviet Union will stop making fissionable material and will transfer large amounts of stockpiled material to peaceful uses.

The proposal itself is not new; it was advanced several months ago. But there has been a most interesting change. When first offered, the proposal was that each of the two nations transfer 50,000 kilograms of fissionable material to peaceful uses. The offer now put forward is that the United States would transfer 60,000 kilograms and the Soviet Union 40,000 kilos. The figures were changed, it was said, to meet any Soviet objection that the United States has more fissionable material than Russia.

But there has never been any published Soviet reply to the proposal—not even an acknowledgment. What, then, leads U.S. officials to conclude that Russia may have such an objection? The obvious inference is that this matter has been discussed secretly.

There is still no open response from the Soviets. Doubtless they're waiting for the figures to get better.

Recollection of the test ban inspection business at this point brings a chill to the spine. The United States started out with a declaration that it would make no test ban agreement without inspection, and with a requirement for inspection of effective scope. The Soviets played a cat-and-mouse game while the U.S. requirement was whittled down and down, in a persistent effort to meet Soviet objections. At length the U.S. demand got down to an amount of inspection which would be farcical, and there finally emerged a treaty which does not mention inspection.

Will the same thing happen on the matter of stopping production and disposing of nuclear material?

The test ban treaty is declared to be the prelude to more agreements. That in itself

is a most compelling reason to ask a great many questions about it. Just where do the negotiators plan to go from here?

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 20, 1963]

THE TEST BAN TRAGEDY

While Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that administration pressure was not exerted to obtain his compliance with test ban proposals, the heads of the Armed Forces display no enthusiasm for the Moscow pact.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, USAF, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified that he would like to see the United States develop a super bomb similar to those which the Russians have exploded. Adm. David McDonald, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, warned Congress that a large-yield Soviet bomb "quite likely" would knock out communications for the Polaris submarine missile system.

General LeMay also stated that all the service chiefs believe in the necessity of adequate safeguards if the treaty is approved. He stated they could not have approved the test ban agreement unless "adequate safeguards" were contained in it to preserve U.S. readiness to resume testing. He added that as yet "no one has said that these safeguards will be carried out."

Asked who will insist on the safeguards, he said that he depended on Congress to take the necessary action.

The heads of the armed services are in a quandary. If they completely oppose the President, they will be questioning the judgment of their Commander in Chief. Personally, they will be in an intolerable spot. Furthermore, opposition to the test ban could lead the administration to take retaliatory action against a branch of the service if its chief declined to go along with the White House.

The Navy, for instance, is fighting to save its aircraft carriers. Mr. McNamara's "whiz kid" advisers want to put away these vital ships in mothballs. The Kennedy administration is quite capable of denying the Navy ships or funds in order to make the admirals understand who is the boss. This is a serious charge but the administration's ruthlessness is notorious.

The tragedy is that the Joint Chiefs are being asked to make judgments about the enemy's intentions instead of his capabilities. It is the capabilities that the Senate should consider. A guessing game about Communist intentions could be fatal to the United States.

This is not the first time that the leaders of the Armed Forces have been forced to go along with an administration in power in accepting limitations on U.S. readiness. President Eisenhower overrode military objections when he ordered a temporary test ban in 1958.

If we look back to the 1920's, we find a similar situation. The administration of President Warren G. Harding entered into naval agreements that deprived the United States of needed seapower. It also agreed to demilitarization of certain islands in the Pacific. Mr. Harding's advisers assumed that they could trust the Japanese not to fortify their islands. What happened is that the Japanese secretly built fortifications while the United States lived up to its side of the agreement. As a result, thousands of U.S. marines lost their lives in World War II, trying to seize islands the Japanese had fortified.

With the Moscow test ban agreement, the United States is making the same mistake. We are reminded of a statement of George Santayana, the philosopher, who said that nations which don't learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat the errors

of the past. No one knows on what nuclear battlefields Americans will have to pay the ultimate price for today's folly.

[From the Miami Herald]

PERIL IS IN BELIEVING ALL IS SWEETNESS
(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

As the U.S. Senate prepares to do its duty by the test ban treaty, it can sympathize with the pleading of the quack who was halled before the court for selling earthquake pills.

Said the judge, sternly: "You know that your pills will not stop earthquakes."

Replied the defendant: "Can you tell me anything that will do any better?"

That the Senate will ratify the treaty is becoming pikestaff plain. Hardly less so is the fact that much of the opposition to it is worry about the wrong things.

The pact in itself does not endanger any vital interest of the United States. A simple reprieve from nuclear tests in the atmosphere contains real jeopardy for no one.

On the other hand, the agreement between the powers to proceed with the experiment doesn't usher in the millennial dawn. It's only a slight gesture in the right direction, the equivalent of quarreling neighbors agreeing to sheath one picket in a spite fence.

Let the Russian band strike up, "Love Walked In," at the signing, if the Kremlin must have its little joke. When Americans whistle the same tune, when headlines spread rumors of bigger treaties to come, when average citizens dream that the test ban presages the greatest embrace since Adam and Eve were booted from the garden, it's time to say: "Hold your hats, boys, here we go again."

Amid trial, we as a people love to believe that there must be an easy way out. Moreover, national leadership tends to encourage that illusion because it's the popular line and overglorifying achievement is one way to win votes.

But as Reinhold Niebuhr once said: "If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

The realists are Khrushchev, Mao, and the men around them. They do not change course because of any paper signed by Dean Rusk. They merely tack off momentarily in different directions. But they're headed for the same port.

Since shortly before Mr. Harriman flew to Moscow, in our press and on our platforms, there had been an upsurge of wishful speculation about how and why the quarrel with Red China is softening the Soviet view of America and the free world. Most of it leads to the happy conclusion that we may be relieved of tension as the Communist threat to the West sputters out, which is pure Pollyannaism.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON put it this way a few days ago in a Seattle speech: "Khrushchev and Mao are not quarreling about whether to bury us. They are quarreling about how. The Moscow-Peking dispute is for the highest stakes. The leadership of world communism is at issue. So are the fates of men who regard themselves as the locomotives of history. Mao and Khrushchev each desperately desires to prove that his policy for liquidating the West is best. The consequence for us may well be a period of rising danger."

In Khrushchev we are coping with as adroit and resourceful a political leader as the century has known. But whether he is building a Berlin wall or hugging Mr. Harriman, he is the same crocodile with gentle smiling jaws.

I read history eye to eye with "Scoop" JACKSON. International peace and security derive not from a balance of power but from

a certain imbalance favorable to those who really believe in peace. As in war itself, our success depends upon our margins. No expansionist power like the Soviets will ever be satisfied with this condition. They will keep on trying to alter it.

Exactly for this reason, we must stay satisfied with it. But we won't if we now start looking for syrupy options.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,
Aug. 19, 1963]

STRANGE PLEAS BEING LODGED FOR TEST BAN
(By David Lawrence)

More puzzling than any of the words themselves in the pending treaty limiting nuclear tests are the strange arguments being made urging its ratification.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who represent the military judgment on which the security of the country is customarily based, say frankly that they have had their doubts but that, on the whole, they now think the disadvantages in ratifying the treaty are outweighed by the advantages. They insist, however, that the United States not only carry on a vigorous program of underground testing but that it stay ready on short notice to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviets abrogate the treaty.

PRESSURE ON MILITARY LEADERS

All this is difficult for the average person to understand, and many Members of Congress have wondered whether political pressure has been applied to persuade the Joint Chiefs to support the treaty. In fact, in a Senate committee hearing last week, the question was asked if the Joint Chiefs responded to "pressure." This was emphatically denied. But the mere raising of the question indicates that in the back of the minds of some Senators is a feeling that the high military officers do not dare to incur disfavor. Indeed, recently a Chief of Naval Operations was not reappointed and, while it was denied that he was punished for expressing his views before Congress on a controversial issue, the idea prevails that he did disagree with the administration and paid the penalty.

The campaign to get the treaty ratified is typical of what happens when a political issue is involved, but it is not characteristic of the kind of discussion that usually takes place when purely military matters are being considered. It is doubtful whether any high military men would venture openly to question the wisdom of ratifying the nuclear test treaty.

SCIENTISTS ON OPPOSITE SIDES

Another puzzling development is the attitude of the nuclear scientists. While a large number favor ratification, it is significant that Dr. Edward Teller, often referred to as the "father of the hydrogen bomb," is vehement in his opposition. Efforts are being made by the administration to pooh-pooh his objections as of secondary importance, but his testimony—just published—has served to increase the doubts prevalent on Capitol Hill.

Dr. Teller says that testing in the atmosphere is important in order to catch up with the techniques in which the Soviets are ahead of the United States. He says that nuclear explosions in the air are the key to developing missile defenses. If the Soviets feel they are at an advantage, they can threaten attack and gain political concessions by such a threat. They could invade small countries at will, knowing they would not be risking war with the United States. So, Dr. Teller insists, tests in the atmosphere and in outer space are absolutely essential to America's future safety.

WHY DID MOSCOW REVERSE SELF?

There is considerable speculation as to why the Moscow Government reversed its

previous decisions and suddenly decided to go ahead with a plan it had earlier rejected. It is suggested that the Soviet experts may be planning someday to mount a mock attack by, say, 500 missiles high over Russia and counter the attack with a display of their antimissile defense system. Dr. Teller thinks they might even invite American experts to watch the test. If the test happened to fail, the Russians would have lost only the treaty, but he thinks that, if the scheme worked, they would then be able to say: "Now you see we have an excellent defense and can absorb any attack you can send against us. There is the proof. Now please do this and that, etc."

On this point alone—inhibiting U.S. development of a missile defense—Dr. Teller feels the treaty is dangerous to the United States.

A TEST OF SOVIET HONESTY

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his testimony before a Senate Committee this week, said:

"And probably more important than purely military implications, the treaty should provide us with an opportunity to test the sincerity of Soviet protestations about their desire to explore more sweeping arrangements for preserving the peace. It provides us with this opportunity at a minimum risk."

"I do not pretend that this or any other agreement between great contending powers can be risk free. This one is not."

But the Secretary feels that America possesses the power of a devastating retaliatory attack that could destroy Russia. America can rely on that potential power, however, only as long as the Soviets do not develop a system whereby missiles from the United States or its bases on land or underwater are intercepted and nuclear materials are disintegrated in flight. That's the true worry of the scientists who disagree about approving any treaty while it halts testing in the atmosphere.

WEEKS OF DEBATE ARE PROBABLE

As for fears of "fallout," testimony has been given that these claims have been exaggerated and that the radioactive substances which drop from the air after nuclear tests have not been anywhere near the maximum limits at which the nuclear "fallout" becomes dangerous to mankind.

So the whole issue is far from clear, and probably many weeks of debate in the Senate will ensue before final action is taken.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 20, 1963]

TOO LATE FOR SENATE TO ADVISE—CHAMBER BELIEVED GIVEN NO CHANCE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE ON TREATY

(By David Lawrence)

The Constitution says the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties."

There is no evidence that the text of the limited nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow recently was ever submitted in advance to the Senate so that it could tender its "advice" before the document was signed.

There is no evidence, either, that the text was shown to all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before it was "initialed" and then signed at Moscow. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the U.S. Air Force, told a Senate committee yesterday that "I think I would have been against" the treaty if it had not already been signed. He added that "the fact that it has been signed had an effect on me, yes," because "there might be some political disadvantage if we don't ratify it."

This frank observation indicates clearly that, once the signature of the executive branch of the Government has been affixed to a treaty, there is really no opportunity to render "advice." The Senate, for instance, can only ratify or reject. There is

no chance to amend or modify the terms except by a new negotiation, which, of course, is difficult and often impractical.

So Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, Republican, was right in his speech last Friday night at the University of Wisconsin when he characterized the support of the Joint Chiefs for the nuclear treaty as a political evaluation. He said:

"And what they (the Joint Chiefs of Staff) have to say, and have said, must be weighed independent of the political decision which guided the formal statement of the Joint Chiefs. Why do I say that a political decision guided that statement? Aren't the Joint Chiefs supposed to be free of political pressure? I submit, in answer, the summation of their own report. It flatly says: 'There are military disadvantages to the treaty.' But they conclude by saying that 'the risks inherent in this treaty can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences.'"

"The mention of risks, I say, is a conscientious military evaluation. The decision that the risks are acceptable is not. It is an echo of a State Department evaluation and not of one that necessarily sounds very deeply the real evaluations of our professional military men."

The official statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says pointedly that the risks inherent in the treaty can be accepted "if adequate safeguards are established." Now the debate has begun as to what the "safeguards" are and where the responsibility for providing them is to be placed. General LeMay testified that no one has said as yet what safeguards would be provided. Two Senate committees have asked that the administration provide a "bill of particulars."

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, also asked the Chiefs of the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps whether they would have approved the treaty "in the absence of these safeguards," and each replied that he would not have done so. In answer to a question from Senator BOURKE HICKEN-LOOPER, of Iowa, Republican, General LeMay said that "if you automatically cut off the political factors, there are net disadvantages from a military standpoint," to the United States.

While the Joint Chiefs are reported to have been kept informed in a general way from time to time about the course of the test ban negotiations, General LeMay testified that he was surprised at the administration's speed in hastening the final agreement toward the end. As for voicing objections, General LeMay declared that, once the pact was "initialed" or about to be, he doubted very much "that any of us would have gone to the President at that stage of the game."

Secretary of State Rusk, at a news conference last Friday, was asked whether there was not "an unresolved difference in this Government" on the treaty, and he replied:

"I am not sure that I would call such a difference unresolved. After all, the executive branch is headed by the President of the United States."

This is tantamount to saying that, despite the military expertness of the members of the Joint Chiefs in their respective fields, they can be and are overruled by the President and by his civilian advisers who can place political experimentalism in international affairs above the necessary safeguards against nuclear advances by an adversary state.

The Senate is today presented with a "take it or leave it" proposition. The upper House of Congress, which is a joint partner with the President in treaty-making wasn't afforded an opportunity to give its "advice" before the treaty was signed. Now the treaty

will have to be ratified, or else the Senate will be placed in the position of taking full responsibility for the consequences in the field of diplomacy. If, on the other hand, Russia chooses to "cheat or abrogate"—as General LeMay says might happen—it will be too late to argue about "political factors" or "net military disadvantages" of a treaty which may have put the United States behind in the nuclear arms race.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE RECOMMENDATIONS

U.S. Reds aren't waiting for the long J.F.K.-K. negotiations that lie ahead. They already know how they'll use the test ban and the "detente"—not for real peace but for more struggle.

We're taking the unusual step of quoting U.S. Communist boss Gus Hall. Reason: His words in the party newspaper, the Worker, represent the Kremlin's official instructions to U.S. Communists.

It's worth reading the following statements carefully—behind the turgid Communist jargon is a description of the Reds' three-part strategy—"popular fronts" with the peace groups, "peaceful coexistence" and intensified war on "U.S. imperialism":

"The test ban agreement is the result of the struggle of the peace and ban-the-bomb forces of all lands, including our own." (Note: The Worker is giving great prominence to peace group spokesmen, and quoting them at considerable length.)

"The concept of peaceful coexistence has enriched Marxism because it has added new and additional avenues, possibilities and tactics for the class struggle. It has not nullified the class struggle but has refreshed and raised its policies and tactics to correspond with . . . the new reality."

"Because the policies of peaceful coexistence are the most effective and telling in the struggle against imperialism, and because U.S. imperialism is the citadel of world imperialism, therefore the center of resistance to those realistic anti-imperialist policies is here. To spread the falsehood that the Soviet Union, the bastion of world anti-imperialism, places the anti-imperialist struggle as secondary is to do the bidding of U.S. imperialism. The facts of history completely destroy this falsehood."

Remember this is the "Khrushchev International" speaking, not the "Mao Tse-tung International"—the "peaceful" wing of world communism, not its "violent" one. Hall's statements show clearly what K. had in mind when he said that agreements with the West do not imply any letdown in the ideological war.

Of course, this does not mean that the peace organizations, mothers' and women's groups, etc., are Communist. That, in fact, would spoil the whole "popular front" idea. But it does mean that Moscow thinks they can be used to help drive wedges between the U.S. people and its leaders. You'll see this pattern in Europe, Japan, other spots where Red takeover isn't feasible at this time.

[From Manion Forum, Aug. 11, 1963]

THE RISKS INVOLVED IN THE TEST BAN TREATY
(Remarks by HON. CRAIG HOSMER, Member of Congress for California)

Dean MANION. If you did not hear Adm. Chester Ward's startling speech over this network last week, then by all means send for a copy of it now. Admiral Ward is one of the world's great authorities on nuclear war strategy. He believes that if the Senate ratifies the test ban treaty with the Kremlin it will be the end of our country.

With me here this week is another top authority on nuclear weapons development. In my judgment, nobody in Washington knows more about this critical subject than Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California. At present he is a leading member of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Atomic

Energy, where he pursues an interest which began at Los Alamos, N. Mex., in 1948, when he was attorney for the Atomic Energy Commission.

My friends, we are all getting a lot of fancy managed news about this pending treaty from its proponents in Washington, but what Admiral Ward told you last week and what Congressman HOSMER will tell you now is the unvarnished truth. Listen carefully, therefore, and make use of what you hear.

Congressman HOSMER, it is a great pleasure to have you back at this microphone.

Mr. HOSMER. Thank you, Dean Manion. It is a privilege to return to the Manion Forum.

The White House, State Department Disarmament Agency and news media are telling us of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow and of its alleged advantages. Much has been said about the risks supposedly reduced or eliminated by the arrangement, but little or nothing has been said about the new risks it creates.

Unless these are understood, thoroughly assessed and balanced against the claimed advantages, it is impossible to say whether the Moscow arrangement is in the national interest of the United States, whether it is detrimental to these interests, or whether the entire affair has been a meaningless exercise in futility.

That there are risks in the partial test ban treaty, we can be sure. Unless Mr. Khrushchev is a madman, and he is not, he sees advantages for the Soviet Union and communism in it. He sees them as substantial advantages, worthy of his time and effort. He sees the treaty as advancing the Communist goal of world domination, not retarding it.

Another reason for a hard look at the risks to the free world inherent in the partial test ban treaty, is to dispel the feeling of euphoria it is sure to create. People will tend to regard it as evidencing an easy solvability of East-West relationships. Pressures will mount for concessions all along the line to achieve a detente with communism.

First, a nonaggression declaration, next a summit conference, then concessions here, there, at many points which, when taken together, will add up not to a solution of East-West relations, but to the tragic shift of strategic superiority to Communist hands.

Misconceptions already prevalent concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute amply illustrate the pitfalls of miscalculating Communist intentions. Wishful thinkers view the highly publicized Moscow-Peking dispute as a fundamental split in Communist ranks. This is not the case. Realistically, it concerns in no way whether America and the West shall be buried. Only in dispute are the subsidiary questions of: How, and When?

The military consequences of the partial test ban treaty bear directly on these questions.

U.S. progress in high yield, 30- to 100-megaton weapons, will be paralyzed at a time when the Soviets already have achieved this capability. The United States gives up entirely its opportunity to cope by high-yield warheads with the Soviets' massive program of hardening their offensive intercontinental ballistic missile bases.

Our consequent inability to mete out destruction to Soviet military installations with more powerful warheads will decrease the credibility of our deterrent force in direct ratio to increases in Soviet base hardening. It is equivalent to cutting back our SAC air squadrons, our ICBM bases, and our Polaris submarine patrols.

As Soviet bases harden progressively, we will be left threatening only empty launching pads and indestructible fortifications. This cannot be expected to deter the Soviets from initiating nuclear war. Our only alternative under these conditions would be to threaten Soviet cities, which hardly squares with the administration's "no city" targets doctrine.

Additionally, the partial test ban will either greatly slow down or paralyze completely American progress in antimissile defense. This at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have "solved the problem of antimissile defense." It is to be noted that past Soviet claims like this in the nuclear field have been accurate.

Their claim to having achieved the H-bomb is a notable example. When made, many in the United States scoffed. Nonetheless, it turned out to be quite accurate. The massive construction program now going on at Leningrad's missile defense sites lends credence to the estimates that the Soviets have what they claim regarding ICBM defense missiles and are installing them.

Antimissile defense capability in the hands of the Soviet Union is another way of saying our deterrent against Soviet surprise attack has weakened. It, too, is the equivalent of cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris fleet. For if the warheads carried by these delivery systems can be intercepted and destroyed by Soviet defenses, they will not dissuade those in the Kremlin who are arguing for the explosive removal of the United States as the roadblock to Communist world domination.

TREATY MAY PRECLUDE OUR DEVELOPMENT OF ANTIMISSILE MISSILE

Conversely, the absence of American antimissile capability permits a Soviet first-strike, surprise attack to get through, destroy our deterrent forces before they are put in operation, and thus further reduce U.S. power to deter Soviet button pushers with a credible threat to impose unacceptable, retaliatory damage upon their country.

This situation cannot be remedied except by improvement of our antimissile capabilities. This cannot be done well, it cannot be done readily, perhaps it cannot be done at all without atmospheric testing.

Moreover, the partial test ban treaty will introduce a completely new hazard and risk to America of "surprise abrogation." This is the situation where, under the cover of the treaty, Russian nuclear weapons scientists might be put to work intensively in many clandestine laboratories behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain.

All test preparations would be made in strictest secrecy, then the Soviet Government suddenly would announce itself no longer bound by the treaty and promptly initiate an extensive series of tests.

During all this period of secret preparation, which might last for years, U.S. laboratory work would deteriorate in quality and quantity; and our capabilities for atmospheric testing would dissipate. The net effect would give the Soviets a quantum jump ahead in nuclear capabilities which might well gain them decisive nuclear superiority.

Under such conditions, America could expect at the worst a "nuclear Pearl Harbor" and at best a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

As an alternative to surprise abrogation, the Kremlin simply might direct its nuclear laboratories to concentrate exclusively on underground development of highly efficient tactical nuclear weapons. This, in secret, could include even the dreaded neutron bomb.

In any event, we do know that the Soviet Union spends $3\frac{1}{2}$ times the amount spent by the United States on basic military research. This indicates an aim at developing "full spectrum" Soviet military superiority in approximately a decade. This fits well either with a "surprise abrogation" timetable or with the tactical neutron weapon development timetable.

Unless one is to be wholly and totally naive, he cannot say that any Russian rubble released from nuclear research by the partial test ban treaty will be reallocated to con-

sumer goods production. This "refrigerator" argument simply fails to square with any past action ever taken by Communist leaders.

Put another way, we can be absolutely certain that any financial savings the Soviet Union makes by the test ban treaty will be utilized to improve its military strength relative to the United States, not to better the standard of living of its people.

We can also be certain that the relative weakening of American military might will encourage Communist leaders to intensify efforts in the cold war areas of conflict between East and West. It could even lead to easier decisions by Communist leaders to engage in limited conventional warfare.

This simply because the fearful capacity of American military strength cautions Communist leaders now against risking lesser types of conflict which might escalate into a full scale nuclear war. Weakening America's strength only makes it easier for Communists to be more adventurous in choosing actions which can escalate into nuclear warfare.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF TREATY COULD SHATTER OUR ALLIANCES

There are political consequences of the partial test ban treaty as well as military ones. Heretofore, the U.S. policy against dissemination of nuclear weapons to numerous countries has been a matter of national discretion.

The partial test ban treaty will commit us indefinite to that policy, even though future events may dictate we change it; and because of the treaty, now we will not be able to do so without abrogating it and involving ourselves in deep international complications.

With respect to our NATO allies, this freeze comes at a time when the U.S. policy against dissemination is seriously weakening the alliance. As the partial test ban treaty results in sapping our deterrent capabilities, Europeans will become less and less inclined to follow our lead. The estrangement will deepen. European defenses will weaken, and the dissolution of NATO well could follow. This, for years, has been one of Premier Khrushchev's priority objectives.

With respect to the situation in the Far East, our options in meeting the threat of emerging nuclear capabilities on the part of Red China will be seriously restricted. It will be impossible to work closely with Japan and other Far Eastern allies in creating a nuclear deterrent. The full burden of handling the Red Chinese will fall on the United States, at the very time our overall military capabilities are seriously weakened because of the treaty.

This weakening is certain to accelerate, rather than decelerate efforts of other countries to obtain their own independent national nuclear deterrent capabilities. Even if we choose to weaken ourselves, they will not. Proliferation will occur under other country's terms, not under terms which the United States might impose to make the consequences of proliferation less risky.

Dean Manion, I strongly recommend that your listeners who feel these military and political disadvantages to the United States from a partial test ban treaty outweigh the advantages claimed for it, write their U.S. Senators and urge them to vote against ratifying President Kennedy's test ban treaty.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California, for this good advice.

My friends, the Senators are getting plenty of pressure from the White House to vote for this treaty. But, after all, the Senators do not represent the White House: they represent you. They are your Senators—so tell them what you want and tell them now.

[The Providence (R.I.) Journal, Aug. 16, 1963]

THE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY SHOULD NOT BE RATIFIED—MEANING OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

(By Robert B. Dresser)

The nuclear test ban treaty has been signed by the three original parties, the United States, Great Britain and Russia. The signing took place in Moscow and was witnessed by a group of U.S. Senators.

Khrushchev has expressed his delight at the signing and it has been acclaimed by our administration as a major step toward peace and toward general and complete disarmament.

CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TREATY

The preamble to the treaty itself so declares in the following language:

The three governments, the original parties to the treaty, proclaim "as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons."

Article IV of the treaty is well worth noting. It provides as follows:

"Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty 3 months in advance."

This extraordinary provision gives to each party to the treaty the right to withdraw at any time. It makes one wonder why it is regarded as so important that the treaty be signed if any party to it can withdraw at will, a right which Russia certainly will exercise if and when it suits her convenience.

RATIFICATION BY SENATE NECESSARY

It now remains to secure the ratification of the treaty by the Senate. The administration is doing everything in its power to bring this about as quickly as possible. A veritable barrage of propaganda has emanated from Washington to convince the public of the great importance of signing the treaty.

QUERIES

Does anyone really believe that the treaty constitutes a step toward peace?

Does anyone really believe that our disarming would not lead either to our destruction or our domination by Russia?

Don't the American people know by this time what Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" means?

MEANING OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

Statement by J. Edgar Hoover

Let me quote from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's book, "A Study of Communism," published in 1962 (p. 181):

"The overall intensification of subversive and intelligence activities against the United States reveals the underlying treachery and deceit in Khrushchev's pious statements about 'peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation.' Communists never entertain any ideas of a permanent reconciliation with non-Communists. This was cogently stated during 1962 by Mikhail Suslov, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when he said:

"'Peaceful coexistence in the ideological sphere, any reconciliation, even a temporary compromise with the bourgeois ideology both in the internal and external spheres are im-

possible. This is impossible without betraying the interests of communism. This would mean the ideological disarmament of the Communists, the disarmament of the international working class movement."

(NOTE.—In Communist jargon, "bourgeois" means "non-Communist," "working class" means "a Communist Party," or the world Communist Parties collectively.)

THE 1961 REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE

In May 1961 the American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives issued a report entitled "Peaceful Coexistence, a Blueprint for Disruption."

I quote from the report the following:

"What are the immediate objectives of the Communists? How do they propose to achieve them?"

"The Communists themselves have answered and reaffirmed their stand on these questions in two recent documents, reproduced at the end of this report. The first is the Communist Manifesto of 1960, which is entitled 'Statement by 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties' adopted unanimously in Moscow on December 5, 1960, at a meeting of Communist parties. The January 1961 issue of Political Affairs—theoretical magazine of the Communists in the United States—published this manifesto, calling it a 'historic document.' The second document is the report on this statement by Nikita Khrushchev, delivered at a top-level Russian Communist meeting on January 6, 1961.

"The free world once ignored the plans of Hitler as revealed clearly in Mein Kampf until it was too late to prevent World War II. We face a greater danger now. We must not ignore what the Communists now say and long have said they are going to do.

"As a hymn of hate against America, the 81-party statement has no equal. It is also a pronouncement of the current party line to Communists and their followers in all countries.

"The party line is a program of strategy and tactics that may change from time to time to meet changing circumstances. It may disguise, conceal, or restate the basic doctrines of world communism. However, the fundamental ideology called 'Marxism-Leninism' is a program for world domination and control by the Communists. It always remains constant. This is evident in the statement from repeated declarations of adherence to such ideology. Khrushchev said:

"If anyone thinks we shall forget about Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is mistaken. This will happen when shrimps learn to whistle."

"Marxism-Leninism is a program of dictatorship and revolution. It teaches that the conquest of the world by communism is historically inevitable.

"What do the Communists mean by 'peaceful coexistence?' The statement answers that question:

"Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle. . . . The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. Peaceful coexistence . . . does not mean conciliation of the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas."

"The meaning of 'peaceful coexistence' is thus made clear to Communists throughout the world, though the phrase is intended to

convey the opposite meaning to the people in the free world. The statement says:

"In the opinion of Communists the tasks which must be accomplished . . . are to stop the arms race, ban nuclear weapons, their tests and production, dismantle foreign war bases and withdraw foreign troops from other countries, disband military blocs, conclude a peace treaty with (East) Germany, turn West Berlin into a demilitarized (East German) free city, thwart the designs of the West German revanchists, and prevent the revival of Japanese militarism."

"Our people must understand that in party jargon 'peace' means 'universal Communism,' and 'peaceful coexistence,' means 'intensification of the struggle . . . of all the Communist Parties . . . for the triumph of socialist ideas.' When this is understood, we will not be misled into Communist 'peace' movements, 'anti-imperialist' maneuvers, 'antiwar' organizations, and campaigns against our national security.

"Widespread knowledge of the Communists' tactics, strategy, and objectives is essential to national survival."

STATEMENT OF DMITRI MANULSKI

In 1931, Dmitri Manulski, a Soviet official and at one time the presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, stated to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

KHRUSHCHEV'S REAL OBJECTIVE UNCHANGED

In spite of his pleasant smiles and cordial handshake the Butcher of Budapest has but one objective, world conquest, and if our Government leads us into the boobytrap set by this treaty, those responsible for so doing will deserve the bitterest condemnation of the American people.

CERTAIN REFLECTIONS

The slightest reflection leads a person to wonder what purpose this treaty serves.

Consider the facts.

Russia is arming for the purpose of conquering the world, including the United States, and not for self-defense.

The United States is arming for the purpose of defending itself against Russia and not for the purpose of attacking her.

Russia knows this.

Russia openly declares her adherence to her objective of world conquest.

In spite of this we are planning to disarm.

Does this make sense?

It inevitably means our eventual destruction or submission to Russian domination.

ANOTHER COURSE

There is another course that would avoid this dilemma.

Let us maintain a nuclear striking power so superior to that of Russia that she would never dare to attack us.

Let us sever diplomatic relations with this outlaw of civilization and deport its many agents who are stealing our military secrets and stirring up strife and discord among our people.

Let us drive the Communists out of Cuba, 90 miles from our own shore, and restore the control of that island to its unhappy people,

thereby notifying the world that the Monroe Doctrine is not a dead letter.

Let us stop giving aid to the governments of Communist countries, and instead let us help the people of Communist countries to throw off the Russian yoke, which they so much desire to do. Let us not repeat our tragic desertion of the Hungarian patriots.

How else can we hope to win?

[From the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Charlotte, N.C., Aug. 15, 1963]

COMMUNISTS BRINGING GIFTS

The Red Chinese delegates have had their Moscow debates on doctrine with the Soviets, and returned to Peking after what appeared on the surface to be a final disagreement between the two largest Communist countries.

From their capitals they are hurling insults back and forth by radio and the printed word, each accusing the other of unpardonable heresies.

This performance has inspired some incurable optimists in the West to proclaim that the Communist world is now split once and for all, and that we can take advantage of the division. One group says we should rush in and help China with massive foreign aid and build up the country as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union.

Another says Russia, being much smaller than China, must look westward for compensating strength, and as a result the United States and the Soviet Union may find themselves allies after years of enmity.

But there are still others who advise caution. Representative DORN of South Carolina believes the whole show was phony and that the so-called split is intended merely to throw the West off guard so that a test ban treaty favorable to the Soviet Union can be established.

John Noble, who spent years in a Soviet prison camp and has written two books about it, agrees with Mr. DORN that the split is a fake, stage-managed to confuse the West.

For our own part, we think there is fact behind both opinions. If you read the thousands of words printed in Soviet and Chinese papers and broadcast by Radios Moscow and Peking, and compare them with some of Lenin's writings, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that there is a deep rift between the two on Communist doctrine and dialectics.

But this is our red light for Western statesmen: whatever the ideological disagreements between the Soviets and the Chinese, both are still Communists. As such they are deadly enemies of the West, because they have solemnly sworn to destroy us.

In 1948 when a similar split developed between Stalin and Tito, some wishful thinkers in the West thought by building up Tito we would have an ally within the Socialist camp. Tito took our money—more than \$2 billion of it—and then voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States on every major issue that came up between them in the United Nations.

Just last May he was still taking our money—millions of it—at the very moment he was having a love feast with Khrushchev on his state visit to the Soviet Union, at the end of which Tito proclaimed his unbreakable allegiance to Russia.

As a word of warning to Western statesmen, therefore, we would paraphrase Virgil's admonition about the Greeks:

We fear the Communists, even when bringing gifts.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner]

A CHILLING DOCUMENT

(By George Todt)

"A diplomat's words must have no relation to action. Words are one thing, action is

another. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water."—JOSEF STALIN, "Complete works," volume 2, page 277.

I hold in my hand now a copy of the "Korean Underground Report of July 9, 1963," which, according to Mr. Kilsoo Haan, was submitted to President John F. Kennedy. It is a chilling document. Let's examine it.

What J.F.K. did with his original copy, I cannot say. Perhaps he agreed, or disagreed, as the case might be. Likely he saw it—but may have decided to sit on it. A Presidential prerogative. Who knows?

In my case, I think this information ought to be shared with my readers. It is not classified. So why not? Read it and see what you think.

According to the Korean patriot and ace underground intelligence agent, Kilsoo Haan, the following are some important facts to be noted:

About a week before three power nuclear test ban talks began in Moscow last month, the Korean Underground Report of July 9 disclosed a preview of what was purportedly Soviet Russia's price—the conditions for an East-West rapprochement.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The report also revealed the alternative: War between the United States and U.S.S.R., possibly in this decade.

On May 1, 1963, six Russian military officers from the Soviet Union were visiting in P'yongyang, capital of North Korea. They revealed to six North Korean officers of equal rank these five conditions for "peaceful coexistence" between the United States and U.S.S.R.

1. The United States must withdraw completely all its military forces and nuclear weapons from Europe and Asia.

2. The United States should be the first capitalist power to recognize the East German People's Government.

3. The United States must sign the non-aggression agreements with the Socialist commonwealth nations.

4. The United States must abandon the Monroe Doctrine policy and allow the Latin American countries the right of self-determination to choose the kind of government they prefer.

5. As a sign of good faith, the United States must initiate an unrestricted trade agreement negotiation with Red China and North Korea—not later than 1965.

ARROGANT REDS

If we American "Capitalists" do not accept these proposals of the arrogant Reds, then what is our alternative? The ready answer is—war.

Of course, the Communists have already decided in advance that we are responsible for any conflict between us. As they see it: "The determination of war in the sixties will rest on the United States and not on the Soviet Union."

Here are nine reasons why the Soviets say we two world titans may have to fight:

1. The possibility of the United States initiating a preventive war on the U.S.S.R. in the sixties is real.

2. The ruling class and the warmongers in the United States believe American security will depend on the destruction of the U.S.S.R. before 1970.

3. The warmongers are working fanatically for a monolithic control of NATO and rearmament of Germany with nuclear arms and weapons.

4. Therefore the Soviet Union is necessarily committed to war against the Republic of the United States.

5. The first military strike must be against the United States and not the NATO countries in Europe, nor American allies in Asia.

6. The Soviet Union does not intend to be caught unprepared. Hence, the preparation for nuclear war in the sixties must be given top priority.

7. To insure an early victory, the Socialist camp civil defense troops must—swiftly and jointly—occupy all the strategic cities and areas of America.

8. The Soviet war plan calls for two or more advance bases close to the United States—in addition to Red Cuba—in order to deploy civil defense troops prior to the first strike.

9. Also, the Soviet war plan calls for specialized Negro liberation civil defense units. These specialized units can and will (according to the Soviets) play a very important role to insure the Soviet camp an early victory. On this note, the report ends.

K.'S CROWBAR

According to Kilsoo Haan, Premier Khrushchev launched his peace offensive on the eve of the nuclear test ban talks, which began in Moscow on July 15, 1963. He saw in the limited nuclear test ban agreement something of a "diplomatic crowbar" to gain his first objective.

And this is nothing less than the conditions for peaceful coexistence, as revealed in the Korean report of July 9, 1963 (above).

Mr. K. put on another dramatic performance, as usual, and was a huge success from the Soviet point of view. He got his crowbar.

There should no longer be any doubt that we are facing a master chessman on the world stage today. Can we cope with him? Who on our side can give him a serious run for his money? Where is our David to stop this modern Goliath?

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Aug. 20, 1963]

KNOWLAND WOULD VOTE AGAINST PACT—EX-SENATOR WARNS SOVIETS BREAK TREATIES

(By Bill Pugh)

"I am opposed to the nuclear test ban treaty," William F. Knowland said in an exclusive interview. "I would vote against it if I were in the Senate today."

The former Republican Senate leader, now assistant publisher and editor of the Oakland Tribune, gave his opinions on many national and international problems.

"Soviet Russia has never kept its treaty obligations," Knowland said. "Look at what happened to treaties the Soviets made with Hungary, Romania, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, the Republic of China, and Bulgaria. And the Russians violated the United Nations Charter during the Korean war and again during the Hungarian revolt."

BORROW SITE

"Though there are some ideological differences between Moscow and Peking, what is to prevent the Russians from 'borrowing' a test site inside China?"

"Since Red China is not a signatory to the test ban treaty, the Russians could smile and say: 'There's nothing we can do to control our Chinese friends.'"

If this happened and the United States were forced to resume testing, the former Senator said we would stand condemned before world opinion for breaking the ban while the Russians reaped a major propaganda victory.

"To ratify such an agreement," he said, "I would insist on a foolproof system of inspection. At Geneva we started by asking for over a hundred inspections and without getting anything in return we have agreed to no inspections."

VICTORY BY REDS

The 55-year-old publisher said he thought a test ban treaty would lead the West into a nonaggression pact with the Russians and that this would be a major victory for the Communists.

"A nonaggression pact with the Reds would be a death blow to the hopes of freedom to the peoples of the captive nations behind

the Iron Curtain. This is exactly what the Communists want.

"The main disagreement between the Chinese and Russians is on means and not objectives," he declared. "The Russians are conducting what I call Operation Nibble. They will settle—for the time being—for half of this country and part of that one. But the Red Chinese, who are newer at this game and probably have less to lose, favor more violent methods."

"We have abrogated the Monroe Doctrine by allowing a Soviet base 90 miles from our shores. Unless we reinstate this vital policy, how can we complain when the Communists establish another base 300 or 600 miles away?"

KIND WORDS

Knowland had some kind words for the United Nations where he once sat as a delegate for the United States. He considers the U.N. to be a valuable forum where the free world can make its voice heard.

But he also had some criticism for American actions at the U.N., especially during the Korean war and the Hungarian revolt.

"In our anxiety to avoid an adverse vote at the United Nations," Knowland said, "we have at times taken positions that were against the best interests of the United States and the free world."

"In Korea we were prevented from crossing the Yalu to destroy the Chinese bases on the excuse that we might provoke the Chinese. Since we were then being provoked by the Chinese with everything they had, it is hard to see what more they could have done."

"I thought then and still think we should have fought to win the Korean war. And I feel that if we had won in Korea, we would not have many of the problems that now face us in Asia."

"The United States also should not agree to the formation of coalition governments, such as in Laos."

"In every country where we recognized a coalition government—Czechoslovakia, for example—the Communists went through the motions of representative government only long enough to gain control of the police and communications media. Then," Knowland said, "they disposed of their opposition by prison, execution, or exile."

During the Hungarian uprising, the former Senator said he thought the United States should have taken direct action to support the constitutional government headed by Premier Imre Nagy instead of leaving the United Nations to merely pass resolutions which were ignored by the Soviet Union.

CURTAIN AID

Foreign aid should be curtailed, Knowland declared, and on a rapidly diminishing basis.

"I supported and voted for the Marshall plan. But I didn't think—and I don't think anyone else did—that this was going to be a part of our national budget permanently."

"All foreign aid should not be abruptly terminated. But the United States should take a closer look at the aid program and do some substantial pruning—now."

"The Government should encourage private businesses to participate in foreign aid. Some businesses," Knowland said, "have done this. But they got into the field late and have not done as much as they should."

"Some of the original beneficiaries of the Marshall plan are now capable of assuming more of their share in this field and relieving us of part of this vast financial burden."

"We cannot afford to continue the foreign aid program indefinitely and should not be expected to."

"IFFY" QUESTION

Asked about his personal political plans, the Republican stalwart smiled and said he would have to borrow a quote from President Franklin D. Roosevelt: "That's an 'iffy' question."

"I have no plans for running for office," he stated. "I will not make a Sherman statement because I don't know what the situation will be in the future."

He noted that his many years in public service—both houses of the California State Legislature, service in the Army for 3 years, and 13½ years in the U.S. Senate—has caused lengthy absences from the Oakland Tribune, the Knowland family newspaper.

Knowland denied that he was the spokesman in California for Arizona's Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

"After all," Knowland said, "Senator GOLDWATER has said he is running only for the Senate and has not said he would seek the Republican presidential nomination. And the convention is in July 1964, and not next month."

SUPPORT CANDIDATE

"I will support the presidential candidate selected by the convention, regardless of who it may be."

Knowland indicated that he was friendly with both GOLDWATER and New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller. When asked which he would support for the GOP nomination, he said:

"That's another iffy question. But if both GOLDWATER and Rockefeller do enter the California primary, I would support Senator GOLDWATER."

FAR BROADER

On the question of civil rights, Knowland said:

"Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone."

"These include the right to walk our streets day or night without danger to life, limb, or property, the right to own, manage, and dispose of property, the right to associate with friends of one's own choice, the right to have gainful employment and to stay or leave the job based upon one's own choice and judgment. These are also civil rights entitled to the protection of Federal, State, and local authorities."

"Whenever a mob can deny these rights, regardless of the composition of those who would take over the streets from their use by peaceful citizens and from the duly constituted civil authorities, we have a breakdown of constitutional government."

RESPONSIBILITIES

"It is too bad that those who have led the fight for one segment of civil rights have not equally stressed civil obligations and civil responsibilities."

"Every American citizen has the right to register and vote according to the qualifications for voting established by each of our 50 States and to do this without having discriminating standards applied to the individual applicant or voter because of race, creed, sex or color."

"Every American citizen has a right to patronize or withhold his purchasing power according to the choice he and his family make in the marketplaces of the Nation."

"By his political action and economic participation an opportunity is given to every citizen to have 'his say' in influencing events now and over the future years."

PATIENT PEOPLE

"But he has no right to ride roughshod over the constitutional rights of the rest of our citizens. No pressure group minority can impose by unconstitutional means its views upon the majority of our people without their consent. Changes can only be made through the constitutional process of amendment."

"The American people are a just people, they are a patient people, they are an understanding people and they are a law abiding people."

"But if pushed too far (as King George III, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler and Tojo learned to their sorrow) they are capable of taking

the necessary political or military steps to remove the dangers to their constitutional form of government. The ballot box can and will serve the majority as well as the minority."

[From the Sumter (S.C.) Item, Aug. 20, 1963]
TOP BRASS AFRAID TO INCUR DISFAVOR ON
NUCLEAR PACT?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—More puzzling than any of the words themselves in the pending treaty limiting nuclear tests are the strange arguments being made urging its ratification.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who represent the military judgment on which the security of the country is customarily based, say frankly that they have had their doubts but that, on the whole, they now think the disadvantages in ratifying the treaty are outweighed by the advantages. They insist, however, that the United States not only carry on a vigorous program of underground testing but that it stay ready on short notice to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviets abrogate the treaty.

All this is difficult for the average person to understand, and many Members of Congress have wondered whether political pressure has been applied to persuade the Joint Chiefs to support the treaty. In fact, in a Senate committee hearing this week, the question was asked if the Joint Chiefs responded to pressure. This was emphatically denied.

But the mere raising of the question indicates that in the back of the minds of some Senators is a feeling that the high military officers do not dare to incur disfavor. Indeed, recently a Chief of Naval Operations was not reappointed and, while it was denied that he was punished for expressing his views before Congress on a controversial issue, the idea prevails that he did disagree with the administration and paid the penalty.

The campaign to get the treaty ratified is typical of what happens when a political issue is involved, but it is not characteristic of the kind of discussion that usually takes place when purely military matters are being considered. It is doubtful whether any high military man would venture openly to question the wisdom of ratifying the nuclear test treaty.

Another puzzling development is the attitude of the nuclear scientists. While a large number favor ratification, it is significant that Dr. Edward Teller, often referred to as the "father of the hydrogen bomb," is vehement in his opposition. Efforts are being made by the administration to pooh-pooh his objections as of secondary importance, but his testimony—just published—has served to increase the doubts prevalent on Capitol Hill.

Dr. Teller says that testing in the atmosphere is important in order to catch up with the techniques in which the Soviets are ahead of the United States. He says that nuclear explosions in the air are the key to developing missile defenses. If the Soviets feel they are at an advantage, they can threaten attack and gain political concessions by such a threat. They could invade small countries at will, knowing they would not be risking war with the United States. So, Dr. Teller insists, tests in the atmosphere and in outer space are absolutely essential to America's future safety.

There is considerable speculation as to why the Moscow government reversed its previous decisions and suddenly decided to go ahead with a plan it had earlier rejected. It is suggested that the Soviet experts may be planning someday to mount a mock attack by, say, 500 missiles high over Russia and counter the attack with a display of their antimissile defense system.

Dr. Teller thinks they might even invite American experts to watch the test. If the

test happened to fail, the Russians would have lost only the treaty, but he thinks that, if the scheme worked they would then be able to say: "Now, you see we have an excellent defense and can absorb any attack you can send against us. There is the proof. Now please do this and that, etc."

On this point alone—inhibiting U.S. development of a missile defense—Dr. Teller feels the treaty is dangerous to the United States.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his testimony before a Senate committee this week, said:

"And probably more important than purely military implications, the treaty should provide us with an opportunity to test the sincerity of Soviet protestations about their desire to explore more sweeping arrangements for preserving the peace. It provides us with this opportunity at a minimum risk."

"I do not pretend that this or any other agreement between great contending powers can be risk free. This one is not."

But the Secretary feels that America possesses the power of a devastating retaliatory attack that could destroy Russia. America can rely on that potential power, however, only as long as the Soviets do not develop a system whereby missiles from the United States or its bases on land or underwater are intercepted and nuclear materials are disintegrated in flight. That's the true worry of the scientists who disagree about approving any treaty while it halts testing in the atmosphere.

As for fears of fallout, testimony has been given that these claims have been exaggerated and that the radioactive substances which drop from the air after nuclear tests have not been anywhere near the maximum limits at which the nuclear fallout becomes dangerous to mankind.

So the whole issue is far from clear, and probably many weeks of debate in the Senate will ensue before final action is taken.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Aug. 20, 1963]

"DON'T TRUST THEM"—GRUENING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Much to President Kennedy's pained surprise, the nuclear test ban treaty is being sharply challenged by an unexpected critic.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, veteran liberal, is bluntly questioning the reliability of the pact in view of Russia's long and voluminous record of broken and violated agreements.

Specifically pinpointing this caustic accusation, GRUENING is cited the Soviet's persistent illegal invasion of U.S. fishing waters.

These violations are occurring off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. They are particularly numerous and flagrant in Alaskan waters. GRUENING, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, and other congressional and State authorities have repeatedly appealed to the White House and State Department for help, but to little avail.

A few formal complaints have been made to Moscow—comparable to a tap on the wrist—and that's about all.

With the submission of the nuclear test ban treaty to the Senate for ratification, GRUENING is using Russia's persistent fishing violations to question whether the Kremlin can be trusted to abide by the pact.

In a telegram to the President reporting further fishing infringements, GRUENING hotly declared:

"I find it difficult to see how we can be asked to approve a treaty which implies friendly relations with Russia when the Russians are continually violating international law and other treaties respecting our waters."

GRUENING also demanded that vigorous measures be taken against Soviet violators, as follows:

"When the Russians were pulling up Alaskan crab traps, I urged you to send a couple

of destroyers to prevent this continued violation of our waters. It is not enough to report these incidents and make diplomatic protests. These violators should be arrested and brought to trial, and this cannot be done with the inadequate naval and Coast Guard equipment now available. The Russian fishing boats are actually faster than any Coast Guard or naval vessels now in Alaskan waters."

Representatives CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, and PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, also are denouncing the Soviet's numerous fishing violations and contending they cast grave doubts on signing agreements with the Reds.

"Since the beginning of the Communist regime in Russia," said HOSMER, "a calculated course of insincere negotiations has been pursued wherever and whenever it forwards the goal of world domination. In its 44-year history, the Soviet has signed over 2,000 agreements with non-Communist governments. It is safe to say that those remaining unbroken by the Kremlin are only those which expediency has not yet dictated to breach.

"Recently the American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives had this to say: 'During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjon, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.'"

Representative ROGERS, testifying before the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee, detailed numerous instances of Soviet vessels violating U.S. territorial waters along the Florida coast.

"What are the operations of these Russian trawlers?" said ROGERS. "Writing in the Navy publication 'Proceedings,' Comdr. Bernard Kassel states that the trawler fleet is used for purposes ranging from commercial fishing to outright espionage. . . . Whatever the purposes these Soviet vessels have in this hemisphere, it is not in our national interest to allow them to continue their operations as they have."

TREATY FALLOUT

A large number of the letters coming to the White House in favor of the nuclear test ban treaty are being sparked by a new lobbying organization whose members include the curious combination of Norman Thomas, perennial Socialist candidate for President, James Wadsworth, New York Republican and former U.N. ambassador, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, noted baby expert. In an appeal sent to more than 75,000 throughout the country, the organization is urging, "Write three letters or telegrams as follows: To President Kennedy and to both your Senators." Recipients of this appeal also are being asked to get their "friends and neighbors" to do the same. . . . One of the censored deletions in the testimony of Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, was his statement that there is no clearcut knowledge the Russians are not prepared to perform extensive underground nuclear testing. The noted scientist warned that to believe the Russians are incapable of doing that would be highly dangerous. He also pointed out underground tests can be conducted in Russia in an inconspicuous manner. There was no explanation why the Kennedy administration blue-penciled this Teller statement. He said nothing the Russians don't know, and there is utterly no reason the American people shouldn't know it. No military secrets of any kind are in these remarks. . . . Senator BURKE HICKENLOOPER, Iowa, senior Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, doesn't think much of President Kennedy's writing style—which his admirers highly acclaim. While questioning Secretary Dean Rusk, at the

hearings on the test ban treaty, HICKENLOOPER noted that the President's message to the pact contained more "don'ts" than "do's." Said HICKENLOOPER, "I wish I could find as many does it do's as I can find don't it do's."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Aug. 17, 1963]

NONAGGRESSION PACT TO BE SECOND STEP— TEST BAN REGARDED AS MEANINGLESS (By Constantine Brown)

BONN.—Discussion of the "second step" has quickly followed the signing of the test ban treaty in Moscow. This step is the old Rapacki plan of a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations which the Kremlin has been touting for years.

When the proposal was first made by Poland's Foreign Minister Rapacki, it was rejected by the United States and her Western allies as phony.

High ranking Germans do not know whether to admire the diplomatic skill and the patience of the Soviets or to wonder at the gullibility of the policymakers in Washington and London.

It is pointed out here that the atomic test ban means very little, if anything, as a means to world peace. Not too long ago there was a 10-month moratorium by gentleman's agreement on nuclear testing except for underground tests. Then, without a by-your-leave, Russia exploded its most powerful 50-megaton-plus bomb.

The gentleman's agreement has now been made formal and is called the first step in a general and complete disarmament.

Thus Mr. Khrushchev, by merely signing what may turn out to be a meaningless test ban, is about to achieve the main diplomatic objective: a phony nonaggression agreement in which his East German puppet will be allowed to participate formally as a member of the Warsaw bloc and by which it will obtain informal recognition by the United States and Britain.

The explanation from Washington that the United States and Britain need not give their formal assent to East Germany signing and thereby do not recognize the Soviet-occupied part of Germany as a legitimate state, does not go down too well in West Germany. The argument that the partition of Germany is a fact and it might as well be realized is not relished by the Germans.

Their reasoning behind this is that so long as the goal is a freely united Germany—no matter if the goal continues for 50 years or more, the Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain will have hope. And no government of West Germany wants to take that hope from the people.

It is feared that both the Moscow treaty and the nonaggression Rapacki plan will remove that hope from all Germany if East Germany becomes a party to any East-West agreements.

The chancellor-designate, Ludwig Erhard, who will take over from Adenauer in October, is more inclined toward the policies of Washington and London than those of Paris. He and Foreign Secretary Schroeder are known for their strong leanings toward the Anglo-Saxon bloc.

But even Adenauer and Erhard have misgivings about future proceedings because of German public opinion which already is alarmed over any deal which may make permanent the partition of Germany.

There is nothing the Germans would like more than to reduce their military establishment. There is nothing the German industrialists would like so much as to do business with Russia today. Peace in our time means as much to the Germans as it does to Americans and British. They have had a bellyful of war—not only was their nation

devastated and partitioned by the victors, but Hitler brought them the deepest humiliation.

All the same, there is an intense feeling of uneasiness and concern not only in this political capital of the Bundesrepublik but throughout the country over the inescapable prospect that the Rapacki plan is the basis of the negotiations between Washington and London and Moscow.

And this, they fear, will lead to the permanent dismemberment of the German peoples who live "one portion free and one portion slave" as the result of the Yalta agreement—a repeat performance for Mr. Harriman who drew up the Yalta draft with Molotov in 1945.

THE \$64 QUESTION

(Weekly Newsletter by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, Aug. 22, 1963)

Testimony on the Moscow test ban treaty, both in public and secret sessions, reveals that there is one awesome question on which the whole issue precariously hangs. The question: Do we dare risk the entire national security of the United States on the validity of our official intelligence estimates?

All of the intelligence experts admit freely that our intelligence is poorest on what is happening in the Soviet Union and in Red China. By comparison, Cuba is an open book. Our official intelligence estimates do not have a history that exactly inspires confidence. Consider the record.

When the Soviets came up with the atomic bomb, it was a complete surprise to the United States. Official estimates took the position that the Soviets could not master the atomic bomb before the mid-1950's, but they tested on August 19, 1949.

In the fall of 1949, just after the Soviets detonated an atomic bomb, the United States was considering whether to develop a thermonuclear weapon. The official intelligence estimate, even after being fooled by the Soviets on the atomic bomb a few weeks earlier, said the Soviets could not develop the thermonuclear weapon until the late 1950's. All the scientists, except one, agreed with the estimate, and opposed U.S. construction of a thermonuclear bomb. The one exception was Dr. Edward Teller, who, in October 1949, urged that if the United States did not hurry with the development of the H-bomb, the Soviets would get one first. Fortunately, President Truman decided against the official estimate and with Dr. Teller's lone scientific opinion. The estimate was wrong; Dr. Teller was right. We exploded a thermonuclear bomb on October 31, 1952; the Soviets followed on August 12, 1953, with a hydrogen bomb explosion.

When the Communists invaded South Korea in June 1950, the United States was caught off guard. Official intelligence estimates took the position that it wouldn't happen. On the basis of those estimates, U.S. military forces had been withdrawn from the area, making the attack possible.

When the Soviets launched Sputnik I in October 1957, the United States was caught by complete surprise. Official intelligence estimates had let us down again.

Along in 1958, official intelligence estimates said the Soviets had a multitude of ballistic missiles, and thus was born the "missile gap." It was such a scare that it became a major issue in the 1960 presidential election. It then turned out that the whole estimate was phony; the estimates were wrong, and the "missile gap" was a fraud.

On September 19, 1962, an official intelligence estimate was issued which took the position that there were no Soviet missiles in Cuba, and that the Soviets would not put any missiles in Cuba. This one got disproved in a hurry. Now it is admitted that missiles were in Cuba when the estimate was written.

The official estimates now admit that the Soviets are ahead of us in some fields of nuclear technology. They also admit that we don't have much hard information on which to base our estimates. In the areas of technology where we have the most information, official estimates admit the Soviets are ahead; in areas of technology where we have the least information, official estimates assume that the United States is ahead.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, who knows something about our intelligence methods in this field, has little confidence in our intelligence estimates. He stated that if the treaty were not already signed, he would recommend, don't sign it.

Gen. Thomas Power, who commands the Strategic Air Command, and is even closer to the problem, says the estimates are wrong, and that it's far too dangerous to sign the treaty. The Soviets might well have a clear superiority in technology now. Gen. Bernard Schriever, who commands our missile development, says he can't do his job properly if the treaty is ratified.

Dr. Teller, who has the best experience in the nuclear field, and who has a history of making correct judgments, says the intelligence estimates are wrong.

What is the difference? If the treaty is ratified, and any significant part of the estimates is wrong again, the United States is finished. Russia will have us hands down in the nuclear field, and the only choice that would be left to us then is surrender or be wiped out.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1963]

NATO, AFTER TREATY IS OK'D—LULLING OUR ALLIANCE-STRENGTHENING EFFORT BELIEVED SOVIET GOAL IN A-ACCORD

(By Eric Sevareid)

The extreme rightwing in American politics is not likely to prevail in the debate over the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia, in spite of the respectable doubts of such open-minded men as Senator Jackson, in spite of the clear truth that the treaty by no means implies the end of the worldwide contest with aggressive communism. The long reach of history is accomplished by such short, often unpremeditated steps; and this seems to be one of those times when it is better to move than to stand, however impossible it may be to identify the next move after that. What we are engaged in with Russia is a game of poker, not chess.

Before this current argument is over, the United States will have again demonstrated to the world that if there is any basic flaw in the American world stance it is a leaning toward trust rather than distrust, a deep seated predilection toward lowering our guard, not toward rigidity and ingrained hostility, in spite of the clamorous, guilt ridden claims of all those groups which arrogate to themselves the desire for and the label of peace.

No, if from here on we are led into policy errors by reason of domestic pressures, it will not be the pressure of the overly suspicious rightwing minorities but the pressures of the leftwing minorities who persistently equate American with Communist responsibility for the dangerous condition of the world—those groups which would have us detach from Vietnam because its Government happens to be nasty in rightwing fashion and which would have us draw closer to Cuba because its nasty regime happens to be leftwing. Brutality, itself, does not bother these groups; they are concerned only with the words of the torturer's chant as he wields the whip.

One can hope. One can hope, for example, that the tenor and outcome of this debate on the test treaty will demonstrate to these groups and their counterparts in

Europe that, while the "military industrial power structure" of which General Eisenhower warned is, indeed, worth worrying about, it is not determining the foreign and defense policies of this country. The President and the Secretary of Defense are doing that, as much, if not more, than ever.

One can hope that the tranquilizing effect of the treaty agreement will not put the efforts to reorganize and strengthen NATO, already half paralyzed, into a coma. It is entirely permissible to believe that this prospect was one of Premier Khrushchev's various purposes in welcoming the agreement.

One can hope, also, that behind Mr. Khrushchev's corollary desire to isolate the nuclear ambitions of the Chinese, there is not something far more immediate and frightening than a doctrinal disagreement about the worth, in Communist terms, of risking big war. With no hard evidence to support it, the nagging thought persists that the Chinese may have been pushing, not merely for doctrinal support from Moscow, but for support of Chinese plans for immediate, overt aggressions, whether against Vietnam or South Korea or Formosa or India. It may not be merely the Chinese ideologues who left Moscow in disgust last month; it may be also representatives of the Chinese General Staff.

It is a scary notion. Whether or not aggressions do come on such a dire and drastic scale, what we cannot realistically hope for is an end to small-scale Communist aggressions in the Far East or an end to Communist-created alarms and excursions in Latin America, which could easily snowball. The co-existence Mr. Khrushchev has in mind is an intensely competitive coexistence, both political and economic. There is no reason, whatsoever, to think that he, any more than the dogmatic Chinese, has revised his declaration that "socialism is working for history," which is a program of action, as distinguished from the old Marxist slogan that "history is working for socialism," which was an intellectual abstraction.

It is generally and historically true that tyrannies do pass away in time, that doctrines are always diluted by realities, that any church militant tends to become, with prosperity, the established church. And it is also true that these processes, like all social processes, move through their cycle at a faster rate than they did before the modern revolution in communications. But the worst mistake we could make would be to assume, on the evidence of the test ban treaty, that these processes have come to completion, even with the Russians. With the Chinese, of course, the processes have scarcely begun.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1963]

TEST BAN CRITICS

From the public's point of view, bewildering is the only word which describes the clashing expert testimony on the nuclear test ban. Bewildering—and disturbing.

The testimony of the opponents, though it tends to shake confidence, has not altered our belief that, all things considered, the treaty should be ratified. The preponderance of the testimony still is on the side of ratification, and the benefits still seem to outweigh the risks.

All of this, however, does not get us around the fact that only a tightly closed mind could remain indifferent to the views expressed by such as Dr. Teller, General Power, General Schriever and now Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., head of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. The adverse testimony of these men cannot be answered by allusions to bushy eyebrows, theatrical tones, vested military interests, etc. There is no doubt in our mind that these critics are just as sincere and just as devoted to the interests of the United States as are the treaty advocates. And, generally at least, they have access to

essentially the same information. How is it possible, then, for Defense Secretary McNamara to say that this treaty serves the best interests of America, while Dr. Teller tells the Senators that if they ratify the treaty they will be "giving away the future safety of this country?" How can Mr. McNamara say that we are not behind the Russians in our knowledge of antimissile missiles, while Dr. Teller insists that the Russians are far ahead in this area?

One explanation may be that this conflicting testimony, as far as the published accounts go, is opinion testimony. Specific information and facts which support the opinions have not been made public. Perhaps these things have been spelled out for the benefit of the Senators, who must make the final judgment on the treaty. Certainly, we hope so. And we also hope that all the information and facts, consistent with true security, will be made available to the people. Otherwise, the public mind will be bedeviled for years to come by doubts as to whether we have traded our security for a possibly vain political hope. Perhaps these doubts can never be entirely removed. But they should be assuaged to the extent that this is possible.

[From the Aiken (S.C.) Standard and Review, Aug. 21, 1963]

SEDUCTION?

The unanimous opposition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the test ban treaty, hitherto reported as set forth in a secret paper signed by all members, appears to have evaporated—but, like the mushroom cloud, not without some fallout.

In a full day of testimony before the combined Senate Foreign Relations, Senate Armed Services and Joint Atomic Energy Committees, Defense Secretary McNamara declared U.S. military might to be "manifestly superior to the Soviet Union's," said he expected U.S. nuclear superiority to continue and gave his "unequivocal support" to the treaty.

Next day, following their boss, the Joint Chiefs echoed their support of the treaty, if not quite so unequivocally. As their spokesman, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, JCS Chairman, reported to a closed session of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that our ranking military commanders now find the test ban "compatible" with military security in spite of "disadvantages and risks."

"The risks inherent in this treaty," the Joint Chiefs statement concluded, "can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences."

Under questioning, General Taylor assured the subcommittee that his arm had not been twisted. It was not immediately known whether Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay—on record as opposing any ban on testing in space, in the atmosphere, underwater or underground—has an arm in a sling. Adm. George W. Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, who agreed with him, has since walked the plank.

Irrespective of administration pressure, however, the overriding concern expressed by the Joint Chiefs for stabilization of international relations, a peaceful environment, and resolution of our differences suggests that they should be working for Mr. Rusk rather than Mr. McNamara. Their proper concern is with those disadvantages and risks. And it would be a sad state of affairs if our top commanders have been caught in the psychological trap that Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations and JSC member, regards as the treaty's greatest danger.

"We could easily be seduced," he told a group of Congressmen, "into thinking a scrap of paper is a great step toward peace,

permitting us to relax our weapons research, resort once again to wishful thinking, and so, once again, betray ourselves."

[From the Newberry (S.C.) Sun, Aug. 22, 1963]

TEST BAN FATAL TO U.S. INTERESTS

(By Clarence E. Manion)

By the time this column is read, the U.S. Senate will probably have ratified the latest nuclear test ban treaty, in spite of our past experience with the Communists and their treaties and in spite of the statements about treaties which the Communist leaders have frequently made. Remember—they say treaties are like piecrusts—made to be broken.

At least 5 months before the Soviets broke the last test ban treaty, it was predicted that they would do exactly that, just as it was predicted more than a year in advance that the Russians were converting Cuba into an offensive base. No one paid too much attention to either of these predictions until they came true.

Both of these disasters could have been averted if our leadership had been willing to face the proven facts of Communist duplicity and malevolence.

Now, we are again refusing to face the facts in connection with the new test ban treaty. Because we want to believe the Soviets are sincere, we are proceeding as though we know they are. Ratification of the treaty will freeze the United States in second place to Russia in the technology of strategic nuclear weapons. Our strike capability will be reduced rapidly compared with the Soviet's mushrooming superweapon strength, and it will take the Soviets about a year and a half to put us in a position of being unable to retaliate against the military power of the Russians' superweapons of annihilation. This could mean the end of our country.

Managed news out of Washington confused the American people into forgetting what Khrushchev did in atmosphere cheating, and what our own President said then about protecting us from another such fraud. In November 1961 Mr. Kennedy said: "If they fooled us once, it is their fault; but if they fool us twice, it is our fault." We are now giving them another chance.

Some Senators will doubtless feel that the necessity for adequate safeguards against major cheating by the Soviets can be obviated by the United States maintaining a "readiness to test." But the President himself has said that this is not possible. On that subject, the President said in 1962 that for us to maintain such a readiness to test "is not merely difficult or inconvenient; we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

If we could be sure that the test ban agreement contains inspection provisions which the President says are essential to protect against secret prolonged preparations for sudden massive atmospheric tests; or that it contains enforcement provisions, or penalties for cheating, to prevent the Soviets from betraying the second test ban exactly the same way that they betrayed the first one, then we might take some comfort from the signing of this treaty and its ratification.

We should, however, remember that the Soviets first ban-breaking tests enabled them to multiply their nuclear explosive efficiency many times over their previous efficiency, while our own superiority was at a standstill. During the period of the previous test ban treaty, the Soviets were obviously working furiously to get ready for the powerful weapons testing that occurred when they broke the treaty by exploding their big bombs in the air. During that same period, our own testing was stopped according to the treaty and we had nothing in process of manufacture that would be

any defense to these superweapons developed by the Soviets while the test ban was in operation.

There is not much that any one of us can do about the new test ban treaty, except to keep constantly in our minds the results of the last one.

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 19, 1963]

IT ALL FITS

The gaudily publicized "split" between Red China and the Soviet Union has occupied students of world communism for many months.

Ordinarily, such public quarreling is counter to intelligent strategy. Allies seek to present a common front to the enemy, to project an impression of maximum strength. Yet the Communist world seems intent on doing exactly the opposite. Why?

It is obvious the Communists never embark on any large venture without some clear object in mind. They clearly would not publicize their disagreements if they did not think something was to be gained by letting the rest of the world in on the dispute. Precisely for that reason, Westerners who see the "split" as a great plus for our side would be well advised to proceed slowly.

The "why" of the split has begun to become more apparent in recent weeks, with the advent of the nuclear test ban treaty. The Soviet Union is a signatory, but Red China is not. It is assumed Peking will not join in the agreement because it is so much more "belligerent" than Moscow—supposedly the major reason for the "split."

The projection of Sino-Soviet differences into the area of nuclear testing suggests a number of reasons for the copious publicity the Reds have given to their own "problems." If the free world accepts at face value the argument that Khrushchev is more conciliatory than Mao, then the idea of the Kremlin actually abiding by such a treaty seems less unreasonable.

Even more importantly, the "split" allows Moscow to disclaim responsibility for Peking's actions—including atomic tests. Since Red China is not a signatory, nuclear activity inside its boundaries will not be construed as a violation of the treaty. If the "split" is less real than Moscow has made it seem, the Soviets could test in China and blame the whole thing on Mao and company. The recent buildup about Red China's supposed readiness to launch its own nuclear program implausible on the face of it, would dovetail nicely with such a venture in deception.

Thus Khrushchev, thanks to the vast publicity he has built up around the "split," could have the best of both worlds: He could continue to advance Moscow's nuclear program while American testing stopped; and his own "reasonableness," compared to the irreconcilables in Peking, would commend him even more warmly to the West as a man of peace. Indeed, the more he stepped up the "Chinese" tests, the more lovable he would appear by way of contrast. As a cold war stratagem, it would be near perfection.

Whether this is happening or not, no one can say. In the world of Communist deception few things are certain. The problem is that, given the nature of the Communists, we have no way of being certain it is not happening. We have gullibly accepted (a) the existence of the "split," (b) Red China's alleged nuclear capability, and (c) the idea that Khrushchev in fact wants peace. Combined with the nuclear test ban treaty, those three items provide Moscow a perfect opportunity of burying the West for good.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 20, 1963, Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, the distinguished director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, appeared as a witness before the Senate Foreign Re-

lations Committee and testified on the proposed ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty. It is my understanding that Dr. Strausz-Hupé was unable to come before the committee until late in the afternoon, and, therefore, did not have an opportunity to present his complete statement to the committee, but had to insert most of it into the record of the hearings. Because of this, Dr. Strausz-Hupé's remarks received very little public and senatorial attention; so I feel that it would be appropriate to have his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Strausz-Hupé raised some very valid questions about the treaty and proposed some specific Senate reservations to the treaty "should the Senate finally determine that the treaty, in the present international strategic context, poses no unacceptable risks to American security."

I am confident that anyone who studies the testimony on the entire subject of test ban effects on our national security, as that testimony was submitted to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, will find it very difficult to conclude that the risks posed by this treaty to our national security are acceptable.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Strausz-Hupé's testimony on the Moscow test ban treaty be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN AGREEMENT

(A statement submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, by Robert Strausz-Hupé, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., August 20, 1963)

Mr. Chairman and Senators, I have favored the signing of an appropriate three-environment treaty since it was first proposed by the West in August, 1957. My exceptions to the treaty concluded on July 25, 1963, in Moscow, stem from considerations other than its generally stated purposes which for some time have been met in the absence of any treaty. My exceptions concern the following aspects of the Moscow treaty.

First, the symbolic place which the treaty holds on the agenda of U.S./U.S.S.R. issues.

Second, the implications of the treaty for U.S. security.

Third, the motivations which may have led the Soviet Union to sign the treaty.

Fourth, the effect of the treaty on our allies.

Fifth, the range of "next steps" that might be taken.

1. A SYMBOLIC ACT

The President of the United States has stated eloquently why he has sought the nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Last Monday, the Secretary of State told this committee: "We have no basis yet for assuming a fundamental change in Soviet objectives. We are still engaged in a contest between free choice and coercion."

The treaty formalizes a condition that has obtained for many months. The treaty does not bear upon the substantive issues which divide the United States and the U.S.S.R. Thus the conclusion of the treaty signifies a symbolic act which endows an existing condition with moral-legal sanction. In dip-

omatic history, symbolic acts of this kind which precede an understanding on concrete issues, have been proven empty of positive beneficial consequences. It would have been better diplomacy to seek agreement on such concrete issues as, for example, Berlin, Cuba and Laos, and to cap the concrete achievement with a symbolic act.

The claims staked out for the treaty by its makers appear, in view of the treaty's modest substantive content, exorbitant. The judgments of history are exceedingly slow in the making. It seems unduly hasty to seek to anticipate a verdict which history cannot give before several decades have gone by. The immoderate statements intended to dispel doubt about speedy ratification of the treaty have created an atmosphere which does not favor the prudent and sober deliberation on the provisions of the treaty.

2. SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

Last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara presented a picture of American strategic superiority and argued that the treaty will enable the United States to retain indefinitely its margin of nuclear superiority. We are told, too, that the Soviets still seek to prevail over the West, if possible—and I find this quite easy to believe. Apparently, the Soviet leaders, by subscribing to the treaty, are voluntarily relegating themselves to a position of prolonged inferiority in respect to strategic nuclear capabilities. This is difficult for me to believe. In fact, it is hard to conceive of any responsible government actually accepting a second-place position vis-a-vis its major political adversary. Such an attitude is especially out of keeping with the character of the Soviet leaders as we have come to know them over the years.

I do not claim any military or technical expertise, but I have read the arguments pro and con, official and unofficial. It would appear that the Soviet leaders do not find our stressing of our military superiority uncomfortable; in fact, the Soviet press claims the same advantage for the Soviet Union.

Different military considerations than those thus far emphasized, might have influenced the Soviet decision to conclude the treaty. The Soviets may have concluded that the continuation of atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons will not increase the security of the Soviet Union of its selective military advantage over the United States. The treaty, for example, would preserve Soviet superiority in very large weapons which Soviet military experts consider important.

The Soviet leaders, rightly or wrongly, believe air and missile defense to be crucially important and are making a determined and expensive effort to forge ahead in this area. Furthermore, they do not believe that "defense is provocative," but consider it an essential element in a rational military posture. Nor do the Soviet leaders continuously labor the technical difficulties of missile defense.

These considerations suggest one possible motive for the Soviets' decision to enter, at this time, the same kind of partial test ban agreement which they have rejected in the past. That is the motive of employing the test ban as a means of reducing the strategic superiority which the United States undoubtedly now possesses in numbers and kinds of offensive forces, by building on the existing Soviet knowledge to insure destruction of our missiles in the atmosphere.

It is improbable that the Soviets, who have shown themselves to be proficient strategists, have decided to concede military superiority to the West and thus to withdraw from the contest for world power. I hope, therefore, that the Senate of the United States will probe carefully the possibilities which inhere in this treaty of a "flanking maneuver" by Soviet planners of military technology. After all, deception has long been an element of Soviet operational doctrine. Unfortunately,

we have no way of determining how the Soviets really view the projected strategic balance.

3. SOVIET MOTIVATIONS

The Soviet leaders have stressed the political benefits of the treaty. The dominant themes of Moscow broadcasts over the past several weeks have been:

- (1) Contamination can be ended.
- (2) The treaty is but a first step, not the end of the arms race.
- (3) The treaty conforms to the vital interests of the peoples of the world.
- (4) The treaty shows that cooperation can be achieved; the policy of peaceful coexistence, therefore, has been shown to be right.
- (5) The treaty leads to solution of other issues, lessens tensions, and reduces dangers of nuclear war.
- (6) The treaty is the result of the persistent socialist struggle for peace, by various means as, for example, the peace movements.
- (7) Nuclear proliferation in terms of number of states is dangerous. (The theme, incidentally, has been mentioned, only once, and then in negative reply to the Chinese).
- (8) The treaty is opposed by American "madmen" (Senators Goldwater and Thurmond, and former Vice President Nixon); militarist West Germans; extremist French; and incorrect Chinese.

Only one reference was made to economic difficulties of all nations. But contrary to views expressed abroad, the Soviet Union emphatically denied that it was led to signing this treaty because of internal economic pressures.

Insofar as proliferation of nuclear weapons is concerned, I am satisfied that this subject played a distinctly minor role in Moscow's deliberations. For one thing, neither France nor China represents a military threat to the Soviet Union. For another, the Soviets do not believe that any treaty can restrain a government determined to develop its own nuclear power. For their part, the Soviets intend to retain monopoly control over nuclear weapons within the Communist bloc and, therefore, will do nothing to help the Chinese to acquire an independent nuclear force. However, they have not taken drastic measures such as the abrogation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty, in order to prevent the Chinese from acquiring nuclear power.

Because of the obvious Soviet lack of concern with the alleged military consequences of the treaty, we should examine it, first and foremost, as a part of the Soviet political strategy. Outside the immediate security requirements, the present purpose of Soviet nuclear power is to impress the world that the destruction of the United States is within Soviet means: Soviet control over a well-developed nuclear arsenal prevents the West from launching an all-out war, and, by putting fear in the hearts of the "imperialists", Soviet nuclear power paralyzes the Western responses to Communist encroachments.

As the July 13 reply of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Chinese Communist Party indicates the difference between Peking and Moscow is really minor:

"It is the task of the working class and the Communist parties to make maximum use of the now available opportunities for the peaceful road of a Socialist revolution, not connected with a civil war, and to be at the same time ready for the nonpeaceful method, for the armed suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie."

The Chinese contend that the West; i.e., the United States, is already paralyzed by this fear and advocate a more aggressive strategy. The Soviets are not sure whether the United States is as yet psychologically incapable of using nuclear weapons anywhere. At any rate, they want to play their game more prudently. While exploiting American fears of nuclear war, they keep

in front of us an alternative of peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes thereby attempting to soften the American will to resist. Moreover, the Soviets have never renounced general nuclear war as an instrument of Communist policy.

The Western role in this whole episode may have been limited in advance by Soviet decisions. In fact, the first step would never have been taken if it were conditioned upon substantive matters to which the Soviet Union has never agreed and would not now agree.

4. EFFECT ON ALLIES

According to published reports emanating from domestic and foreign sources, several of the principal allies of the United States have taken umbrage at being informed on the details of the treaty negotiations, either late or not at all. There can be no doubt that several of our most important allies have subscribed only reluctantly to the treaty and look upon it and the consequences to which it might give rise, with scarcely concealed misgivings. It is difficult to reconcile the manner in which the treaty was negotiated and concluded with the concept of partnership which, in other forums, the United States propounds vis-a-vis its Atlantic allies. It is too early to determine now the degree to which the treaty might weaken the sense of urgency animating the NATO alliance.

It is no secret that U.S. relations with France are not quite what they have been for many years—and what they ought to be in view of that country's crucial position in Europe. While we may not now be in a position to improve them—although that should be one of our long range objectives—the ratification of the treaty in opposition to the policy of the French Government may aggravate an already dangerous split.

The treaty should be subject to careful scrutiny in respect to our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. The problems faced by the German Government are unique. Germany is the only country in Europe still divided, 18 years after the end of the war, the only country whose former capital still remains an isolated island in an area under Soviet occupation, and the only country specifically prohibited—by international treaty voluntarily acceded to—from manufacturing, possessing or testing nuclear weapons in any form whatsoever. One of the tenets of her policy has been a refusal to recognize the puppet government of the Soviet zone as a "German government." While we may aver that the signature of the Ulbricht government does in no way constitute a de jure or de facto recognition, we must take cognizance of German objections, as well as of the imponderables of the German situation, fraught with problems of internal politics, as well as those of her relations with other members of the Atlantic Community.

The danger exists that a relaxation in East-West tensions might result in a weakening of the NATO alliance.

5. OTHER IMPLICATIONS OF THE TREATY

There is one particular clause in the treaty which stirs disquieting doubts in my mind, and that is article IV, which pertains to the right of withdrawal. The definition in article IV of "extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty . . ." that have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country" is so broad as to permit any signatory to withdraw from the treaty at almost any moment it chooses. While this may seem to give equal rights to the United States and to the Soviet Union, such a symmetry exists largely on paper. There is no problem posed if the Soviets would openly violate the treaty. But a situation in which the United States may find it necessary, in the interests of its own security, to resume testing first, is another matter. Even if the executive branch of our Government came to

the decision that the treaty ought to be abrogated in the interest of national security, it is quite likely that a powerful and vociferous campaign of protest would be instantly organized against abrogation of the treaty. It would enlist the support of many influential and well-meaning citizens. Our greater respect for international law would deter us from withdrawing from the treaty except under major provocation or for other valid and compelling reasons.

I have spelled out the reasons for my concern in an annex to this statement.

Inspection, the most crucial question in the long years of fruitless dialogue on arms control between the West and the Soviet Union, has been effectively sidestepped in this treaty. The crux of the problem has been Soviet unwillingness to allow the West free access to territory inside the Iron Curtain.

To many in the West, the chief villain in the disarmament debates has been the obstinate American insistence on inspection. If it were not for this American fetish, they argue, all nuclear bombs would be banned and we would have a world of peace and harmony. To be sure, one may argue that international inspection is not necessary to detect testing in the atmosphere, outer space or under water. Nevertheless, the treaty should not be allowed to provide a pattern for all future arms control agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. The reasons why I am concerned about this possible precedent are also found in the annex to my statement.

6. THE NEXT STEPS

The Moscow Treaty has been called a "first step" toward other agreements which might usher in an era of peace and good feeling. In his television address of July 26, President Kennedy maintained that the test ban treaty did not mean the end of the cold war. Nevertheless, the President called the treaty "an important first step; a step toward peace; a step toward reason; a step away from war." President Kennedy listed some of the proposals for the reduction of international tensions which might follow the signing of the treaty: safeguards against surprise attack, safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and measures to guard against radioactive fallout.

The Moscow Treaty cannot be divorced from other negotiations, reported to be taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, at first, insisted upon a package, namely the test ban and a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw pact group. According to semiofficial statements, the United States feels restrained in negotiating such a pact by the scruples of some of its allies. In the absence of any official statements denouncing the Soviet proposal as pointless as well as redundant, the American public and world opinion might infer that the U.S. Government is indeed giving serious consideration to the conclusion of such a pact.

This proposal, together with a proposal for the unification of Germany on the basis of direct negotiations between the Bundesrepublik and the German People's Republic and the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Central Europe was first advanced in a note by Foreign Minister Gromyko on May 25, 1959. The proposal was then indignantly rejected by the Western allies. Its resuscitation in what appears to be the familiar Soviet piecemeal method must give rise to deep concern. The very consideration of such a pact by the United States can be taken as an admission that the United States bears a burden equal to that of the Soviet Union of responsibility for the cold war. Since it was the Soviet Union which, according to innumerable official U.S. statements, has engaged in aggressive acts and the United States has abided by the spirit of the

United Nations Charter, the United States' acceptance of the Soviet proposal would mark the abandonment of a long held position. Of course, were such a proposal submitted to the United States upon completion of the Soviet withdrawal from Eastern Europe and the liquidation of the Soviet military position in Cuba, the basis of a meaningful pact might be laid. Thus far, the Soviet record does not encourage the expectation that the Soviets will relinquish their conquests, or for that matter abide by a nonaggression pact. Within the last 25 years, the Soviet Union has concluded several nonaggression pacts and broken them. Although our press contains much news of and hints at a loosening of the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe, Soviet military power still dominates all East European satellites, and each satellite is ruled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders. Thus the association of the treaty with a nonaggression pact raises questions that are even more important than those raised by the treaty itself.

Of particular significance is the last paragraph of the agreed communique, announcing the proposed treaty at the Moscow meeting, which speaks of "other measures, directed at a relaxation of tension." The desirability of such a goal in dealing with an opponent who seeks world domination and frequently speaks of "burying" us is questionable.

Both Secretary McNamara and General Taylor warned about the dangers of Western euphoria that will inevitably follow the treaty. One effect of the treaty will be to raise popular expectations concerning the East-West struggle. A groundswell of hope may induce Western Governments to offer further concessions to the Soviets. Such pressure undoubtedly influenced the British Government to sign the treaty. The treaty's preamble pledges the signers to seek "general and complete disarmament," a utopian concept, the implications of which have never been spelled out.

This treaty will mean many things to different people. To many Europeans it will appear as a manifestation of the sincerity of the Soviet Union to establish an effective and equitable arms control arrangement; many will see in it a gradual abandonment by the Soviets of the core of the Communist political ideology: a deterministic world design. Prime Minister Macmillan, for example, described Russia as "moving away" from communism.

Lenin urged Communists to utilize those circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism. Khrushchev, in his notable speech of January 6, 1961, restated the value of using pacifists in the West to bring pressure to bear on their Governments and to undermine the force opposed to Communist expansion.

While it may be true that many people in the world will welcome the ratification of the treaty, it is not sure that they will credit the United States with motives which reflect credit upon its fortitude under international pressures. That American negotiators traveled to Moscow and subsequently followed the Soviet Premier to his vacation retreat in the Crimea is likely to be taken by many people as a concession. In the eyes of that large segment of the world opinion which does not see us as we see ourselves, the overeagerness with which the treaty has been sought, do not jibe with the image of a great power supremely confident in the righteousness of its case against a notorious aggressor. Soviet propaganda appears to credit Soviet firmness and the rightness of Soviet policy for the Moscow Treaty. It should be recalled that at the Belgrade Conference of Neutrals (Sept. 1-6, 1961) the participants refused to condemn the Soviet Union for having broken the test moratorium. Some refrained from censuring the Soviets because

they feared retaliation. It is not difficult to persuade a large segment of neutral world opinion that we, too, acted from fear rather than more elevated considerations. Perhaps, the Soviet 60-megaton bomb has already played its role in softening up Western elites.

There is a widespread concern, particularly in the United States, that any refusal to sign the treaty will incur the wrath of "world opinion". We must not allow ourselves to be swayed by unfounded assumptions concerning its importance. The Soviets consistently disregard it when it runs counter to their interests.

One of the greatest dangers arising from the treaty, therefore, is the psychological atmosphere which it has generated; the notion that we are now somewhat moving, step by step, into a new period of detente. But as far as we can see ahead we are going to be under the pressure of revolutionary forces, be it Russian communism trying to extend its empire wherever that is possible, be it Chinese communism attempting to build up its own empire wherever conditions permit, be it revolutionary nationalists of various stripes lashing out against the West and their neighbors in other corners of our world.

The failures of our policy in the past have been due to our ever-renewed desire to relax after every great effort, to our hankering after a so-called condition of "normalcy" and "business as usual", to our inability to accept the necessity for vigilance and preparedness over a whole historical period. We are locked in a competitive struggle of long duration and our full acceptance of this prospect is a precondition for our ability to wage it.

SUMMATION

The treaty, as it now stands, may produce the benefits sought by the administration. At best, it is a symbolic act which may ultimately lead to settlement of other cold war problems. I would have preferred it, had the settlement of specific political issues preceded this treaty. That decision, however, rested with others. I would hope that the Senate will state its own interpretation of those articles of the treaty which impinge directly on the vital security interests of the United States.

Should the Senate finally determine that the treaty, in the present international strategic context, poses no unacceptable risks to American security, I recommend ratification with the following stipulations:

First. The Senate should require routine quarterly reports on observance of the treaty on the part of all signatories; on Soviet weapons developments; and on the state of American preparedness to resume nuclear tests. Moreover, the Senate should demand the immediate reporting of any evidence indicating either a violation of the treaty or other "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty."

Second. The Senate should stipulate that ratification of the treaty implies neither American diplomatic recognition of the German Democratic Republic, nor of any claims by the German Democratic Republic to juridical or diplomatic rights under the terms of the treaty.

Third. The Senate shall not look favorably upon any "second step" arms-control agreement which does not embody, in some practicable form, the principle of adequate, and not merely token, international inspection.

(4) The Senate should express its sense as follows: The 90-day waiting period, stipulated in article IV, refers to the formal abrogation of the treaty, but does not prejudice the right of the United States to resume testing in the three environments as soon as possible once it has determined that "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty" have placed the supreme interests of the Nation in jeopardy.

(5) The Senate should express its sense as follows: article I does not affect the use of nuclear weapons in war.

(6) The Senate should express its sense as follows: Article I, section 2, does not mean that the United States is forfeiting the option of transferring nuclear weapons, under proper controls, to its allies.

If the Senate does not accept in essence the foregoing stipulations, I must conclude that ratification of the treaty would be damaging the security of the United States.

ANNEX TO STATEMENT BY DR. ROBERT
STRAUSZ-HUPÉ

Operational and other implications of the treaty

The clause in article IV, which pertains to the right of withdrawal, is not, in itself, objectionable. Given the fact that the treaty is founded upon the principle of national sovereignty and contains no provisions at all for effective international control, each signatory rightly reserves to itself the right of withdrawal. Each party polices the agreement to its own satisfaction. Each gathers its own intelligence and makes its own judgments concerning security. Each is free to withdraw, without a breach of international law, "if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

My misgivings arise out of the last sentence in article IV, which says that the withdrawing party "shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty 3 months in advance." Secretary Rusk furnished one helpful clarification of this sentence in his testimony before this Committee last Monday when he said: "If the Soviet Union were to test in violation of the treaty, the fundamental obligation that is the consideration for our adherence would disappear. In that case the United States could, if it chose, consider itself released from its reciprocal obligation and could resume testing without delay." The Secretary's clarification eliminates one difficulty. But another serious difficulty remains. The situation in which the United States may find it necessary, in the interests of its own security, to resume testing first, is more difficult.

Perhaps I can best explain the reason for my concern by constructing a hypothesis which is not at all far-fetched. Let us suppose that after the treaty goes into effect, the Soviets start producing AICBM's in substantial quantities, deploying them around their cities (as they are already reported to have done in the case of Leningrad), and training crews in their use. At first, American policymakers, relying upon the current estimate of our overwhelming strategic superiority, would probably deprecate Soviet efforts in the antimissile field. I would not be at all surprised if the Soviets themselves should play down the importance of the AICBM, or keep a discreet silence, until after they have made some real headway. But after 2 or 3 years, American defense experts might begin to exhibit a certain amount of concern over the possibility that the Soviets were substantially reducing the American margin of superiority. I am ready to concede that my scenario may leave something to be desired. It does not, for example, take into account other arms control agreements which may be concluded subsequently to this treaty, and which might affect the size of nuclear stockpiles or the number of missiles or the total deliverable megatonnage to be retained by each side. To be sure, in the new international climate which may be ushered in by the treaty, no one can predict with certainty what the relative military positions of the Soviets and ourselves might be 3 years from now. But that is not my point. I simply wish to suggest that there is a conceivable set of circumstances in which our Executive

branch may become sufficiently worried as to conclude that the United States, in prudence, must speed up its own antimissile program by conducting tests in one of the three environments. Under this hypothesis, the Soviets have not been testing in violation of the treaty terms. They have placed the supreme interests of our country in jeopardy by exploiting fully the findings obtained from pretreaty tests. Perhaps those who drafted the treaty had some such contingency in mind when they formulated the phrase, "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty." If the United States should determine that Soviet weapons development, based presumably on the results of pretreaty tests, posed risks to the security of our Nation, I submit that this would constitute an extraordinary event related to the subject matter of the treaty, and that it would, under the wording of article IV, justify an act of withdrawal by the United States, regardless of the fact that the Soviets had not violated the treaty. But once the United States has made an authoritative determination that the supreme national interest has been placed in jeopardy, a question arises as to why 3 months should elapse before tests would be resumed. It seems to me that where national security interests are at stake, the time lapse between the decision and the testing should be limited solely by the state of our technological preparations. If, as we have been assured, the Government expects to sustain a readiness for immediate resumption, then it should resume testing as quickly as possible.

We must recognize frankly that a mandatory delay of 3 months contains a built-in political disadvantage for a democratic society such as the United States. During this period we would probably experience an acrimonious debate between those whose primary concern was preventing an exacerbation of international tensions as a result of U.S. test resumption and those whose primary concern was preserving an adequate security posture for the United States. This would be especially true in those situations—more probable than improbable—in which there would be conflicting reports about whether a violation by the Soviets had actually occurred, or whether other Soviet weapons developments posed a threat to American security. There would be endless arguments over the kind of evidence possessed by Western intelligence sources, the seriousness of the violation or other technological development, and its significance for the international strategic balance. Under these ambiguous circumstances, extremist groups all over the world would have ample opportunity to organize a massive protest against the scheduled resumption of testing by the United States, and the opponents of resumption would issue warnings that we must not outrage world public opinion by canceling the agreement. If we do ratify the test ban treaty, we should not penalize ourselves by inviting controversy after the appropriate authorities have already decided that the supreme interest of the United States has been placed in jeopardy. There should be vigorous and free debate before that determination is made; but once made, this country should not be inhibited from moving as swiftly as possible to remedy whatever deficiencies may appear in its defenses. There is little doubt in my mind that if the Soviets should ever decide to resume testing, and to bear the opprobrium of withdrawing from the treaty publicly, they will do what they did in the late summer of 1961—make the announcement on one day and test the next.

Another serious implication of the treaty is the precedent which it sets for future arms control or disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. This agreement is quite different from the one which our diplomats tried so hard to obtain at Geneva. In the Geneva talks, the central issue was interna-

tional inspection, and on this issue the Soviets and the United States were not able to reach any final agreement. Hence there is no way of knowing whether the Soviets today are any closer to accepting the principle of international inspection in practice than they were 17 years ago, when they turned down the Baruch plan. Not long ago, it was argued that the chief utility of the projected test ban consisted in the fact that it would establish an invaluable precedent for future disarmament agreements, for it would involve the acceptance by Soviet leaders of international inspectors on their soil. Presumably, in adhering to a test ban, the Soviets would be setting aside their traditional phobia of international inspectors as "espionage agents." They would be abandoning their traditional insistence upon the preservation of an excessive national sovereign exclusivism. They would be accepting, even though in modest form, the principle which the United States has insisted upon for 17 years as the basis of any arms agreement, viz, international control and inspection. American analysts have always argued that it would be much safer for the United States to conclude armaments agreements with the Soviets if the latter could be induced gradually to give up their neurotic secrecy complex and to begin opening up their closed society. We were anxious, therefore, to use the test ban agreement to establish a certain kind of precedent. But now, we have signed a test ban agreement which may establish exactly the opposite kind of precedent. Ignoring the question as to whether the absence of an inspection feature in the treaty poses any direct security problems to the United States, we should ask what it signifies for future arms agreements. We cannot fully blame the Soviets: We ourselves proposed a nationally inspected ban on atmospheric tests in April 1959, and a nationally inspected three-environment ban just 1 year ago. But even if the Soviets had accepted either of those proposals, the Senate would have been obliged to examine the significance of a shift from the principle of international inspection to the principle of national policing. We should try to understand what such a shift may portend for the "next steps." I have no way of knowing what those administration officials who have been shaping our national arms control policy within the last 2 years may now be contemplating as logical "next steps," or what proposals may have been exchanged in the post-Cuban correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, or what possibilities may have been explored by East and West in the recent Moscow talks. But you will recall that President John F. Kennedy last November 3, after Khrushchev's pledge to remove Soviet missiles from Cuba, announced that the United States would insist on international ground inspection in Cuba. However, as you know, when we were confronted by Premier Castro's refusal to allow international inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles, the United States dropped its demand. Now we have departed from international inspection in the test ban treaty, except for a ritual mention of the principle in the preamble. Who is to say whether the "next step" might involve nuclear disengagement in Central Europe without effective international inspection and control. It would be a serious lapse from a previously held, and strongly held position, if the United States were to lose interest, for all practical purposes, in international inspection and control as an essential condition of disarmament.

COMMUNIST CONNECTIONS AND INFLUENCES IN THE CURRENT NEGRO DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 2 and 7 I placed in the RECORD

a series of articles showing Communist connections and influences in the current Negro demonstrations, riots, and agitational efforts. On August 13, I placed in the RECORD police reports and other articles dealing with immorality and Communist deception and duplicity in using Negro movements and demonstrations. Today I wish to present to the Senate other tactics used by the Communists to incite and exploit racial tensions—treachery and terrorism.

The activities of Carl Braden and his wife, Anne Braden, fit the master plan of communism to use the Negroes to bring about strife and bloodshed in the United States. The Honorable Dale Alford, of Arkansas, summarized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 2, page 2546, the Bradens' activities with these comments:

Traveling about the South today, distributing the doctrine of totalitarian government, is a husband-wife team by name of Carl and Anne Braden. Carl Braden is free to roam the Nation, these days, because of a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court that Federal statutes against sedition have preempted State sedition laws. Braden is now a field secretary for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which was formed after the SCHW was revealed as a Communist front. As a Communist boss in Louisville, Ky., Carl Braden was indicted on charges of sedition in Jefferson Circuit Court, State of Kentucky. He was convicted in December 1954, subsequently sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment and fined \$5,000. Evidence at the trial, with the prosecution conducted by State's Attorney Scott Hamilton, showed that Braden purchased a home in a suburban Louisville community occupied exclusively by white families and then, transferred ownership to a Negro named Wade. It was further shown at the trial that the home was dynamited on June 27, 1954, and the grand jury determined, after visiting the scene of the crime, that the dynamiting was "an inside job" perpetrated to create an incident. The prosecution maintained that Braden was the "common denominator" of the explosion. Shortly after this home purchasing and bombing incident, Carl Braden received a letter from a comrade who signed his name as "Al," otherwise unidentified in the trial record. The letter stated that the latest project of the Bradens—the Wade home acquisition—constituted a "breach in the wall" of what Comrade Al referred to as "the real estate trust." Al told Carl and Anne their project "left us breathless."

These comments of Mr. Alford are as valid today as in 1959, as the Bradens have appeared in the Negro demonstrations in Danville, Va., as late as last month.

At this point, Mr. President, to show sworn testimony of Carl Braden's Communist Party membership, I shall now read testimony taken in the Jefferson Circuit Court at Louisville, Ky., and used in evidence at his sedition trial in 1954.

Question. I hand you what purports to be a transcript of some testimony taken in the Jefferson Circuit Court, the Criminal Branch of the Second Division, of Kentucky, at Louisville, of December 11, 1954, in a case entitled *Commonwealth of Kentucky v. Carl Braden*, and ask you if that is one of the documents you received?

Answer. It is.

Question. Does that transcript contain any sworn testimony concerning Carl Braden and affiliation with the Communist Party of the United States?

Answer. It does.

Question. Who is the witness who testifies in that regard in that case?

Answer. The witness is known as Alberta Ahern.

Question. Turn to page 2276 of that transcript of testimony and read what that witness swore under oath in regard to Mr. Braden.

Question. Will you please state your name to the court?

Answer. Mrs. Alberta Ahern.

Question. And where do you live, Mrs. Ahern?

Answer. 2311 Payne Street.

Question. And what is your occupation?

Answer. Seamstress.

Question. Mrs. Ahern, I will ask you if you have been employed in an undercover capacity for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Answer. I have.

Question. I will ask you, please whether or not the defendant, Carl Braden, got you into the Communist Party?

Then there was an objection, and—

The COURT. No, that is leading. Objection sustained.

Very well, Your Honor.

Question. Now, you are a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. That's right.

Question. I will ask you if, of your own knowledge, the defendant, Carl Braden, is a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. Mr. Braden is a member of the Communist Party.

Question. Now, Mrs. Ahern, I will ask you whether or not you were a member of the same group or the same cell of the Communist Party in Louisville, Ky., with the defendant, Carl Braden?

Answer. I was.

Question. I will ask you, please, whether or not on July 9 of this year, 1954, you attended a meeting of the Communist Party here in Louisville? If you did, where was that meeting held?

Answer. I attended a Communist Party meeting at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden, 4403 Virginia Avenue, Louisville, Ky.

Question. By Mr. Hawes. Turn, Mr. Strickland, to page 2280 of that transcript of testimony and read what this witness swore under oath further in regard to Mr. Braden. I will ask you if on June 3, 1954, you attended as a member of the Communist Party a called meeting of your cell or group? Did you attend a meeting on June 3, 1954?

Answer. I did.

Question. Where was that meeting held?

Answer. It was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden.

Question. And who were present, please?

Answer. Mr. I. O. Ford, Mr. Carl Braden, and myself.

Now I wish to present to the Senate a résumé of the grand jury investigation on the facts concerning the explosion which occurred at 12:30 a.m., June 27, 1954, at the home of Andrew Wade IV, at Rone Court, near Louisville, Ky. This record is one of the best and most clear-cut examples of crimes committed by Communists interested in causing racial strife between Negroes and whites. It reveals the activities of highly trained saboteurs, trained to expertly detonate explosives by use of a battery, portable-type radio. This was the act of a professional by the name of Vernon Baun, who in the record shows as having served in Spain during the Spanish civil war. He was cited for contempt when he refused to answer whether he had been, or was a Communist.

I ask unanimous consent to have this grand jury report printed at this point in my remarks.

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

RÉSUMÉ OF GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION

(The following is an outline of the facts concerning the grand jury investigation into the explosion which occurred at 12:30 a.m., June 27, 1954, at the home of Andrew Wade IV, at Rone Court, near Louisville, Ky.)

During the late winter or early spring (approximately the first part of March, 1954), Andrew Wade IV and his wife, entered into an agreement with Carl Braden and his wife, Anne, to purchase a house in what might be referred to as a predominantly white residential neighborhood of Louisville, or vicinity. The Wades are young colored people, approximately 30 years of age and the parents of two children, one being about 2 years old, and the other 2 months old. The Bradens are white people, probably in their early forties. Both Braden and his wife formerly were employed by the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, but several years ago Mrs. Braden gave up her employment and Braden severed his relationship with the paper for a period of time, but subsequently was reemployed.

Apparently the Bradens and Wades endeavored to buy one or more houses, but for some reason were unable to complete the transactions. Finally, however, during the month of May 1954, the Bradens represented to a real estate dealer, Mr. Hudson, who was the representative of a Mr. Rone, and also to Mr. Rone that they, the Bradens, desired to purchase a house which recently had been constructed by Mr. Rone. They stated that they desired to move into the house and went so far as to discuss with the real estate agent the possibility of listing their home on Virginia Avenue, in Louisville, with him for sale or rental, knowing all the while that they intended to convey the house to the Wades immediately. The house was, in fact, conveyed to the Wades a short time after it was transferred to the Bradens and, before moving into the house, and before any acts or threats of violence whatsoever had occurred, the Bradens and the Wades, or someone interested in them, sought a police escort to accompany them while they moved. Because there had been neither threats nor violence and, in fact, apparently no one but the Wades and Bradens knew that the Wades intended to move into the house at that time, police protection was denied them. They thereupon moved into the residence, and the investigation has disclosed that at least 18 firearms, made up of high powered rifles, shotguns, and pistols, were taken into the house for the alleged purpose of defending it.

Shortly after the Wades moved into the residence, a cross was burned in an adjoining field, and the identity of three young white men was established as being the persons who burned it. Thereafter a rock was thrown through a window of the Wade house, and rifle shots were fired into the front door. The identity of the persons responsible for the shooting has not been established, although some people seem to believe that this was done to create trouble, rather than as an effort to frighten the Wades into moving from the neighborhood. The three young men involved in the cross burning readily admitted that they did this, and stated that it was somewhat of a prank and done on the spur of the moment. One or two of the three involved in this incident live in the immediate neighborhood.

Immediately after the first act of violence occurred, the Jefferson County Police furnished police protection all around the clock, keeping a man at the scene at all times. In

addition, the occupants of the house likewise had persons, both white and colored, to stay on the premises to guard the residence. A committee, made up of both white and colored people, was formed for the alleged purpose of stimulating interest in the protection of the Wades and their right to live wherever they desired. It developed that many of these persons had a reputation of being Communist sympathizers or active Communists.

This committee sought to obtain the support of the NAACP, and we have been informed that this organization would not participate in the movement.

One of the persons who was active in the group was one Vernon Bown, whose true name is Vernon Baun. He also has used the name of Vernon Brown. He has resided in Kentucky only approximately a year and a half, and from the investigation, has lived for comparatively short times in other parts of the United States, among them, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, and New York. This man was in the merchant marine during the war, and also served in Spain during the civil war in that country. Bown, a white man, volunteered to act as a guard at the Wade residence. He gave up his living quarters and moved into the house. Either shortly before, or shortly after moving into the Wade home, Bown purchased and took there, a battery, portable-type radio. After the explosion, which occurred at exactly 12:30 a.m., this radio was found beneath the house and the speaker was missing. We have been informed that dynamite can be discharged by using a radio such as this, and the electronic authorities say that the fact that the speaker is missing is significant, that apparently being a possible source of current to set off the explosive.

Bown refused to testify before the grand jury in response to whether or not he is, or had been, a Communist, whether or not he ever had been beneath the house, and whether or not he ever had taken a radio underneath the house. His refusal to answer was based on the fifth amendment, and section 11 of the Kentucky Constitution, on the ground that his answers might be self-incriminating. Bown was indicted for contempt of court when he refused to answer certain other questions after the Court had instructed him to answer.

Our investigation disclosed that Bown had not known the Wades before moving into the premises. He had been, and after the explosion again was living with one I. O. Ford, who moved to Louisville from Paducah within the past year or two. When the officers went to his residence to execute the bench warrant for his arrest, they saw certain communistic literature in the living room, and upon making a further search, found what might be referred to as a huge quantity of communistic literature, letters, and records, which indicated that both Bown and Ford were Communists.

Among the papers found was a letter, a photostatic copy of which, marked "Exhibit I" is attached hereto, from a person in California to Ford, calling his attention to the fact that the residence of a colored family in or about Los Angeles had been damaged by explosives, and further pointing out that it had caused a great deal of trouble in that community.

Exhibit II is a photostatic copy of an undated letter, which, by reference to certain facts contained therein, is believed to have been written on July 5, 1954. In this letter Ford is congratulated for the work he is doing in Louisville. We believe this pertains to the explosion at the Wade residence on June 27, 1954.

Exhibits III and IV consist of a newspaper clipping of an explosion which occurred at a grocery owned by a colored man in eastern Kentucky, and a typewritten letter, signed "G," and mailed from Lexington, Ky., to Braden, in Louisville. Written in longhand

beside the clipping is a notation concerning the disturbance this caused and, in parentheses, it is stated that the writer of the letter was 20 miles away when the explosion occurred.

In addition to Bown, the Bradens, and Ford, at least two other persons whom we believe to be Communists, were active on the Wade committee. They both came to Louisville from Indianapolis some time ago after the loyalty of either one or both was questioned in that city. Both Miss Gilbert and Miss Spiker were called before the grand jury and at first refused to be sworn and were sent to jail for contempt of court. After spending approximately 3 hours in jail, Louise Gilbert sent word to the court by her attorney, Grover Sales, of Louisville, that she would be sworn and thereupon purged herself of the contempt charge. After being sworn, she refused to testify concerning her Communist connections on the ground that it might incriminate her. Miss Spiker spent a day and night in jail and finally sent word to the court that she, too, would be sworn and, after being sworn, she, too, refused to answer such questions on the ground that the answers might incriminate her.

Due to certain references in letters concerning Ford, particularly praising him for work that he has done on the picket line, and considering the fact that he moved to Louisville from Paducah comparatively recently, we are wondering if he might not have had some connection with all of the labor trouble that has existed at the atomic energy project at Paducah.

The grand jury and the officials conducting the investigation were dismayed at certain statements made by a radio and television commentator on the stations connected with the Louisville Times and Courier-Journal. Copies of two scripts are attached hereto, marked for identification, exhibit V and exhibit VI.

We also were dismayed at the editorial policy of these two papers, both of which are owned by the same individual, and are the only newspapers of general circulation in this community. Two editorials, marked exhibit VII and exhibit VIII, regarding the Wade case are attached hereto. Also attached, and identified as exhibit IX, is another editorial which pertains to a bill introduced by the attorney general at the last session of the legislature for the control of subversive organizations in this State. We do not charge anyone connected with the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times as knowingly encouraging or condoning the activities of Communists and Communist sympathizers but, as stated, all concerned were dismayed at the stand taken by these papers and their satellite radio and television stations.

The executive committee of the Louisville Bar Association adopted a resolution commending the grand jury for its work and, in substance, criticized the editorial position above referred to.

At the outset of the investigation, it was made clear to all concerned that there were at least two possible motives for the commission of this crime, one being that the white residents of the neighborhood were endeavoring to cause these Negroes to move, and the other that it was committed by persons interested in causing racial strife in and about Louisville. This community has not, in many, many years, had any trouble to speak of between the white and Negro people living here.

It also has been significant that the conflicts between the statements of various witnesses only occurred between those who might be suspected of causing the trouble for the purpose of effecting racial difficulties and was noticeably absent among the other witnesses.

The grand jury called before it 53 individual witnesses, and some of these were re-

called. The grand jury called, among other witnesses, those who were interested in the Wades' behalf, and every name which was submitted by the Wades, even though these people could give no reason as to why they should have been called as witnesses. In many of these instances, the Wades alleged that various individuals they demanded the grand jury call, had been seen riding past their house with "an evil look." Actually, when these witnesses testified, they knew nothing whatsoever concerning the matter, and were not even residents of the neighborhood. The only people asked concerning Communist connections were those whom we had reason to believe were so connected, or were Communist sympathizers, and they, without exception had prepared statements ready to hand to newspaper reporters and, on each occasion, wanted to make speeches in open court. The law in Kentucky provides that grand jury proceedings shall be held in secret, and the only publicity given in this matter was brought on those who were publicized by their own actions.

Among the facts which caused the grand jury to investigate the possibility of Communist involvement are the following: The house was under guard as above stated; the radio with the missing speaker was found underneath the house; there was no outside fuse; the explosion was located under the house near a wall which was on the opposite side of the only means of entrance. These items, together with Bown's refusal to state whether or not he had been under the house—and we might say that it can be established that he had been—and his failure to state whether or not he ever had taken a radio under the house, would seem to cause a reasonable person to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that Bown set off the explosion. It also is significant that the occupants of the house were on the outside porch, on the opposite side from where the explosion occurred; and had taken their 2-year-old child to stay with its grandparents that night. The reason given for this was so the child could go to Sunday school the next morning.

Based upon the evidence developed from this investigation, the grand jury indicted Vernon Bown for blowing up the house and also for advocating and teaching sedition and criminal syndicalism. The grand jury also indicted Larue Spiker, Louise Gilbert, I. O. Ford, Carl Braden, and Anne Braden for advocating sedition.

Large quantities of Communist material were found at the residence of the Bradens and the residences of Ford and Bown. Some was found at the home of Larue Spiker and Louise Gilbert.

The following are only a few samples of the material found:

1. "Exhibit of Bacteriological War Crimes Committed by the Government of the United States of America." This was printed in Peiping, China, by the Chinese People's Committee for World Peace.
2. "How To Be a Good Communist."
3. "Thirteen Communists Speak to the Court."
4. "Constitution of the U.S.S.R."
5. Soviet Literature, a monthly magazine printed in Moscow.

There were other articles of the same nature, too numerous to mention.

Exhibit X, attached, is a photostatic copy of a letter apparently written by a man in Lexington, Ky., to I. O. Ford relating to the situation in the coal fields in the Eastern United States. It will be noted that in this letter the writer admits that they are Communists, Marxists, etc., and points out that the miners are fertile subjects for exploitation by the Communists.

Exhibit VI, also attached, is a photostatic of a letter dated October 1, 1954, signed "KL," and written on two sides of the page, and photostated in that way, addressed to I. O.

Ford. The envelope was postmarked "Los Angeles, Calif." and the letter expresses concern about the communistic material being found in Ford's home and refers to Ford having been on the picket line and also performing other duties.

It is the opinion of the grand jury and the officials that this presents a very serious situation and, in conformity with the recommendations of the Jefferson County Grand Jury of September 1954, a copy of this statement, the attached exhibits, and the grand jury report is being forwarded to those who are interested in such matters. We believe that this matter should be pursued by the Federal authorities, since it does relate to national security, and apparently concerns persons in other parts of the country.

Respectfully submitted.

A. SCOTT HAMILTON,
Commonwealth's Attorney,
30th Judicial District of Kentucky.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Carl Braden, except for action by the U.S. Supreme Court, would today be in jail where he belongs instead of being field secretary for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, associated with Rev. Martin Luther King, and causing racial strife and agitation throughout the South. The Kentucky telephone directory lists the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., at 4403 Virginia Avenue, Louisville, Ky., telephone number SPing 4-3331. The same directory lists the same address and same telephone number for Carl Braden.

The present activities of Carl and Ann Braden are clearly outlined in the following news articles and columns: "Commies Recruiting Members in Hinds?" Jackson Daily News, September 1, 1962; "Southern Conference Educational Fund, led by Shuttlesworth, called Red Trent," the Danville Register, July 11, 1963; "White Women Exhorters Are Known Left Wingers," the Danville Register, July 17, 1963; "Moses Admits He is Carl Braden's Friend," Jackson Clarion Ledger; two columns by Jack Lotto, "U.S. Commies Seek Freedom for Buddies" which appeared in the Houston Chronicle and "Dixie Drive by Pro-Reds," Los Angeles Herald Examiner.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have these news items printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News,
Sept. 1, 1962]

COMMIES RECRUITING MEMBERS IN HINDS?
APPLICATION FORM AT WORKSHOP CITED

(By James M. Ward)

REGISTRATION BLANK: ADULT EDUCATION WORKSHOPS CONDUCTED BY THE MISSISSIPPI ADULT EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Name.....
Age.....
Street address.....
City.....
State.....
Telephone.....

I. If you are a student:

1. What school are you attending?.....

2. What is your classification?.....

Freshman sophomore junior senior.....

16. Do your political views differ basically from those of your parents? Yes No

Do they approve of your working in programs for the greater equality of the races? Yes No

Do they or have they participated in such programs themselves? Yes No

17. Do you think that the Negro has a better life in Mississippi — or in Africa —?

18. If you had the opportunity to move to Africa, would you be willing to do so? Yes No

19. Do you think that a transition to the Communist system of government would better or worsen the lot of the Negro in Mississippi? Better Worsen

20. Do you think that the need to improve the lot of the poor white is greater than —, equal to —, or less than — the need to improve the lot of the poor Negro in the South?

SEMINAR REGISTRATION FORM

The Jackson Daily News has intercepted an inflammatory registration form to be completed by Negroes attending "workshops" and "seminars" that are conducted under the sponsorship of Carl Braden, an identified Communist who recently visited Mississippi to drum up support for voter registration and integration activity. The Braden meetings are being held at Mount Beulah Christian College near Edwards, Tougaloo Christian College, and other points throughout the State. Special attention is called to question No. 19.

At a "voter registration" workshop held at Mount Beulah Christian Institute near Edwards under the sponsorship of Carl Braden, an identified Communist and field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, an inflammatory registration blank was passed out for prospective participants.

A source qualified in such activity said the questionnaire has all the earmarks of a snare for Communist Party membership.

Soliciting various personal background data on candidates for the workshop, the registration blank also asks for information on the participant's desire to engage in voter registration work and agitation for integration in schools, churches, and private facilities.

The explosive portions come near the end of the long form with such questions as:

"Do your political views differ basically from those of your parents. Do they approve of your working in programs for the greater equality of the races?"

"Do you think that the Negro has a better life in Mississippi — or in Africa —?"

"If you had the opportunity to move to Africa, would you be willing to do so?"

"Do you think that a transition to the Communist system of government would better or worsen the lot of the Negro in Mississippi?"

WHAT IT MEANS

An authority on subversion said the latter question was highly interesting. After giving a group of Negroes a heated lecture on how they are being mistreated they would tend to answer they favored a transition to the Communist system. If they did answer in that manner, they were then considered ripe prospects for recruitment into the party. If they signed "yes" and later changed their mind, their original answer could be used as blackmail to make them conform to party discipline and the victim could be used as a dupe.

The questionnaire was used at Mount Beulah in connection with an adult education workshop conducted by the Mississippi Adult Education Committee.

A confidential report by Carl Braden published in full in yesterday's Jackson Daily News revealed Braden instrumental in set-

ting up the workshop and Braden reported that he and Bob Moses, 27-year-old Negro native of New York who has been active in integration attempts in Mississippi within the past 2 years, recruited participants, signing up some 50 to 75 people.

Moses was arrested in Indianola yesterday on a charge of passing out handbills without a permit. Police said he went to jail and made no effort to post the \$50 cash bond necessary to be released.

Braden has revealed that he will return to Mississippi in the near future to set up a special workshop at Mount Beulah to plan means of getting the maximum amount of national publicity on "violence and police brutality" in Mississippi.

In connection with his plan, Braden said: "The continued (police) beatings have caused the leadership people in the State to see the great need for a constant stream of reports going out across the country."

Braden's deep interest in voter registration, integration of schools, churches, and private places is not new. Upon release from a Federal prison last February he has resumed a busy schedule of agitation in the South.

Much of the planning for his current crusade was made at a conference on "The Deep South: Ways and Means to Integration" at Birmingham last April 13-14.

The conference was sponsored by the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee and the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.

Participants on the program included Bishop Edgar A. Love, president, Southern Conference Educational Fund, Baltimore; Aubrey W. Williams, president emeritus, who made a financial reward to the Reverend F. L. Shuttlesworth, president, Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights and agitation leader in Alabama; Miles Horton, director of the Highlander Center at Monteagle, Tenn., an institution that was closed by the State of Tennessee upon exposure of its pro-Communist training work.

Braden's chief role at the Birmingham rally was to explain his plan for "getting better and fuller coverage in the news media."

Listed on the printed program was the Reverend Murray Cox, Gulfport minister and chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Reverend Cox, like Braden, has an intensive dislike for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He recently was a cosigner of an ad in the New York Times urging abolition of the committee.

Reverend Cox did not attend the meeting due to "a conflict" but he said he gave his name to be used as a participant.

Highlander Folk School, shut down by Tennessee as a public nuisance, is out of business and its property is being auctioned.

With Braden's intensive interest in Mount Beulah near Edwards and Tougaloo College, is the successor to Highlander Folk School to be established at one or both institutions?

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, July 11, 1963]

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE EDUCATIONAL FUND,
LED BY SHUTTLESWORTH, CALLED RED FRONT

The man who substituted for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as the speaker at a rally here last week to protest segregation has been identified as head of a big pro-Communist front, according to a Cincinnati newspaper.

In an article published Sunday, June 9, in the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth was identified as the new president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund.

According to the article, both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities

have described the SCEF as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

This has been confirmed, according to City Manager T. E. Temple, who received a copy of the article.

The same news item notes that new additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund include the Reverend James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla., and father of Bob Zellner, a young white man who has been active in the demonstration movement here. Young Zellner is among 13 who have been indicted for inciting racial violence as a result of the demonstrations.

The article also points out that the field secretary for the SCEF is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky., who was among the speakers at a rally here March 26 when King was the featured speaker.

King reportedly is expected here today. He was to be the speaker at a rally July 3 but was replaced by Shuttlesworth after canceling out the previous night.

Shuttlesworth vowed at the time he would return here "and march" but local leaders say he will not be among the group accompanying King here today.

According to the Cincinnati newspaper, Shuttlesworth is pastor of a church in the Ohio city. However, he has become better known as a leader in the Birmingham, Ala., integration movement. He was identified here as national secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which King heads, and president of the Alabama Christian Movement.

Asked for comment by the Enquirer, Shuttlesworth said: "To a segregationist, integration means communism. I can think of nothing more un-American than the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

Following is the text of the Cincinnati Enquirer article (written by Jack Lotto):

"One of the top leaders of the integration movement in the South has been named head of a big pro-Communist front.

"He is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth (965 Dana Avenue), pastor of the Revelation Baptist Church, 1556 John Street.

"The post he was elected to is president of the 'Southern Conference Educational Fund,' with headquarters in New Orleans, and active in 17 Southern States.

"Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to 'promote communism' throughout the South.

"This group has a long history of activity in the South. It originally was known as the 'Southern Conference for Human Welfare.' One of its founders was a veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham.

"When the SCHW was cited as a Communist front in 1947 by the House committee, it ostensibly went out of business.

"It quickly reopened at the same New Orleans address, under the new name and with the same telephone number.

"According to the Senate subcommittee, the Southern Conference Educational Fund was 'operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes' of its predecessor.

"Said the House report on the SCHW:

"It seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. Its professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

"The field secretary for the SCEF, and editor of its publications, 'The Southern Patriot,' is Carl Braden of Louisville, Ky. Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, recently finished serving a 1-year prison term for contempt of Congress.

"New additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund included the Reverend James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla. He is the father of Bob Zellner, the 'freedom-walker' active in the 'Student Non-Violence Committee' and now serving a jail term in Alabama.

"Another board member is Mrs. Diane Bevel of Cleveland, Miss., active in Nashville student demonstrations, and currently working in Alabama and Mississippi.

"She is jailed in Gadsden, Ala., for taking part with Zellner in a prointegration march, following in the steps of William Moore, the postman shot and killed during a one-man protest march.

"Communists and pro-Communists are moving into the South to provoke friction between whites and Negroes. On the scene is James E. Jackson, a member of the four-man secretariat of the U.S. Communist party.

"Jackson, who is propaganda boss in the United States for the Reds, is also the party's secretary for southern and Negro affairs—a polite term for chief racial troublemaker.

"This Moscow-trained Negro has been in the forefront of Communist organizational and agitational work in the South for years.

"In 1959, he went to Russia as representative of the U.S. Communist party at the 21st World Congress of Communist Parties. There, he hailed the Soviet Union and denounced the United States."

Following is the statement given the Enquirer by Shuttlesworth:

"I do not intend to become involved in verbal gymnastics with those, who for years, have prided themselves and made themselves famous for slandering the character of others without proof and for making a mockery of the democratic process which says a man is innocent until proven guilty.

"I have the highest regard for this organization (SCEF), for the work it has done since I have been a member of the board, and I have seen nothing on the part of any persons, with whom I have been associated, to give any substantiation to these charges.

"Generally, the House committees are governed by southerners who will label any organization subversive or communistic that seeks to further the American aims of integration, justice, and fairplay.

"To a segregationist, integration means communism. I can think of nothing more un-American than the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

[The Danville (Va.) Register, July 17, 1963]
WHITE WOMEN EXHORTERS ARE KNOWN LEFT-
WINGERS

Anne Braden addressed Danville Negroes last night at St. Pauls AME Church. Two weeks ago, Dorothy Day spoke to them at High Street Baptist Church.

Both women have numerous leftwing connections.

Mrs. Braden, for instance, is the wife of Carl Braden, a man who has been identified as a Communist and who has served a prison sentence for contempt of Congress.

A woman who did undercover work for the FBI testified in court both Mrs. Braden and her husband were members of a Communist cell.

Mrs. Braden, a 1943 graduate of Stratford College was described by her husband as editor of the Southern Patriot when the latter accompanied Martin Luther King to Danville in March.

The Southern Patriot is published in Atlanta. It formerly was an organ of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, an organization which went out of existence after the House Un-American Activities Committee described it as a Communist front.

Carl Braden was associated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Now he is field secretary of the Southern

Conference Education Fund, which has been described in Congress "as an organization set up to 'promote communism' throughout the State." When the SCEF was founded, it had the same address and telephone number formerly used by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

The Washington Star of December 12, 1954, carried an Associated Press dispatch telling about Carl Braden's trial. It read in part as follows:

"LOUISVILLE, Ky., December 11.—Newspaperman Carl Braden was branded a Communist today by a surprise rebuttal witness testifying at his sedition trial.

"Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, 44, a Louisville seamstress, said she had been doing undercover work for the FBI in a Communist cell of which both Braden and his wife, Anne, were members.

"Braden testified earlier in the week he was not a Communist and had never been one."

"Dorothy Day, editor of the 'Catholic Worker,' is a woman who frequently lends her name to leftwing causes.

For instance, she was one of the signers of a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson when the cases of the latter two were before the Supreme Court on appeal in February 1961. Wilkinson is head of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and has been identified as a Communist.

Miss Day is sponsor of an organization known as Friends of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and was present at a reception for the Flynn woman on March 29 at the Belmont Plaza Hotel in New York City. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is chairman of the Communist Party of the United States.

According to the Communist Party organ Daily Worker on May 12, 1963, Miss Day praised "The Alderson Story," a biography of Elizabeth G. Flynn.

The Brooklyn Tablet on October 20, 1962, carried an article in which it was stated Miss Day had made a trip to Cuba and attacked American policy toward Cuba.

In the June 18, 1963, issue of the weekly magazine National Review, a book review of Garry Wills described her in this manner:

"Dorothy Day goes among the poor to prove things about poverty and anarchy that the poor would be the last to believe in—as she went to Cuba last year to help the Cubans by pointing out to them how Castro resembles Christ."

Priscilla L. Buckley, managing editor of National Review, yesterday called Miss Day politically very naive and a far-left passivist who, in her peace-promotion efforts, will do such things as refuse to take shelter during civil defense test alerts.

She described the Catholic Worker, which Miss Day edits and publishes as a tiny little mimeographed sheet that is totally lay and is neither sponsored nor connected with the Catholic Church. The Catholic Worker, she said follows fairly closely to the Communist line on peace.

Shortly after the execution of the Red spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the Catholic Worker carried an article written by Miss Day entitled "Meditation on the Death of the Rosenbergs."

This article said, in part: "They were children of that race in which Mary and Jesus and Joseph, the Holy Family, belonged. In their humanity, they more closely resembled Jesus than we do who are not Jews. Let us have no part with the vindictive state and let us pray for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg."

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger]
MOSES ADMITS HE IS CARL BRADEN'S FRIEND

GREENVILLE.—Voter registration worker Robert Moses of New York testified Thursday he was a friend of Carl Braden and had

seen him recently at a workshop sponsored by the Southern Conference Education Fund.

Moses' testimony came during a hearing before Federal District Judge Claude Clayton on a Justice Department suit seeking release of 45 Negroes arrested during a march at Itta Bena last month.

A. H. Bell, attorney for the Leflore County Board of Supervisors, questioned Moses about his connections with Braden and the SCEF, which a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee cited as a Communist-front group. Braden refused to answer questions about whether he was a Communist.

Moses testified he was not a Communist. Asked about Braden, a Louisville, Ky., man, the 28-year-old Moses said, "I consider him a friend." He also said he had seen Braden recently at a SCEF workshop at Atlanta.

The hearing was expected to continue several days.

Defending the county were Bell and Assistant State Attorney General Guy Rogers. Representing the Justice Department were special Assistant Attorney General John Doar and Attorney John Martin.

Moses, a New York City Negro, said he was in Mississippi "because I'm interested in helping my people in Harlem. If Mississippi Negroes can defeat with their votes the men in Congress who block and defeat worthwhile legislation, then all Negroes will benefit."

He also said he came "to help alleviate injustice" and said he felt Mississippi voting laws were unjust.

Moses, a field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was questioned about food distributed to needy Negroes by SNCC in Leflore County this spring.

Asked if SNCC required recipients to seek registration as voters, Moses said:

"We required that a minimum requirement because there was a shortage of food and we didn't have enough to go around. But there were cases of great individual need when we gave the food without requiring that * * *."

Asked if SNCC workers had credit cards for use in telephoning the Justice Department, Moses said they did not and:

"We usually pay for the calls ourselves. When there is a matter that the Justice Department is particularly interested in, we sometimes call collect."

He said "SNCC workers were paid expenses, room and board, and \$10 a week when we have the money."

Also testifying were workers Willie Baxter, 19-year-old Itta Bena woman, and Willie H. Magee, 22, also from Itta Bena. They were among the 27 Leflore County prisoners called to testify.

The woman said a tear gas bomb was thrown into an Itta Bena church June 18 while a voter meeting was in progress.

Magee testified the group decided after that to go looking for police protection. He said at one point they found an officer 2 blocks from the church, so returned to continue the meeting.

But, he said, "the church was full of gas and we came out again. The officer we saw, I don't know who he was, was gone, so we decided to go looking for protection, walking two by two."

He said another group of Negroes began throwing bottles and bricks at them and the arrests followed. Officers testified the original group did the throwing.

Magee said he had never been intimidated by Leflore officials because of his activities and the officials had not interfered with his meetings.

Asked if the group had been refused police protection, he said, "I don't know."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, 1962] U.S. COMMIES SEEK FREEDOM FOR BUDDIES (By Jack Lotto)

Pro-Communists and their supporters are doing their Christmas shopping early this year.

They have asked President Kennedy to play Santa Claus and free two identified Communists jailed for contempt of Congress.

Red sympathizers and/or dupes are working also to get the general public behind their petitions for Executive clemency.

In effect, the groups trying to open prison doors for Frank Wilkinson of Los Angeles and Carl Braden of Louisville, Ky., want the President to slap the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Freeing the defiant pair could be interpreted as a sign of Presidential disapproval of the committee.

Wilkinson is the coordinator of the intensive nationwide pro-Red effort to destroy or utterly discredit the important House group.

He and Braden, active in the South, were jailed for 1 year for refusing to answer any committee questions, including whether they were party members.

The U.S. Supreme Court upheld their convictions. They began serving their terms May 1.

At least four groups are distributing signature petitions for clemency. They are the New York Council to Abolish the House Un-American Activities, the Los Angeles Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights and the Southern Educational Fund, headquartered in New Orleans.

A few days ago, two delegations turned over petitions collected so far to President Kennedy's special counsel.

One delegation was headed by Prof. Otto Nathan of New York. Nathan, executor of the late Albert Einstein estate, has refused to affirm or deny Communist Party membership in congressional appearances.

Braden is field secretary of the Southern Conference Education Fund, cited officially as a national Communist front by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Identified under oath as a Red, Braden also was active in the drive to abolish the House committee.

The biggest Red front leading the operation to kill the House subversion-probing committee is the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

ECLC Chairman Harvey O'Connor, of Little Compton, R.I., is soon starting a coast-to-coast tour to drum up public support for his pals and collect funds.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner]

DIXIE DRIVE BY PRO-REDS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the Herald-Examiner brings you this authoritative weekly roundup.)

(By Jack Lotto)

One of the top leaders of the integration movement in the South has been named head of a pro-Communist front.

He is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, of Birmingham, Ala.

The post he was elected to is president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, headquartered in New Orleans, and active in 17 Southern States.

LONG HISTORY

Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

This group has a long history of activity in the South. It originally was known as

the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. One of its founders was a veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham.

When the SCHW was cited as a Communist front in 1947 by the House committee, it ostensibly went out of business.

It quickly reopened at the same New Orleans address, under the new name and with the same telephone number.

According to the Senate subcommittee, the Southern Conference Education Fund was "operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes" of its predecessor.

Said the House report on the SCHW—"It seeks to attract Southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. Its professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The field secretary for the SCEF, and editor of its publication, The Southern Patriot, is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky. Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, recently finished serving a 1-year prison term for contempt of Congress.

OTHERS

New additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund included the Rev. James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla. He is the father of "Freedom Walker" Bob Zellner, active in the "student nonviolence committee," and now serving a jail term in Alabama.

Another board member is Mrs. Diane Bevel, of Cleveland, Miss., active in Nashville student demonstrations, and currently working in Alabama and Mississippi.

She was jailed in Gadsden, Ala., for taking part with Zellner in a prointegration march, following in the steps of postman William Moore, who was shot and killed during a one-man protest march.

Communists and pro-Communists are moving into the South to provoke friction between whites and Negroes. On the scene is James E. Jackson, a member of the four-man ruling secretariat of the U.S. Communist Party.

MOSCOW-TRAINED

Jackson, who is propaganda boss in the United States for the Reds, is also the party's secretary for Southern and Negro affairs.

This Moscow-trained Negro has been in the forefront of Communist organizational and agitational work in the South for many years.

In 1959, he went to Russia as the representative of the U.S. Communist Party at the 21st World Congress of Communist Parties. There, he hailed the Soviet Union and denounced the United States.

[From The Worker, Dec. 3, 1960]

RALLY TO ABOLISH THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE—TO URGE CHRISTMAS CLEMENCY FOR FRANK WILKINSON AND CARL BRADEN—TO PAY TRIBUTE TO FIRST AMENDMENT DEFENDANTS WHO HAVE FOR YEARS FOUGHT IN THE COURTS AGAINST HUAC AND SIMILAR COMMITTEES

Speakers: Prof. Fowler Harper, Yale Law School, civil liberties; James Higgins, assistant editor, York, Pa., Gazette & Daily Advocate; Ring Lardner, Jr., Academy Award Winner screenwriter; Ernst Mazey, Detroit Trade Union Official; Pete Seeger, folklorist and singer, first amendment defendant; Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, Birmingham, Ala., integration leader; Gore Vidal, playwright, author, "The Best Man"; Mrs. Frank Wilkinson, wife of HUAC abolition leader.

Place: Wednesday, December 6, 8 p.m. sharp, Manhattan Center, 34th Street and 8th Avenue. Contribution 99 cents.

Auspices: New York Council to Abolish HUAC, 150 W 34th Street, New York, Staten Island. Dr. Otto Nathan, chairman; Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, honorary chairman; Rev. Lee H. Ball, treasurer and Youth To Abolish HUAC; Mrs. Sandra Rosenblum, chairman. Telephone PE 6-3228.

Contribute to New York Council To Abolish HUAC, 150 West 34th Street, New York 1, N.Y.

I enclose \$_____ for _____ tickets at 99 cents each December 6 rally.

Name _____

Address _____

Make checks payable to Rev. Lee H. Ball, treasurer.

Mr. THURMOND. Having placed in the RECORD certain information on Mr. Braden and his connections with the Negro demonstration movements, I call to the attention of my colleagues another example of a direct connection of a supposed former Communist with the proposed August 28 march on Washington as exposed in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland, Ohio, on August 16, 1963. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article entitled "Two Freedom March Buses Booked by Admitted Red: Reinthaler Acts Here for CORE" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TWO FREEDOM MARCH BUSES BOOKED BY ADMITTED RED—REINTHALER ACTS HERE FOR CORE

(By William C. Barnard)

Eric J. Reinthaler, who has admitted Communist Party affiliations, has been identified by Cleveland police as the reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups sending freedom march buses to a mass Negro demonstration in Washington on August 28.

Reinthal, 39, a longtime participant in civil rights movements here, has a long record of affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations, police said yesterday.

In a 1958 trial Reinthal admitted he had been a Communist up until 1954.

Members of the Cleveland department's special investigation unit said Reinthal identified himself as the contract agent for the Cleveland chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant Negro civil rights organization, in the chartering of two Greyhound buses for the trip.

CORE has announced it will send 78 persons to Washington to participate in the freedom march. The 2 CORE buses are part of a cavalcade of 8 chartered buses and a private plane that will be taking more than 350 Clevelanders to the Nation's Capital for the Negro civil rights demonstration.

Civil rights leaders have said that more than 100,000 persons from scores of cities will participate in the protest.

The Cleveland delegation is being organized by a newly formed civil rights group, the United Freedom Movement (UFM). A spokesman for UFM last night denied knowledge of Reinthal's role with CORE and said UFM's arrangements were not connected with CORE.

Following Plain Dealer efforts to reach Reinthal and other CORE officers, a call was received from Bruce Warshal, who identified himself as vice president of Cleveland's CORE chapter. He made this statement:

"CORE has certain admission requirements which Reinthal has met. We ask two questions of prospective members: (1) Do you believe in civil rights and equality be-

tween the races? (2) Do you believe unequivocally in nonviolence?

"Every member is asked this and we do not ask what his other affiliations are or have been."

Lt. Martin P. Cooney and Sgt. John J. Ungvary of the special investigation unit of the police department said Reinthal made arrangements for the buses through a travel agent. At that time he left a \$50 deposit.

Last Saturday Reinthal and an official of CORE sent a telegram to the agent confirming the arrangements, the officers said. In the telegram Reinthal listed himself as the contract agent for CORE and gave his home phone number, they said.

In 1958 Reinthal and six other persons were convicted on charges of conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law in U.S. district court here.

The seven were found guilty of conspiracy to file false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board. U.S. District Judge Paul C. Welch, now an appellate judge, sentenced Reinthal to 18 months in the Federal prison at Milan, Mich., and fined him \$2,500. Reinthal served the term after losing higher court appeals.

Reinthal was identified in the trial as an officer of a Cleveland local of the United Electrical Workers which was expelled in 1948 from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, now merged into the AFL-CIO. The Taft-Hartley law requires union officers to submit affidavits stating whether they ever were Communist Party members.

In the trial, Reinthal admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various periods from 1938 to 1954. He said he was a member of the Communist Party in Cleveland, Steubenville and Youngstown and had been a Communist organizer in the Steubenville area.

The Reverend Charles W. Rawlings, director of the Office of Religion and Race of the Cleveland Presbytery, who is assisting in the UFM protest cavalcade, said: "We cannot stop fighting for racial justice because these causes have been exploited by organizations such as the Communist Party for their self-interest."

Clarence H. Holmes, president of the Cleveland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and leader of UFM, said he was surprised that CORE was sending its own buses. He said all arrangements for the civil rights movement in Cleveland were to be coordinated by the UFM.

The Plain Dealer was unable to reach Reinthal last night for comment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks additional articles from the Plain Dealer as follows:

"Reinthal Joined Communists Twice; Was Only 14 First Time," on August 16, 1963.

"UFM Brass Denies Link to Reinthal," on August 16, 1963.

"CORE Weighs No Policy Change," on August 17, 1963.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these articles an excerpt from hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on legislation to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and dated February 26, 1958.

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

UFM BRASS DENIES LINK TO REINTHALER

Leaders of the United Freedom Movement, which is sending 363 Clevelanders to Wash-

ington for the August 28 March for Freedom demonstration, yesterday denied any ties with Eric J. Reinthal who has arranged for two buses to take part.

"Our six buses are completely separate from the two being sent by the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)," explained Mrs. Carlebell Cook, general chairman for the UFM Washington project.

Mrs. Cook was called by the Plain Dealer following disclosure by Cleveland police that Reinthal, who has admitted Communist ties in the past, figured in the CORE bus arrangements.

"The first I knew that CORE was sending buses was when I read it in the newspapers," said Mrs. Cook, who is employed at city hall as director of manpower retraining for the city.

"I never even heard of Eric J. Reinthal," she said. "We are screening out all who would violate the spirit of this march. The purpose is peaceful throughout. Only responsible citizens sincerely interested in civil rights will ride on our buses."

When asked whether he knew of Reinthal's Communist background, Arthur Evans, Jr., chairman of the arrangements for CORE's Freedom March activity, said: "I don't think it's my responsibility to tell you that."

Later Evans said: "I know him as a member of the local chapter of CORE. What other organizations he had belonged to was no concern of mine."

Mrs. Cook has been busy taking reservations from individuals for the UFM buses at the Cleveland office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 9293 Cedar Avenue SE. She said reservations for the CORE buses would not be accepted there.

Both CORE and NAACP are part of the United Freedom Movement, a federation of more than 30 organizations active in the civil rights field. It was formed several months ago under leadership of the NAACP to gain Negro rights in housing, education, and employment.

Nationally, CORE and the NAACP have been feuding. The NAACP's traditional approach to obtain Negro rights has been through the courts. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 ruling out segregated schools crowned these efforts by the NAACP. CORE on the other hand, uses direct action such as sit-ins.

The maverick CORE buses, two in number, are priced at \$12.50 per seat. The UFM buses will leave Cleveland at 7 p.m. August 27 from the Karam House parking lot 2355 East 89th Street. The CORE buses leave at midnight from the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian), 11205 Euclid Avenue.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 16, 1963]

REINTHALER JOINED COMMUNISTS TWICE; WAS ONLY 14 FIRST TIME

Eric J. Reinthal, who is listed as a bus contract agent for the Cleveland branch of the Congress of Racial Equality, began his Communist affiliation at a young age.

At his Federal conspiracy trial here in 1958, Reinthal testified he joined the Young Communist League in Youngstown in 1938 when he was 14 years old and attending Youngstown Chaney High School.

At the time he was working in the steel mills in Youngstown, he said, the Communist Party was active in the Little Steel Strike. He said he stayed in the party league until 1941.

In 1943 Reinthal went into the Army and served in France and Germany as a machine gunner. He was wounded December 12, 1944, and was hospitalized, he related. He was discharged from the Army in 1946.

Reinthal said he received the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Metal and European campaign ribbons for his military service.

Reinthal said he joined the Communist Party in 1946 when he went to work for Republic Steel Corp. in Youngstown.

He told the court he remained in the Communist Party until 1954.

From 1948 until 1950, he related, he had been an organizer in the Ohio Valley Section of the Communist Party with headquarters in Steubenville.

In 1949 the Daily Worker, the Communist party organ in the United States, reported Reinthal was among protestors in New York on behalf of top Communist leaders on trial in the first of a series of Communist conspiracy trials.

Labor records show that Reinthal had been a steward, an executive board member, the legislative secretary and an editorial writer for Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers Union.

Reinthal, whose last known address was 1568 Ansel Road NE., was born in Salem, Oreg., on January 7, 1924. He moved to Youngstown in 1936 and to Steubenville in 1948.

He came to Cleveland in 1950 for treatment at Brecksville Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Reinthal had attended Bethany College in Bethany, W. Va., and later studied at Western Reserve University. He was dismissed from WRU in 1953 for bad grades.

In 1952 he represented himself to city officials as a member of the Progressive Party when he was protesting the arrest of a friend.

In 1953 the Cleveland Council on World Affairs expelled Reinthal after his Communist affiliations were disclosed. The Plain Dealer at that time ran news stories revealing that Reinthal had worked his way up to membership on a policymaking group of the council.

Reinthal served 18 months in a Federal prison for his conviction in the conspiracy trial. Six others, including Fred and Marie Reed Haug, once influential labor leaders here, were convicted of a conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

CORE WEIGHS NO POLICY CHANGE

(By William C. Barnard)

No change in the membership policy of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) is contemplated, a spokesman for the organization said yesterday following disclosure Eric J. Reinthal is an active member.

Reinthal, 38, of 1568 Ansel Road NE., was convicted in 1958 of a Communist conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

Reinthal was identified by police as the reservation agent for two buses chartered by CORE to take interested Clevelanders to Washington on August 28 to participate in the Washington freedom march.

Bruce S. Warshal, vice president of the Cleveland chapter of CORE, said his group had nothing to hide and confirmed that Reinthal is on the CORE bus committee.

"His past is known and he freely admits it. Eric has met all the requirements of our organization and is a sincere member," Warshal said.

Warshal said he knew Reinthal was not a Communist at present because of his actions. He said Reinthal was a dedicated worker for civil rights. "We cannot ask any more of him as a member," Warshal said.

The only requirements for membership in CORE, Warshal said, are that the applicant believe in civil rights and in nonviolent action. He said Reinthal subscribed to these policies.

Warshal criticized the Plain Dealer for publishing the story.

"It was gutter-type journalism by a third-rate newspaper," he said.

"The story was a smear on the entire civil rights movement," Warshal protested.

He would not comment, however, on whether Reinthal's membership in CORE was detrimental to the civil rights movement.

In the 1958 conspiracy trial, Reinthal admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various times from 1938 to 1954. He served 14 months of an 18-month sentence. Police said his participation in Communist activities was extensive.

Anton Krchmarek, who identifies himself as spokesman for the Communist Party of Ohio, issued a statement to the Plain Dealer yesterday. Commenting on the Reinthal case, he said:

"The position of the Communists * * * is no secret. Why then did the Cleveland Police Department at this time choose to publicize actions of individuals in supporting the historic freedom march to Washington? Clearly, it can be only for one purpose—an effort to disrupt the freedom march by use of the old Red-baiting tactics.

"In doing so the Cleveland Police Department is lending itself as a cat's paw to the racists, the Birchites, and reactionaries who are seeking to block human progress."

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON LIMITATION OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

FEBRUARY 26, 1958

Mr. FORBES. On January 6, 1958, 8 persons were brought to trial in Federal court in Cleveland, Ohio, on "charges of conspiracy to file false non-Communist union officer affidavits (form 1081) with the National Labor Relations Board" under a provision of the Taft-Hartley law. According to a Department of Justice release dated January 23, 1957, the indictment alleged these individuals "were aware that statements and representations * * * made in the affidavits denying membership in the 'Communist Party, were false.' The indictment accused the defendants of conspiring 'to fake resignations from the Communist Party and conceal the plot by using aliases, secret codes, and other deceptions.'" (See the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Jan. 24, 1957, p. A-30.)

(The additional incidents referred to follow:)

"Two of the defendants, Marie Reed Haug and her husband, Fred Haug, are also charged with having signed false non-Communist affidavits in a previous indictment. The other six defendants who allegedly conspired with the Haugs to willfully violate the Taft-Hartley law provision were Edward Joseph Chaka, Hyman Lumer, Sam Reed, Andrew Remes, Eric Jerome Reinthal, and James S. West. This case was the first of its kind in which prosecution was instituted by the Department of Justice. The indictment charged a direct relationship between alleged subversives in the labor field and national leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Listed in the indictment as coconspirators but not as defendants were the following eight known Communist officials: Joe Brandt, Martin Chancey, Gus Hall, Frank Hashmall, Anthony Krchmarek, Steve Nelson, Sidney Stein, and John Williamson. Since their January 1957 indictments, the defendants have been supported by two newly created defense organizations in the Midwest. According to recent letterheads, Mrs. Betty Chaka is secretary of the Committee for Taft-Hartley Defendants, room 202, 2014 East 105th Street, Cleveland 6, Ohio, and Rev. Harold H. Hester and Harry J. Canter are affiliated with the Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley, room 402, 189

West Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill." (See National Guardian, Dec. 23, 1957, p. 3.)

"As chairman of the Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley, Canter is a veteran of the Communist movement in the United States. In 1930, he was a Communist candidate for Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. During that period, he served 1 year in a Massachusetts jail for carrying a banner 'in Boston's Sacco and Vanzetti demonstration, denouncing the Governor Fuller as the murderer of these two workers * * *'. Canter was listed as an instructor at the Communist Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago, Ill., during its 1943 fall session." (See Special Committee on Un-American Activities, appendix IX, 1944, p. 292. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, Investigation of Communist Propaganda, pt. 5, vol. 4, 1930, p. 757; and HUAC, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, 1957, p. 5.)

"In 1956, Canter was secretary of the James Keller Defense Commission, of room 325, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. This organization was apparently a defense front for James A. Keller, who had been 'ordered deported in 1953 on charges of past membership in the Communist Party.' A 1955 indictment against Keller was dismissed last year when the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *United States of America v. George I. Witovich* that 'an alien awaiting deportation was not compelled to answer questions about Communist activities.' According to the June 23, 1957 issue of the Worker, Sunday edition of the recently defunct Communist Daily Worker, Canter wrote a congratulatory letter to this paper's editor." (See Daily Worker, May 17, 1957, p. 3, and Firing Line, July 1, 1957, pp. 6 and 7.)

"The Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley is currently using the office facilities of the Chicago Joint Defense Committee To Defeat the Smith Act. Formerly known as the Claude Lightfoot Defense Committee, the Chicago Joint Defense Committee's October 1957 letterhead reflects their following officers: Leon Katzen, chairman; John T. Bernard, vice chairman; Geraldine Lightfoot, projects director; and Richard Criley, publicity and research. Katzen, Bernard, and Criley were identified as members of the Communist Party before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1952. Both Katzen and Criley have been listed as Communist leaders. Like Canter, Geraldine Lightfoot and Katzen are former instructors of the aforementioned Abraham Lincoln School." (See HUAC, annual report, 1952, pp. 29 and 31, and HUAC. Testimony of Walter S. Steele Regarding Communists Activities in the United States, 1947, p. 52.)

Mr. THURMOND. These articles report that an active participant in the march on Washington is Eric J. Reinthal, who twice joined the Communist Party and who was convicted and was sentenced to serve 18 months beginning in 1958 for conspiring to "fake resignations from the Communist Party and concealed the plot by using aliases, secret codes and other deceptions" in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Plain Dealer articles report that Mr. Reinthal was convicted in 1958 of "a Communist conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board." They also show that leaders of the CORE chapter in Cleveland have confirmed that Mr. Reinthal is a member in good standing and that the only requirements for

membership in CORE, according to Mr. Bruce S. Warshal, vice president of the Cleveland chapter, is that the applicant believe in civil rights and nonviolent action.

Mr. President, it is incomprehensible that any organization in this country would have such a lax policy for accepting membership and particularly in permitting leadership such as has evidently been given to Mr. Reinthaler with his authority to arrange for transportation of CORE members to Washington for the march on the Nation's Capitol. This appears to be in line, however, with the stand that Mr. A. Philip Randolph, chairman of the march on Washington committee, has taken with regard to his vice chairman, Mr. Bayard Rustin, whose unsavory record as a former member of the Young Communist League and who has been convicted as a sex pervert and for refusing to serve in the Armed Forces of this country, was laid bare on the Senate floor by me on August 13. Mr. Randolph and other spokesmen for his committee continue to insist that Mr. Rustin will be Mr. March on Washington despite his ludicrous record. Evidently, Mr. President, many ministers, rabbis, priests, and others will march under his command on August 28 because even with the revelation of this information none of these religious leaders indorsing the march has backed off.

Mr. President, as further evidence of the tie-in between communism and the Negro demonstrations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article from the September 1963 issue of the Christian Herald entitled "Road to Riot: George S. Schuyler Presents One Negro Viewpoint." The author of this article, Mr. President, is the associate editor of the Negro newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier.

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

ROAD TO RIOT—GEORGE S. SCHUYLER
PRESENTS ONE NEGRO VIEWPOINT

Considering the recklessness of the agitators currently leading Negroes, it need surprise no one if we see in America a bloody massacre similar to that which disgraced South Africa at Sharpeville in 1960, when police fired into a crowd, killing 89 demonstrators.

That the Negro demonstrations in America are spontaneous and unrehearsed is a major imposture of the times. Far from being a grassroots flareup of indignant innocents panting for drastic reforms, they are a part of a carefully concocted program generated by experts in mobism.

It would be a grave error to overlook the real grievances of the Negro, as it would also be to ignore the great advances made in his status since World War II. When the present generation was born, prominent Negroes had already perfected the techniques of exploiting discontent, and there was plenty to be discontented about.

Save in a few northern and eastern communities, racial discrimination, segregation, and exclusion were rife, lynching was still going on although declining, all transportation into and out of the South was rigidly segregated, there were separate racial schools everywhere in the South and in many parts of the North and West, and of course there were no general hotels and restaurants that

would serve Negroes, nor any filling stations whose facilities they could use.

Department stores were reluctant, or refused, to permit Negroes to try on garments: the service was studiously rude so that bourgeois colored women either sent their maids to shop for them or waited until they could go to New York or Chicago. Theaters and movie houses relegated Negroes to balconies or galleries, if they admitted them at all, and the Nation's Capital was the worst offender. Everywhere Negroes were bulldozed or beaten by the police.

Civil service, even outside the South, was largely a white preserve. Housing was an acute problem whenever the Negro wished to move from his racial district, even more so than it is today. The columns of Negro newspapers have been filled for years with accounts of colored homes bombed, burned, or defaced, because their owners had the effrontery to move into a white district. Even if a Negro wished to operate a business, he could do so only in his own neighborhood, rarely downtown because of the virtual impossibility of getting a lease.

Publicly owned recreational facilities such as swimming pools, golf courses, tennis courts, and zoos were barred to Negroes or a special time set aside for them.

At the same time Negro illiteracy was being wiped out rapidly, tens of thousands of Negro students were matriculating in colleges and universities the country over, great athletes were bringing honor to the United States in Olympic games and to the alma maters at home, black boxers were dominating the field, a million young Negroes in uniform had been segregated and discriminated against at home and abroad.

It would have tried the patience of Job, and the Negro is not made of the stuff that will take treatment like this lying down. He was and always has been—contrary to some unlettered opinion—ready to fight. The question was how, where, and when.

During the same period, through the efforts of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, the large church denominations, and labor unions, the lot of the Negro was being gradually improved. Through the years the NAACP had won a score or more cases before the U.S. Supreme Court which broke the color bar in tax-supported colleges, killed the white primary, ended the Jim Crow car and bus in interstate travel, compelled the equalization of school moneys and teachers' salaries, forced open tax-supported recreational facilities, outlawed residential covenants excluding Negroes. Finally, with the Supreme Court decision of 1954-55 desegregating schools, it did not seem far to the promised land of full equality.

The Army, Navy, Air Force and Coast Guard had been integrated by President Truman. Washington's racial barriers had been cast down by President Eisenhower. A score of States had fair employment practices laws, and because of this, significant advances had been made in jobs and in union membership.

The rigid Jim Crow barrier in organized religion was slowly being lifted in token fashion. Some big corporations were at last seeking out Negro graduates even before graduation. In a half hundred cities the Urban League was getting an increasing share of Community Chest funds for Negroes and making significant openings in employment. In the theater, on the concert stage, in art and literature, the postwar period was the golden age for Negroes.

Quite likely the rapidity of these successive reforms stimulated rising expectations and increased the appetite for more. There was a growing impatience with moderate advances and gradualistic approaches. The erstwhile nostrum of politics nowhere brought the advertised utopia, although it did bring some Negroes political preferment and minor

reforms. Negroes became keenly aware, more so than ever, of the vast gulf separating them from their white neighbors in wages, job opportunities and social restrictions. A cause of vast bitterness was the persistent circumvention of court rulings on desegregation of public schools, and the dead end confronting the ambitious young Negro throughout the South who sought anything better than menial work in his community.

Where at first the Negro demands were far from extreme and the agitation was locally generated and controlled, it was not long before the direction of the campaign against Jim Crowism was seized by professionals from afar, versed in mass pressure techniques and in creating hysteria. From mild demands which local authorities might have granted, there were soon strident shouts for immediate revolutionary changes which officials could not meet because the majority of whites would not tolerate them. The evidence from Albany, Ga., Jackson, Miss., Birmingham, Ala., indicates that it was outside agitators, the trained men from Nashville, Atlanta, New Orleans and New York, who kept the fires burning.

The NAACP was caught flatfooted by the well-trained corpsmen of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Students Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee, many of them schooled in special techniques at secret sessions subsidized by certain white individuals sharing the philosophy of mass pressure. The NAACP is now stressing immediacy as strongly as the less responsible groups. Like them it has refused to let up pressure anywhere along the line, although it is being hurt by the bite of other groups into the civil rights dollar while it has to pay the fines and go the ball of youngsters arrested for sitting-in, swimming in, kneeling-in and other challenges to local law and order.

Now the Negro cries for revolutionary changes are rising more loudly. Demands are being made that leaders know cannot be fulfilled, but they have a tiger by the tail and dare not let go for fear of being labeled "Uncle Tom" and deserted by the more hysterical. There are many who seem to welcome the strife that must inevitably come when the patience of law enforcement officers runs out. They daily warn that demonstrations will continue unless all their demands are met. They say literally or in effect that "the white man is scared." They have seen him run out of Asia and Africa; have noted that Washington rushed to recognize Castro, laid out the red carpet for Lumumba and Adoula, supported Nasser and Nkrumah; and they figure whites will surrender here without a real struggle, if they keep on challenging them. They perhaps rightly observe that the West has gone soft due to unprecedented luxury and high wages. They fail to distinguish the difference between globally oriented Washington politicians, international-minded big-city officials, and persons in the hinterland; or the undisciplined neurotic and vainglorious white youth in congested urban centers.

Examination of the cast of characters reveals that it consists of a hierarchy of professional agitators schooled in sit-in tactics that were imported by American labor unions in 1937, after a successful trial by the French Confederation of Labor the year before. These sit-in strikes were revelatory and effective, and were not lost upon Negroes seeking solutions to the color bar and its attendant evils. There was also ample though not encouraging precedent in the Cooxey's Army march of 1894 and the pathetic Bonus Marchers of 1932, as well as the jobless demonstrations engineered by the Communists of that period.

One of the most respected leaders today is A. Philip Randolph, president of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car

Porters, a longtime advocate of mass pressure and founder of the march on Washington movement. It was this threat to march on a band of 10,000 Negroes into Washington that pressured President F. D. Roosevelt into issuing his Fair Employment Practices Executive Order 8802, 3 days after the Nazis attacked their erstwhile Moscow allies. Ever since then, Randolph has been in the forefront of Negro leadership. Today's marches on city halls and executive mansions, culminating in the proposed march of 100,000 Negroes on the Nation's capital to speed passage of a sweeping civil rights law, is an indication of the effectiveness of these ideas now re-echoed by younger men. Other Negro leaders who now wholeheartedly support this program in the name of non-violent civil disobedience, had sat on their hands in 1941—when it was first proposed by Randolph—content to confer and draw up resolutions.

A year later the Congress of Racial Equality was founded by James Farmer, a pacifist, which brought to perfection the tactic of sit-ins in public places excluding Negroes from service. For years CORE restricted its activities largely to nonsouthern areas, enlisting an interracial corps of intrepid individuals willing to brave clubbings and arrests to break down the color bar. CORE took the lead in testing supposedly integrated buses and trains in Dixie, and later waiting rooms and lunch counters in bus and railroad stations.

There were other organizations set up in the period after World War I which concentrated on Negro agitation. One of the earliest was the African Blood Brotherhood headed by a "voluntary" Negro, Cyril Briggs in the twenties in Harlem; the American Negro Labor Congress of 1925, headed by Lovett Fort-Whiteman, who soon took off for the Soviet promised land and remained. This was followed by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights of 1930. Others included the Communist-dominated Federal Writers' and theater projects; the very profitable Scottsboro case which the astute colored Communist leader, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., snatched from the NAACP, thus keeping the Reds' larder filled for years; the International Labor Defense, an arm of the Third International, which was able to penetrate Negro churches and organizations by parading a succession of Scottsboro "mothers" all over the country, taking up collections and delivering incendiary speeches. Other directly Red-inspired or at least pink-tinted organizations were the Sharecroppers Union; the Negro Labor Councils; the Negro Labor Victory Committee; and the Civil Rights Congress.

They all had their part in training adherents and agitators.

Most influential of the efforts to mold Negro opinion favorable to a Soviet America was the National Negro Congress. Ostensibly formed by Howard University professors, the plan for it actually originated in the New York County Committee of the Communist Party and was carried to Howard by Manning Johnson and another Communist. According to Johnson, who was a member, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, was later elected to the National Committee of the Communist Party. The president from 1936 to 1940 was A. Philip Randolph. He resigned, saying, "I quit the congress because it is not truly a Negro congress." Out of some 1,200 or more delegates, over 300 were white, and obviously of Communist persuasion.

The first Negro president of Howard University, Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, now a member of the Washington, D.C., Board of Education, was publicly identified with Communist doctrines by Judge James A. Cobb, of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, testifying before the House Committee Against Un-American Activities.

Another witness, the very respected Dr. Kelly Miller, for 45 years a faculty member, testified about a conference held at Howard on May 18, 19, and 20, 1935, presided over by President Johnson. Miller said that he was astonished to hear the fiery speeches by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, Professors Emmet Dorsey and Abram Harris, James Ford (quadrennial vice presidential candidate of the Communist Party), and Eric Waldron, correspondent of the Communist Daily Worker and surprised that President Johnson sat through it all without comment and apparently with approval. (HUAC, vol. 3, p. 2148, Oct.-Nov. 1938.)

Lawrence A. Oxley, an official of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, attended every session of this conference and found it "distinctly communistic in character. * * * There seemed to be but three ways out for the Negro. (1) The answer of the Socialist Party; (2) the answer of the Communist Party; (3) the answer of the American Labor Party."

"During the course of the last session, May 20," said Mr. Oxley, "I heard Mr. Ford and Mr. Dorsey advocate the overthrow of the American Government, if necessary, to secure the objectives of the program sponsored by the conference" (p. 2149 HUAC, vol. 3, November 1938).

It is illuminating to read what was outlined at the secret Communist Party convention in Bridgman, Mich., on August 22, 1922, attended by subversives and unkindly raided by the Michigan constabulary who carted off two barrels of documentary proof. The blueprint for Negroes reads: "In order that the Negro may be reached with education and propaganda and that he may be organized for activity, the following methods are recommended:

"1. Nuclei shall be established in all existing Negro organizations, such as fraternal, religious, and labor organizations, cooperatives, tenant farmers' leagues, etc.

"2. Colored organizers and speakers shall be sent among Negroes to inform them and win their confidence.

"3. Newspapers and publications shall be established or, when this is not feasible, news service shall be established by friendly co-operation with colored newspapers of liberal tenets.

"4. Friendship of liberal-minded Negro ministers shall be sought as these men are at the present time the leaders of the Negro masses and many of them are earnest but lack scientific knowledge.

"5. Conferences on the economic conditions shall be held from time to time with these ministers, educators and other liberal elements, and through their influence the party shall aim to secure a more favorable hearing before the Negro masses.

"6. By means of its membership the party shall penetrate the existing forums, literary societies, lyceums, schools, colleges, teachers' institutes, etc., of the colored people, and establish forums of its own for the enlightenment of the Negro population.

"Where other forms of activity are impossible or impracticable, as in certain southern districts, cooperatives may be formed."

This prescient program of 40 years ago has been followed to the letter. Thousands of Negro students, professors and preachers are prepared to lead and support extremist strategy. With opportunities for leadership sparse, Negro intellectuals were easily beguiled with honorary positions in front organizations, chairmanship at dinners and meetings, and grosser forms of interracial persuasion at which the Communist conspiracy is adept. Many did not even know where their guidance was coming from and indignantly denied any Red membership or connection—as if that made any difference so long as they served the Communist purpose. A fancier of old Communist-front letterheads and the columns of Red news-

papers will find enough names of prominent Negro leaders to fill a book; many of these people are the intellectual authors of the present disturbances.

When Jacques Duclos, the French Communist leader, with one stroke of the pen, in 1946 snatched the Communist Party U.S.A. away from 20th century Americanism, which it had opportunistically adopted while American arms were making the world safe for the Soviet Union, the party fell upon evil days. Security agencies were smiting the comrades hip and thigh. The revival of Self-Determination-for-the-Black-Belt, the ousting of nine Red unions from the CIO, the Peekskill riot, the presentation to the United Nations by the NAACP's Dr. DuBois and Walter White of a charge of American genocide against Negroes, even the triumphant Communist Peace Conference at New York's Waldorf-Astoria (endorsed by the first Negro president of Fisk University, Dr. Charles S. Johnson) could not rescue the above-ground party from the doldrums. It was then that a new Red policy on Negroes was adopted. It meant abandonment of front organizations and concentration on boring from within existing Negro groups.

In July 1931, when Robert Minor, a veteran Communist boss, quoted approvingly an editorial "No Menacing Red" in the powerful Negro weekly, *Afro-American*, it was almost alone among the 150 colored weeklies in its position. Twenty years later this was a popular view in editorial offices, and one big newspaper had as many as four fellow-traveling columnists.

The *Afro* editorial said in part: "The Reds are going our way. Like ourselves they represent a feared and hated cause. They are the first white group since Emancipation to advocate race, social equality and intermarriage for those who wish it. In fact there is more real Christianity among white Communists than in the white YMCA, the white Christian Endeavor Societies or the white so-called Christian churches. The Reds are no menace to Negroes. In fact, it is comforting to find groups of such people as Communists in this color-mad world."

Interestingly this newspaper had no comment when in the midfifties the Communists set up a Jim Crow school in Harlem because of racial tension and discrimination at its Jefferson School in Greenwich Village.

The *People's Voice*, a Negro weekly of large Harlem circulation founded by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was soon dubbed the "Uptown Daily Worker" because of its news and editorial content and fiery volumes by Paul Robeson and Lena Horne, which left no doubt of its ideological kinship with the *Afro-American*. On the Pacific coast, the widely circulated *California Eagle* was equally a mouthpiece for Red ideas.

These are among the influences that shaped the thinking of the current crop of agitators.

Irresponsible demagoguery on both sides will lead someday, somewhere, to a bloody conflict which could spread as rapidly and as far as the demonstrations have, and the outcome of which will have to be martial law and eventual dictatorship. As Bernard Shaw has observed: "Bravery is sometimes a form of stupidity," and some may cynically agree with the Communists that "You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs," but the risk is an American Sharpeville. While this may satisfy those who favor Red revolution, it is scarcely guaranteed to advance the cause of the Negro. Even Gandhi discovered that nonviolence frequently leads to violence because few leaders can control hysterical followers, and bedeviled police armed with shotguns and rifles may not always withstand showers of rocks and bottles with calm and fortitude.

It is a most alarming development when leaders of a people shout, "No compromise." "No moderation." Since the Negro wishes

to remain in America, embittered violences on both sides will not bring any real integration or guarantee our national security nor insure our survival as a democracy which has brought the greatest freedom and highest living standards in all history to its citizens, black and white.

Mr. THURMOND. I expect to have additional information to present to the Senate on the question of whether there are Communist connections and influences in the Negro demonstrations and agitational efforts. I have stated, and I state here again today that I am certain that many persons involved in these demonstrations are sincerely seeking to serve some end other than advancing the cause of communism. I am convinced, however, that there are also some who are sincerely carrying out the orders and aims of the Communist Party U.S.A. So I renew here today my request that this entire matter be looked into without further delay by the Congress.

In concluding my statement, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my weekly newsletter for August 19, 1963.

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

WHO IS WORKING FOR THE KREMLIN
(By U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND)

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of August 2, 7, and 13, and the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on S. 1732, are filled with information from public sources which prove that there is Communist influence in and penetration of the current Negro demonstrations and agitational efforts in this country. Unfortunately, all requests for investigations of these demonstrations, which have caused violence and bloodshed across this country, have fallen on deaf ears and closed minds. The only antidote suggested to solve all this—as if anything could, including complete surrender by the Congress to all demands of the rioters—is passage of the President's power-laden and unconstitutional civil rights program.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has emphasized to the Congress and also to the public in his books, "Masters of Deceit" and "A Study of Communism" that a primary objective of the Communists in this country is to foment and exploit racial strife and disorders. Indeed, the key propaganda terms used by the Communist Party U.S.A. are the words "equality" and "peace."

Testimony by a former Communist before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1957 corroborates Mr. Hoover's point about the Red goal in the United States of America. Frank S. Meyer told the subcommittee: "The major drive . . . to penetrate the movement of the Negro people . . . has nothing to do with any interest in the aims and desires of the Negro people, but is a realization by the Communist Party that that movement can be used as the most important and strongest cutting edge against the constitutional structure of the United States, by trying to develop a removal of division of power guarantees in the Senate, and secondarily, by the fact that they believe . . . that at this time in a prosperous country this is the only place in which serious trouble can possibly be stirred up, in which there are serious possibilities of developing what they call mass struggles of building up extraconstitutional and extralegal actions, and so on."

Here is a quote from Mr. Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit": "The party's sole interest, as most American Negroes know, is to hoodwink the Negro, exploit him, and use him as a tool to build a Communist America."

Later he told the House Appropriations Committee on March 3, 1961: "The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

The evidence in the hearings and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that the man most generally credited with inciting and organizing the riots, Dr. Martin Luther King, has had top assistants with questionable backgrounds. One of these, Bayard Rustin, has admitted being a former member of the Young Communist League and having served jail sentences for sex perversion, lewdness, and refusing to serve in our Armed Forces. He has also been arrested on numerous occasions. Now he is Mr. March on Washington, serving as vice chairman of the August 28 march on Washington. How can ministers, rabbis, and priests march to Lincoln Memorial on August 28 under such leadership?

Dr. King has been a lecturer at the Highlander Folk School with admitted Communist and pro-Communist characters. This school has been closed by the State of Tennessee and cited as subversive by the attorney general of Georgia. There is much more public evidence in the RECORD and even more to be obtained by a penetrating investigation into the current riots.

There is no question but that many persons participating in these disturbances are sincerely seeking to obtain some end other than advancing the cause of communism. However, there are also some who are sincerely carrying out the orders and aims of the Communist Party, U.S.A. A recent article by the National Editorial Association says Gus Hall, head of the CPUSA, has issued secret orders for Reds to infiltrate the demonstrations, especially the march on Washington.

Columist Holmes Alexander has made the point that "if it's true, as seems evident, that the Communists are trying to exploit the civil rights issue, the best way to spoil their game is to expose them." The Washington Evening Star has also stated that "all concerned—both white and colored—have a right to know just who is working for the Kremlin in this matter."

With these comments, I concur completely, as do many others who are likewise not satisfied with the efforts to sweep this vital question under the rug with passage of more unconstitutional civil rights legislation and addition of more dictatorial police powers for the Attorney General.

Mr. THURMOND. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks a news dispatch which was printed in the Los Angeles Times of Los Angeles, Calif., on August 14, 1963. This article, which is entitled "Senator Raps March Organizer as Ex-Red—Target of THURMOND Attack Admits Being Former Communist, Jailed Draft Evader" written by Mr. Andrew J. Glass, of the New York Herald Tribune staff, contains a report of my remarks on the Senate floor on August 13 about Mr. Bayard Rustin. It also has an interview with Mr. Rustin on the charges I made, and it is interesting to note that he affirms the principal charges I made, refusing to comment on one which is a matter of public record, and denies only one point I made.

Mr. Rustin specifically denies that he ever traveled to the Soviet Union as was reported in my speech, but he does admit that he was one of the organizers of the 1958 pacifist march to which he referred "and would have been proud to have joined them in Red Square." I

wish to point out to the Senate that my point about Mr. Rustin having visited the Soviet Union in conjunction with this parade came from an Associated Press news dispatch from New York which quoted Mr. Rustin to this effect. However, regardless of the accuracy of the AP report on this point, I think Mr. Rustin's reply to this charge makes a distinction without too much of a difference.

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

SENATOR RAPS MARCH ORGANIZER AS EX-RED—
TARGET OF THURMOND ATTACK ADMITS BEING
FORMER COMMUNIST, JAILED DRAFT
EVADER

(By Andrew J. Glass)

WASHINGTON.—Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged Tuesday that the chief organizer of the August 28 civil rights march on Washington is a former Communist who spent 28 months in jail during World War II for refusing to register for the draft.

The South Carolina Democrat inserted what he said was the police record of Bayard Rustin, the 53-year-old deputy director of the march, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The file, he said, includes a 1953 conviction for sex perversion and a subsequent arrest for vagrancy and lewdness.

CITES DISSATISFACTION

"Many people across the country," the southerner told the Senate, "are not satisfied with the Attorney General's efforts to whitewash the question of Communist influence or involvement in these Negro demonstrations which have been turning into race riots in various cities in this country."

(Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy informed the Senate Commerce Committee last month that the Justice Department had "no evidence" that the Negro equality drive was inspired by Moscow.)

Rustin, who runs the march headquarters from the community center of Harlem's Friendship Baptist Church, confirmed both his wartime prison term and his former Communist membership.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

"As a Quaker and a pacifist," he told the Herald Tribune News Service, "I was opposed to all participation. I notified the draft board 2 years before I was arrested that I could not support the military effort in any way."

While a student at City College of New York in 1936, Rustin said, "I joined the Young Communist League because at that time, I thought they were deeply concerned with social justice." He said he "broke completely" with the YCL in June 1941, after the Nazi attack on Russia. At the time, the league accepted racial segregation in the Armed Forces and "their true intentions became crystal clear."

RUSSIAN TRIP DENIED

"In 1958," Senator THURMOND further alleged, "(Rustin) saw fit to travel to the Soviet Union and meet with the butchers of the Hungarian freedom fighters to participate in a Communist propaganda show called 'Non-Violent Action Committee Against Nuclear Weapons.'"

Rustin termed this "an absolute lie." He said he had never been to the Soviet Union, although he was one of the organizers of the 1958 pacifist march and "would have been proud to have joined them in Red Square."

Rustin declined to comment on the morals charges which allegedly were lodged against him in Pasadena, Calif., and involved two other men.

A spokesman for the march said all comments on the affair must come from A. Philip Randolph, director of the rally. Randolph was at an AFL-CIO summit meeting at Unity House, Pa., and could not be reached.

RUSTIN BACKGROUND

The spokesman, however, recalled that the ministers backing the march had spoken of "redemption." He also noted that the conviction was 10 years old.

"They cannot get Randolph, they cannot get King, they cannot get Wilkins—so they go after Rustin," the spokesman said.

Rustin was secretary to Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference from 1956 to 1960. Wilkins is executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Arrested more than 25 times in the South for his role in the civil rights fight, Rustin said he once spent 30 days on a North Carolina chain gang. Along with Randolph, he came here last week to brief 60 legislators on the coming mass demonstration.

Asked recently whether he wanted Rustin to resign, Randolph replied: "Why, Heavens, no. He is Mr. March himself."

Mr. THURMOND. I think it would also be appropriate at this point, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Columbia Record on August 20, 1963, entitled "Red Influence on Capital March." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial placed in the RECORD.

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

RED INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL MARCH

Administration spokesmen looked up and declared innocently that they saw no Communist cloud hanging over the August 28 March on Washington. They couldn't see it for the rubescent smog.

Senator THURMOND took the Senate floor to call attention to the pink haze in the atmosphere. He cited public documents for proof.

The vice chairman of the committee in charge of the Nation's biggest civil rights demonstration is Bayard Rustin, who has a long record of Communist and leftwing associations, although he declined to join the Communist Party.

He was incarcerated 28 months in Federal prisons during World War II for failure to abide by the selective service law. More than a conscientious objector, he refused to do patriotic Government work or to stand a physical examination.

Rustin admits that he was a member of the Young Communist League and attended a Communist Party convention, as an observer. He participated in a Communist propaganda show in Moscow. He is a friend of Communist Dictator Nkrumah, of Ghana. He has been actively associated with organizations that have been officially designated as Communist fronts.

One of his boasts is that he has been jailed more than 20 times for civil rights activities. He has police records in California, New York, and North Carolina. He pleaded guilty to a charge of sex perversion and has been convicted for vagrancy and lewdness.

This unsavory record was called to the attention of A. Philip Randolph, of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, chairman of the march on Washington committee. Asked if he wanted Rustin to resign, he replied, "Heavens, no. He's Mr. March himself."

Granting that it is true that Rustin is "Mr. March on Washington," even the most ardent and colorblind integrationists should

be able to see the red aura of influence that is pervading the Washington protest scene. If their eyes and ears do not inform them, at least their nostrils should.

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it for consideration one of the most crucial and vital issues of our time. I refer to the nuclear test ban treaty before the Senate on the question of ratification.

On any issue before the Congress, but particularly on this vital issue affecting the military security of our Nation, it is absolutely necessary that the testimony presented to the Congress be candid, forthright, and unequivocal. Some of the testimony on the test ban treaty, in my opinion, fails to meet the standard which should be enforced. Unfortunately, since the subject is both technical and subject to security restrictions, it is most difficult for the Senate to enforce the forthrightness which it could otherwise require. As a result, there is an ever-present danger that both the Senate and the public may be misled by some of the testimony, particularly the public testimony, and the generalizations contained therein.

Official witnesses from the executive branch, as is to be expected, have sought to make the strongest possible case for ratification of the treaty. We can and do expect the officials of the administration to make the strongest arguments in support of their conclusions that the treaty is in the best interest of the United States. The facts upon which those conclusions are based, however, should not be subject to bias in presentation. It is against the facts themselves, upon which the Senate must weigh the conclusions of the executive branch and, thereby, the merits or demerits of the treaty.

I am particularly disturbed by the testimony of the Secretary of Defense on August 13 before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Let me say at this point that while I disagree completely with many of his conclusions, it is not with his statement of conclusions that I take issue now; rather it is with the manner in which the facts were presented. The presentation of factual matters was unbalanced to the extent that it was misleading. The testimony of the Secretary of Defense was lengthy, and I will make no attempt to point out all of the instances of unbalance. I will illustrate my point with one particular aspect of his testimony—that pertaining to the antiballistic-missile field—in some detail; and then briefly call attention to several other rather glaring instances.

Historically, the U.S. position in support of a prohibition of nuclear testing has been based, whether publicly acknowledged or not, on the premise that a cessation of nuclear testing would have a strong tendency to preserve an existing U.S. superiority in nuclear power. This is a worthy motive, but one which is based on a fundamental premise that the United States does, in fact, have such a superiority to protect. Probably the most fundamental question to be answered by the Senate on the issue of ratification

of the proposed treaty, therefore, is whether the United States does now have a superiority in nuclear power.

In approaching the estimate of whether the United States or the Soviet Union has a superiority, the question initially resolves itself into two related, but distant, aspects—technology and arsenal, or knowledge and weapons. And in each field of nuclear power, strategic and tactical, offensive and defensive, this distinction exists. It is possible that the two elements—technological superiority and arsenal superiority—do not coincide. One side may have the greater quantity and quality of weapons in a particular field, while the other may have a superiority in technology, although lapse of time will usually insure that at some point the superiority of knowledge and weapons will coincide. Productive capacity, or the lack of it, on one side, could prevent the coincidence of the two, of course.

When the question of superiority, or "who's ahead," in a particular field comes up, therefore, it must necessarily relate, unless specifically limited, to both the questions of technology and weaponry. The field of antiballistic missiles is no exception. Superiority in the field of ABM's involves really two questions, knowledge and weapons.

The Secretary of Defense testified on the subject of antiballistic missiles, and in order that there may be no question of quoting him out of context, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the Secretary's prepared statement dealing with antiballistic missiles, and the closely related subject of penetrability of U.S. ballistic missiles, be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. The Secretary, after describing in general terms the nature of the problems in any anti-ballistic-missile system, stated: "The last of these two items, resistance to blackout effect and warhead technology depend on nuclear testing." The Secretary then pointed out that the United States has the capability, without further testing, to weaponize ABM warheads. He did not specifically mention the Soviet capability in this regard.

On the question of resistance to blackout effect, the Secretary stated:

As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.

Each side has had about the same number of high altitude tests, and over yield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable though not identical. By theoretical analysis of presently available data, we believe we can adequately predict effects over the range of yields and altitudes in which we are most interested. We will be able to design around the remaining uncertainties.

Mr. President, it is in the field of resistance to blackout effect that the most serious problem of technology arises.

This falls generally into the field of weapons effects. On this question, the Secretary of Defense stated:

As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.

That, Mr. President, is a most deceptive statement.

Testimony in classified session has spelled out the particular tests in detail which have been conducted by both sides. This testimony cannot be discussed in public. Two statements which have been released to the public belie the Secretary's assertion, however.

The statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, delivered by General Taylor, included this statement on weapons effects:

It is indicated that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the high-yield (tens of megatons) technology, in weapons effects knowledge derived from high-yield nuclear explosions.

Thus, the Joint Chiefs of Staff assert categorically and without equivocation that the Soviets are ahead in weapons effects technology in the high yields.

Dr. Edward Teller put it even more emphatically, and I quote from his publicly released statement:

There is one field of particularly great importance where we have reason to believe that the Russians have acquired a decisive lead. This is the investigation of the effects of nuclear weapons.

The Secretary's most carefully worded statement that "each side has had about the same number of high-altitude tests, and overyield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable though not identical," is grossly deceptive. In testing for weapons effects, it is the type of tests and the purpose of tests, together with the type and sophistication of instrumentation used, and not just the number, yield, range, and altitude which make the difference. The implication of the Secretary's statement is that there exists a parity in technology between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on weapons effects. Such an implication is not supported by any of the scientific testimony on the record, and, Mr. President, there is considerable scientific testimony on the record.

The Secretary's testimony is even more misleading when considered from the standpoint of weaponry, as contrasted to technology. The Secretary stated:

The best present judgment is that our design efforts are comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system. It should be noted that the United States decided not to deploy the Nike-Zeus because its effectiveness was inadequate.

Mr. President, our "design efforts" are undoubtedly, as the Secretary stated, comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. This does not go to the questions of weaponry superiority, or arsenal superiority, however; and it does not cover the field of ABM

blackout technology, for the Soviets have probably not yet converted their knowledge into design, having only finished their testing in late 1962.

The Secretary went on to state:

Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system.

Mr. President, the Secretary did not say at this point that the Soviets did not have a system deployed now, nor did he say that they had not begun deploying such a system. He implied, however, that both countries are still in the design stage.

Subsequently, in answer to a question I asked, the Secretary of Defense stated:

I would like the record to be clear. I have not stated the Soviets had a deployed anti-ballistic missile system.

The Secretary's denial covered his previous testimony in the Foreign Relations Committee, and also, by context, his testimony earlier this year before the Armed Services Committee in the posture hearings. The latter hearings, insofar as this subject is concerned, are classified. I can say, however, that I was perturbed, at the very least, by the Secretary's denial.

On August 14, the day following the Secretary's testimony, an article appeared in the Evening Star over the byline of Richard Fryklund, which revealed what may have been a technical basis for the Secretary's denial. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. Fryklund described the testimony as follows:

Senator THURMOND contended that Mr. McNamara had said in closed testimony earlier this year that the Russians have an anti-ICBM system. The Senator also said—as did his allies—that nuclear tests in the atmosphere are needed by the United States for the development of such a weapon.

Mr. McNamara denied saying that the Russians have an anti-missile-missile system, and disputed the idea that the treaty would hinder development of such a system by this country.

Mr. Fryklund then proceeded to explain that the difference was in semantics. He wrote:

The dispute stems primarily from differing estimates of technical uncertainties and propaganda.

In referring to Russian development of an anti-ICBM, Senator THURMOND was talking about the Leningrad missiles. So was Mr. McNamara in denying that the Soviets have developed an anti-missile-missile system.

The Evening Star reported in mid-March that American intelligence had spotted the sites around Leningrad and thought they probably were for an antimissile missile similar to the Nike-Zeus, which this country dropped last year.

There is nothing to indicate the Russians have a system, however. In military parlance, a weapons system is a vast complex which includes the weapons themselves and the bases, troops, communications, training schools, supplies, etc., that are necessary to fight with the weapons.

If this is, indeed, what the Secretary meant, he should have said so. The impression he gave was that the Soviets have not deployed an anti-ballistic-missile system at all, and this in turn would leave the impression that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are in the same boat, since the United States has not even begun component production of a system.

As Mr. Fryklund's article states, the Evening Star, in an article by Mr. Fryklund himself, reported in mid-March that the Soviets had anti-ballistic-missile sites around Leningrad. Even by Mr. Fryklund's definition, however, what is deployed around Leningrad is an ABM system. If a weapons complex had to be deployed at every conceivable defense site to constitute a system, then obviously, it could always be argued that there was no system in being in the absence of absolute saturation. This is a lot of nonsense. The intelligence reports of the Defense Department, itself, refer to the ABM system deployed around Leningrad. It is about time that the leaked stories to the newspapers were cleared up on this whole matter of the Leningrad complex. We have not been able to get accurate and full information in the hearings on this matter, but here are the facts:

The Soviets are believed to be deploying an anti-MRBM/IRBM system around Leningrad. Current intelligence indicates that the initial operational capability of this system at Leningrad could be achieved in 1963. This system is believed to have attained effectiveness against ballistic missiles fired from 300 to 1,000 nautical miles. The system will probably be effective against unsophisticated IRBM's, but we cannot define the degree of effectiveness at this time.

During 1963-64, the Soviets could begin deployment of a transportable AM-1 system to their army fronts. This system should provide an effective defense against MRBM's such as the Pershing and Redstone and IRBM's such as the Thor, Jupiter, and Polaris.

The system being deployed at Leningrad is probably the basis for the continued development of a transportable AMM system for use in the defense of field force rear areas and strategic areas of secondary importance. The follow-on development could result in a system which could be deployed in 1963-64.

The AM-1 system possibly could, under certain favorable conditions, engage an ICBM reentry vehicle. There are 30 launchers per AM-1 system and 5 AM-1 missiles can be launched simultaneously and/or controlled at one time by one system against from one to five different targets.

From this it is quite obvious that from the standpoint of ABM weaponry, the Soviets are ahead. We do not have the first missile, launcher, or radar in production, much less on site. Significantly, there is a minimum period of 4 years between beginning of production and beginning deployment.

At another point, the Secretary stated:

Multimegaton weapons development tests would have to be conducted more than 20 million miles from the earth • • • if they

were to have a good chance of escaping detection by a ground-base system such as could be installed rapidly with the cooperation of Western and possibly some neutral nations.

This is a gross misstatement as to distances. Senators should compare classified testimony. The most likely tests in outer space which we could expect the Soviets to conduct clandestinely would be weapons proof tests, not weapons development tests, and the instrumentation and expense involved would be considerably less and one or two shots would be adequate for the purpose. A series of such tests such as would probably be necessary for weapons development tests would be unnecessary for proof tests of weapons which had been designed on the basis of existing knowledge.

At another point, the Secretary of Defense stated:

Over the U.S.S.R. or Communist China, only very low-yield tests with quite limited objectives, could have a good chance of escaping discovery. These tests could not produce significant advantages.

Mr. President, with a very low-yield test in the atmosphere, the Soviets could test resistance of an ABM system to blackout effects. Since such a test must be conducted in the environment in which the system would be operated, very low-yield atmospheric tests by the Soviets would, for this purpose, give them a very distinct and significant advantage.

In discussing the ban on underwater tests, the Secretary of Defense stated:

A violator might like to perform a nuclear test to determine overall vulnerability of submarines and surface vessels with their associated electronic gear. Such a test would almost certainly be detected.

Mr. President, underwater tests conducted by the Soviets in inland Lake Baikal would give almost precisely the same type of seismic signals as would underground tests, which are permitted under the treaty. Even if the signals were detected, we would have no information on which to base a case for abrogation; for we would be quite helpless to prove that the signals which were detected did not result from underground tests. Indeed, if the tests were at a relatively low yield, we probably would not detect them at all; for if we could detect such low-yield underground tests, a comprehensive, rather than a partial, test ban agreement would be feasible in the eyes of the administration.

But for the limitation of security classification on the testimony and evidence which has been received in executive sessions, many, many more discrepancies in Mr. McNamara's presentation could be brought to the public's attention.

The statement of the Secretary was eloquently presented and was masterfully conjured to create a predetermined impression in the minds of Senators and the public. I sincerely hope that Senators will not accept Secretary McNamara's statement at face value, but will analyze it in detail, and compare it with the factual presentations received in the executive hearings. The Senate must

not permit itself to be "conned" on such a vital matter.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPT OF TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 13, 1963

Now, turning to the antiballistic missile. This is the third special area relating to the military balance which has concerned some people, the antiballistic missile known as the "ABM."

My remarks on this subject will have a close relation to those on the next subject—penetrability by U.S. ballistic missiles. Interception and penetration are opposite sides of the same coin.

An ABM system consists of several types of radars, the interceptor missile and the very complex computing equipment at a ground station to control the radars and to direct the interceptor missile. The various radars serve to detect incoming objects in space, to distinguish the incoming warhead from other objects in nearby space, to track the incoming warhead, and to track and control the interceptor missile, which is targeted on the incoming warhead by the computing equipment.

In designing an antiballistic-missile system, the major factors are reaction speed, missile performance, traffic handling capacity for decoy discrimination, resistance to blackout effects, and warhead technology.

The last two of these items, resistance to blackout effect and warhead technology depend on nuclear testing.

With respect to warhead technology, the United States now has the capability, without further testing, to weaponize a variety of possible ABM warheads, including those within the yield range desired by the designers of what is known as our Nike-X system.

These or larger warheads can be improved even further by underground testing under the treaty. The ABM system which we are now designing will provide us with a high confidence of achieving a low miss distance, a short distance between intercepting missile and the incoming warhead.

At such miss distances, the ABM warhead designs which we now have or can develop through underground testing will provide a high probability of killing Soviet warheads even if they incorporate advanced technology far beyond what now exists.

As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.

Each side has had about the same number of high-altitude tests, and overyield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable, though not identical. By theoretical analysis of presently available data, we believe we can adequately predict effects over the range of yields and altitudes in which we are most interested. We will be able to design around the remaining uncertainties.

The best present judgment is that our design efforts are comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system.

It should be noted that the United States decided not to deploy the Nike-Zeus because its effectiveness was inadequate.

One important point stands out in connection with the antiballistic missile: The ABM problem is dominated by factors unrelated to the treaty—by reaction speed, missile performance; that is, the rate of acceleration of the intercepted missile, traffic handling capacity, and capacity for decoy discrimination. A fuller understanding of

the blackout phenomenon—which would result from tests prohibited by the treaty—might at most permit some reduction in the number of ABM radars required per ABM site.

Thus, with or without a test ban, we could proceed with the development of an ABM system.

Next, the penetration capability of our missiles. This is the final special area relating to the military balance which I wish to discuss, that of the capability of U.S. weapons to penetrate any enemy defenses. They have, and will continue to have, that capability.

Penetration of an enemy antiballistic missile system depends on the capability to destroy, disrupt, or saturate the system. Current penetration philosophy concentrates on saturation, and is dominated by problems of decoy design and salvo techniques, as well as of nuclear technology.

The problems of nuclear technology here relate to the vulnerability of the ballistic missile warhead to kill by blast or by radiation. The latter vulnerability, as to radiation, can be tested underground, but the former cannot be fully tested underground.

We have not, and we believe that the Soviet Union has not, explored by full-scale, high-altitude tests the vulnerability of re-entry vehicles to blast.

Atmospheric testing would enable us to confirm the enhanced resistance of new, hard warhead designs to blast. Without the confirmation which dynamic tests of re-entry vehicles would provide, we will have to rely on extensive extrapolations and, therefore, there will be greater uncertainties than would otherwise exist.

But, regardless of the design of any Soviet ABM system, in view of the warhead improvements we can make under the treaty, of the massive U.S. force available to saturate their defenses, and of the array of penetration aids which are being developed and will continue to be developed and improved, by underground testing where necessary, the United States will continue to have the capability, and most importantly, the Soviets will know that we will continue to have the capability—to penetrate and to devastate the Soviet Union if a retaliatory blow is required.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 14, 1963]

THE TREATY FOES' ARGUMENT

(By Richard Fryklund)

Opponents of the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia apparently are seizing on the lack of an effective U.S. anti-ICBM weapon as the major reason the treaty should not be ratified.

This argument became clear yesterday during Secretary of Defense McNamara's testimony on the treaty at a Foreign Relations Committee hearing.

Democratic Senators STENNIS, of Mississippi, THURMOND, of South Carolina, and LAUSCHE, of Ohio, clashed with Mr. McNamara over the development of this weapon.

Senator THURMOND contended that Mr. McNamara had said in closed testimony earlier this year that the Russians have an anti-ICBM system. The Senator also said—as did his allies—that nuclear tests in the atmosphere are needed by the United States for the development of such a weapon.

Later, Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, told the Senate it must make sure the test ban treaty is not opening a possible fatal gap in our defenses by foreclosing this country's development of an effective anti-ICBM.

McNAMARA'S STAND

Mr. McNamara denied saying that the Russians have an anti-missile-missile system, and disputed the idea that the treaty would hinder development of such a system by this country.

He stressed in his statement that a system that could destroy incoming missiles is very complex and made up of many elements, of which a nuclear warhead is only one.

Mr. McNamara contended repeatedly under direct questioning that further atmospheric tests were not necessary to develop an anti-missile missile.

He added, however, that therein is no certainty that either Russia or the United States will be able to perfect such a system.

Senator GOLDWATER, in his speech, challenged President Kennedy's comment at a news conference earlier this month that "the problem of developing a defense against a missile is beyond us and beyond the Soviet's technology."

Senator GOLDWATER said the Nike-Zeus, although called a primitive defense against missiles, still is a defense and is a step toward greater defense. He added that missile defenses around Leningrad also are steps toward greater defense against missiles.

ESTIMATES DIFFER

The dispute stems primarily from differing estimates of technical uncertainties and propaganda.

In referring to Russian development of an anti-ICBM, Senator THURMOND was talking about the Leningrad missiles. So was Mr. McNamara in denying that the Soviets have developed an anti-missile-missile system.

The Washington Star reported in mid-March that American intelligence had spotted the sites around Leningrad and thought they probably were for an anti-missile missile similar to the Nike-Zeus, which this country dropped last year.

There is nothing to indicate the Russians have a system, however. In military parlance, a weapons system is a vast complex which includes the weapons themselves and the bases, troops, communications, training schools, supplies, etc., that are necessary to fight with the weapons.

Even if all of these things did exist in Russia, the Red anti-ICBM probably could not intercept American long-range missiles.

Intelligence estimates say that when completed, the Russian system will not be able to overcome the penetration aids which now go with American missiles.

It was this inability to cope with anticipated Russian decoys, salvos and jamming that caused Mr. McNamara to drop the American Nike-Zeus.

The Army is now developing a system called the Nike-X which would be able to beat Russian penetration aids.

HEARS COLD WAR BALLYHOO

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has disagreed with Mr. McNamara on an anti-ICBM, but his concern has been over possible "great ballyhoo" about a reported Russian weapon.

General Taylor sees the limitations of Zeus, but he told a House Armed Services Appropriations subcommittee this year that "some day there will be a great ballyhoo that the Soviets have an antiballistic missile and we do not. The claim may be largely sham and propaganda, but we face that possibility of a cold war defeat."

The ballyhoo has started, but Mr. McNamara believes it would cost \$14 billion for a Zeus to counter it.

Military experts agree that continued testing in the atmosphere—banned under the treaty—is not needed to develop a Zeus. But there is disagreement brought out by Senator THURMOND yesterday about the need for testing the Nike-X.

WEAPON UNCERTAINTY

Nothing here is black or white. All experts agree that there is always some uncertainty that any nuclear warhead will go off as scheduled and do the damage it was designed for.

This uncertainty is compounded in the case of the Nike-X because that weapon

must not only blow up the incoming warhead, but "neutralize" it by spraying it with so many free neutrons that its explosive chain reaction cannot start.

The science advisers to the Joint Chiefs disagree about the amount of uncertainty in the case of Nike-X. It seems clear that a majority of the Chiefs, including General Taylor, believe the uncertainty is small enough to live with, however.

Senator THURMOND reflects the views of other military men and some scientists who believe the uncertainty must be reduced by atmospheric testing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, August 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 23, 1963:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Amis, Thomas W.	Hofheinz, Walter H.
Barris, Victor E.	Jensen, Duane S.
Bartlett, Stephen C.	Kessler, Robert G.
Baumgardner, Carroll G.	Leonhardt, George T., Jr.
Behm, John R.	Martell, David W.
Bibles, Jerry D.	McGehean, Stanley M., Jr.
Bowen, Dennis R.	Meskan, Donald J.
Brenan, Richard P.	Moyer, Lawrence R.
Brigham, Don A.	Mullen, William F.
Buck, Leslie E.	Owens, Jack C.
Civelli, Joseph R.	Prosch, Thomas J.
Clark, Dan W.	Reynolds, James C.
Cline, John T.	Robinson, Larry W.
Collins, Michael E.	Rooke, John A.
Common, Anthony T.	Saeger, Herbert F.
Cumpston, George W.	Sagebiel, Walter C.
Curtis, Bill B.	Scheuren, William J.
Dubinsky, Ronald L.	Smidt, John D.
Frost, Robert E.	Ulm, Richard H.
Gallup, Bryan A.	Underwood, James L.
Getz, Alan C.	Waterfield, Robert G.
Glass, Richard H.	Waters, Kenneth D.
Goforth, Robert K.	Westmiller, Paul B.
Grossfuss, George H.	Williamson, John C.
Hageman, Richard A.	Wolson, Abraham W.
Hagener, Robert L.	

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Baker, Richard W.	England, Gary L.
Barbes, Alden H., Jr.	Everett, William E.
Bartlett, Jack, Jr.	Fallon, Timothy J.
Bergan, Darrel T.	Faulkner, James P.
Brindell, William F.	Fetterly, Roger A.
Brown, James B.	Gilmartin, Martin T.
Burrows, William J.	Hansen, Dawson P.
Calvert, John D.	Harvill, William B.
Campbell, Donald B.	Healy, David Y.
Cason, Billy A.	Heinzereing, Conrad W.
Coady, Eric J.	Hendricks, Dick D.
Connell, Carey B., Jr.	Hines, Oscar J.
Cooper, John R.	Hobbs, Claude C.
Crane, William B.	Ilzhoefer, Robert E.
Daniels, Robert L.	Jacobs, Richard E.
Davidson, Jerry	Janss, Peter F.
Defries, Christian F., Jr.	Judkins, Cliff J. III
Durham, Thomas R.	Kalas, Warren D.
Dyer, Wallace N., Jr.	Kanaley, Thomas F., Jr.
Eisenenson, Henry L.	

Kelley, William R.	Ranta, Roger J.
Kilfanski, Joseph R.	Rauscher, Thomas J.
Kinser, George A.	Reid, Lawrence E.
Klingele, Terence G.	Reves, Samuel S.
Koch, Neil D.	Richter, Charles J.
Lacroix, Carroll M.	Sales, Joseph R.
Lecy, Henry E.	Schlagel, Gordon R.
Lewis, Thomas E.	Shaw, "H" "J"
Loveless, Graden E.	Sherman, Wayne F.
Maddocks, Maynard W.	Sherwin, Robert S.
Mathews, Robert A., Jr.	Shields, John M.
Mattia, Henry L.	Sites, David T.
Maxwell, Harold J.	Snedeker, Munson R.
McMenamin, John J., Jr.	Strickland, James D., Jr.
Meredith, Martin W.	Summe, Robert C.
Miller, Clifford S.	Tanzman, Arnold
Moffett, Donald L.	Therriault, Anton E.
Mueller, Gerard H.	Thomson, Richard T., Jr.
Munson, Rolfe L.	Tierney, Michael W.
Murley, Thomas E.	Tristany, John P.
Nevins, William J., Jr.	Usher, Rockeley E.
Oison, Glenn A.	Vacca, Donald U.
Osborn, William F.	Vanes, John M.
Owens, Terry D.	Wallace, Daniel T.
Paydo, Michael A.	Walsworth, William A.
Peterson, Bruce R.	Wardlaw, Robert W., Jr.
Pollard, Stephen F.	Wasko, Michael J.
Pyle, Harold F., Jr.	Watkins, Thomas L.
Quadrini, Frank J., Jr.	Wiegand, Robert W.
Randall, Jesse T.	Williams, Gary W.
	Wood, Charles H.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Akin, Robert M.	Kaljian, Dan
Allen, James S.	Knight, John B.
Banks, Andrew B., Jr.	Korman, Robert C.
Baranowski, Joseph T.	Krueger, Peter A.
Bertram, Barry J.	Kruse, Philip R.
Brenan, Michael H.	Madigan, Edward F.
Brown, George W.	Marshall, James H.
Brown, John M., Jr.	Martin, John S.
Buckley, James E.	May, James E., Jr.
Bullard, Clyde A., Jr.	Mills, Harry R.
Carroll, Michael M.	Moffett, James H.
Childress, Clyde "O", Jr.	Morris, John D.
Decastro, Howard L.	Newsom, Bobby J.
Dejong, Gerald	Nicholson, Robert G.
Dickey, Clarence D.	Nunn, Albert N.
Elkenbery, Tod A.	Palatini, Anthony
Garland, John D.	Pearce, William M.
Gibson, Thomas M.	Pinson, Raymond G.
Graham, Gordon L.	Rea, John M.
Gram, Ivar R.	Ripley, Michael J.
Griffin, James R.	Rummel, William H.
Hadley, Allen C.	Salem, Donald L.
Halliday, Bartholomew G. III	Sandvoss, Bert E. G.
Holland, Kenneth D.	Scholl, Robert B., Jr.
Hull, Longstreet M.	Stockburger, Arthur L.
	Thrash, Ronald J.
	Underhill, Lonnie S.
	Walters, Francis M., Jr.
	Yatsko, Anthony A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Acuff, Burnis R.	Bohline, John C.
Allen, Howard W.	Bonenberger, Norman G.
Altizer, Robert B.	Booth, Franklin H.
Altomare, Gaspar R.	Brasher, Willie R.
Alves, Frank	Bredding, James R.
Ambrose, Timothy J.	Briley, George L.
Andrew, Samuel E.	Brown, Raymond W.
Arnott, Joseph R.	Broyles, Kermit E.
Baier, Kenneth C.	Brumbaugh, France W.
Beckner, Charles C.	Burger, Elmer S.
Begg, Robert W.	Carroll, William O.
Belles, Harry J.	Cash, John C.
Bishop, Herbert H.	Cavanaugh, Charles H.
Bloomfield, Albert B.	Chapman, Homer L.
Bocko, Peter P.	

Christensen, Jack C.
 Christie, Harold D.
 Clark, Harlan D.
 Clements, William R.
 Colter, Lessie H.
 Cook, Charles B.
 Corbin, "E J"
 Corman, William C.
 Cottrell, Billy R.
 Cree, Donald
 Crouss, Herman F.
 Cullinan, John F.
 Daniel, Charles L.
 Day, Gordon H., Jr.
 Debaecke, Ivan J.
 Dodge, James H., Jr.
 Donnelly, Frederick J.
 Dracoules, Harry L.
 Dradger, Robert F.
 Duenwald, Vernon D.
 Eells, Burton B.
 Elkins, Harvey W.
 Emond, Francis L.
 Engle, Clarence W.
 Engler, Donald A.
 Epoch, Wilbert M.
 Estes, Martin C.
 Farnham, Charles R., Jr.
 Fazer, Vernon T.
 Feeney, James F.
 Fore, Ralph W.
 Forgey, Augustine H.
 Forsen, George U.
 Foster, Albert W., Jr.
 Fousle, Howard M.
 Gardner, John F.
 Gentry, Gerald H.
 Giblin, Walter L.
 Gibson, William E.
 Gilbert, Edgar L., Jr.
 Glace, James H.
 Goodwin, Ballard E.
 Gordon, Robert C.
 Graham, Philip J.
 Griffin, Robert A.
 Grueter, Sidney L.
 Haffey, John E.
 Hamryszak, Peter J.
 Hansen, Donald A.
 Hayes, Charles R.
 Heeney, Joseph F.
 Higgins, Dean S.
 Hill, James W.
 Hoff, Robert T.
 Hollowell, Joseph M.
 Holmes, Theron C.
 Howell, Abbie R.
 Huddleston, Howard E.
 Hughes, Raymond W.
 Johnson, Byron W.
 Johnson, Harley, Jr.
 Joyner, Edward C.
 Kelly, Francis H.
 Key, Thomas F., Jr.
 Knutson, Robert G.
 Kovichinsky, Edward A.
 Lamb, James H.
 Lane, Robert T.
 Lofgren, Earl W.
 Loftus, Joseph F.
 Long, Henry A., Jr.
 Lowe, Kenneth A.
 Lydon, John F.
 Madewell, John A.
 Malloy, Lloyd L., Jr.
 Mankin, Robert N.
 Mann, Robert H.
 Mansell, John T., Jr.
 Mariniak, George W.
 Marilino, Lena M.
 Martin, Vincent E.
 Mathiasen, Vernon A.
 Mathison, Elmer L.
 May, Willie C., Jr.
 Mayer, Edward J.
 McCarron, John H.
 McCay, George E.
 McClure, Lester G.

McCracken, James M.
 McKelvey, Allen O.
 McNaught, Ray A.
 Miller, William V.
 Milligan, John C.
 Mitchell, Harold H.
 Morissette, Lucian G.
 Murray, Eugene C.
 Newton, Thomas A.
 Noonan, Robert J.
 Pace, William J.
 Parrett, Vanita F.
 Petersen, Hans P.
 Pick, Robert J.
 Pierson, Harmon L.
 Pittman, Ora L.
 Pitts, Jewel C.
 Porter, Newell H.
 Prince, Louis F.
 Prisk, Lloyd E.
 Pryor, Walter T.
 Racette, Arthur H.
 Rambo, Jack Wesley
 Ramsey, James M.
 Redden, Dennis J.
 Revolinsky, Walter R.
 Rewucki, Henry
 Rhoades, Richard C., Jr.
 Rice, Harold B.
 Riggat, Jack W.
 Romenski, Edward W.
 Rooney, Philip J.
 Rowland, George H., Jr.
 Rutkofske, John A.
 Sanchez, Rogelio, Jr.
 Scanlan, Philip T.
 Schlags, Alvin E.
 Schwerdtfeger, William K.
 Sekerak, Francis A.
 Shealy, Harold O.
 Sheets, Robert T.
 Sheldon, Robert E., Jr.
 Shontz, Michael
 Simmons, Albert F.
 Sloat, Lewis D.
 Smith, Clark L.
 Smith, William R.
 Smolski, Stephen
 Spisak, Frank
 Steffen, John V.
 Stenstrom, Joseph F.
 Still, Stephen R., Jr.
 Stone, Thurman R.
 Stromstedt, Dale R.
 Stubbs, James E.
 Sudol, Elvina J.
 Sullivan, John V.
 Summers, Clarence E.
 Talton, Lewis E.
 Taylor, Earl P.
 Taylor, Jodie V.
 Tenney, Leo C.
 Thompson, Homer C.
 Travis, John R.
 Treanor, Peter F.
 Unkle, Osborne L.
 Upton, "L R"
 Walsh, William K.
 Webb, Howard J., Jr.
 Welch, Calvin K.
 Wheeling, James T.
 Williams, James V. P.
 Williams, Joseph H.
 Willis, Donald W.
 Wilson, Charles E.
 Windham, Joe C.
 Witkoski, Cheslaw
 Wooten, Robert W.
 Yackie, Milton R.
 Yates, Wallace G.
 Zacharias, Clarence J.
 Zelechoski, Stanley F.
 Zimmerman, Paul W.
 Zwer, Don O.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Abney, Walter R.
 Aemmer, Donald A.
 Allen, Charles N.
 Anderson, Dale K.
 Axtell, Clair F., Jr.
 Balasan, Robert
 Baron, Theodore J.
 Barry, Harry L.
 Barry, Timothy A.
 Barton, Robert J.
 Bickel, Charles W.
 Blevins, William C.
 Blood, Hiawatha E.
 Boland, Charles L., Jr.
 Booth, Robert C.
 Bordonel, Buford T.
 Bracken, Christopher
 Bracy, Lloyd E.
 Bradley, Robert E.
 Braham, Sidney A.
 Brooks, Samuel N.
 Brown, Charles E.
 Brown, Denton C.
 Brown, Edward C., Jr.
 Brown, Leo E.
 Bryson, Allen C.
 Buck, Billy
 Burdett, Lesta D.
 Burdette, Claude N.
 Burns, Lawrence C., Sr.
 Calfee, Julian E.
 Cantrell, Warren P.
 Carney, James J.
 Carr, Franklin P.
 Carrozza, Salvatore
 Chapin, Junior R.
 Childers, Sanford L.
 Cobb, Arthur E.
 Cook, Harry C.
 Crawford, Jack
 Cribbs, Dossey C.
 Crim, Marvin E.
 Crowell, James L.
 Ceselka, John
 Dall, George O.
 Dauenhauer, Eldon G.
 Dautuelli, Pierre P.
 Davis, Alan B.
 Davis, Robert E.
 Deal, Franklin D.
 Dehnhostel, John H.
 Dinga, John A.
 Dixon, Robert E., Jr.
 Doyle, Alfred L.
 Doyle, Roger V.
 Drell, Warren J.
 Dressel, Howard B.
 Dudley, Melvin L.
 Duhaime, Arthur R.
 Eades, Earl W.
 Edalgo, Tyson
 Fazio, Michael
 Fetterman, Melvin W.
 Fitzhugh, Herman H., Jr.
 Flynn, James L.
 Fowler, Bion, Jr.
 Frazee, Wilton J.
 Freel, James H.
 Friend, Donald E.
 Frye, Ward W.
 Frye, Warren A.
 Gardner, Wayne R.
 Gay, George L.
 Golbski, Edward J.
 Gordy, Granville E.
 Gore, Charles A., Jr.
 Gould, Alexander
 Granlee, Gayle L.
 Guzy, Edward M.
 Hall, James A.
 Hammond, Robert R., Jr.
 Harris, Walter B.
 Harrison, Fred, Jr.
 Harter, Richard S.
 Hartley, Clair C.

Hayes, Layton A.
 Heckendorf, Leonard H.
 Henke, Walter L.
 Hill, Eugene L.
 Hintz, Loyd G.
 Hoffsetz, Robert F.
 Holley, Bernard M.
 Howell, Albert W.
 Hudgins, Luther M.
 Hudson, James H.
 Hull, William T.
 Hunter, Vincent M.
 Ivery, Edward S.
 Johnson, Joseph H.
 Jones, William S.
 Jorgensen, Herbert R.
 Kanevel, Jack R.
 Klein, Marcus G.
 Kummer, Arthur J.
 Lathen, Sylvester H.
 Lenon, Horace G.
 Leroy, John D., Jr.
 Lewis, Eugene I.
 Lewis, Francis M.
 Lipe, James C.
 Livingston, Lyle W.
 Lovelace, Darrell M.
 Lunt, Alfred G.
 Mable, Earl D.
 Macnaughton, John R.
 Marion, George L.
 Martin, Melvin L.
 Matson, Francis M.
 Mazza, Robert J.
 Matthews, Carl W.
 McCaffrey, John W.
 McConnell, Howard E.
 McDonald, Edwin W. J.
 McFall, Henry R.
 McGuire, Shely W.
 McInnis, Edwin L., Jr.
 Miller, Daniel J.
 Mintz, Kermit T.
 Moore, Orange J., Jr.
 Moorehead, Harold L.
 Morris, Benjamin F.
 Morrison, William M.
 Morrissey, Robert M.
 Mount, Marvin A.
 Myers, Russel E.
 Nash, Kenneth P.
 Nelson, Carl A.
 Newill, Lawrence E.
 Nickel, Steve J.
 Nobel Lowell I.
 Osterman, Joseph F.
 Page, Jack W.
 Palmer, Charles E.
 Palmer, Roger A.
 Parks, Joe
 Perdue, Samuel K.
 Peverada, Caesar L.
 Pickerill, Henry S.
 Powner, Walter J., Jr.
 Ragan, Lionel B.
 Ramage, Rudel E.
 Redding, Victor L.
 Raddoch, Donald W.
 Renshaw, William M.
 Resch, Raymond R.
 Richcreek, Edmund V.
 Rosenkoetter, Russell E.
 Sawyer, Robert S.
 Schepmann, Leroy E.
 Schmidt, John J.
 Shaw, Garland R.
 Shea, Richard H.
 Shirley, Raymond R.
 Sims, Curtis H.
 Skoldberg, George W.
 Slater, Charles
 Smith, Coleman D., Jr.
 Smith, Gerald F.
 Smith, Henry J.
 Smith, Lester L.

Smith, Paul F.
 Smith, Sidney P.
 Southard, Conward B.
 Speer, Charles D.
 Steele, Burton, A.
 Taylor, Rex C.
 Tenney, Charles A., Jr.
 Thomas, Harry A.
 Thompson, Robert A.
 Tucker, Lester B.
 Tully, Harold J.
 Tworek, Flavius S.
 Unger, George W., Jr.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Anagnostou, Angelo
 Baldasari, Nilo J.
 Rowman, Glenn P.
 Butler, Creighton F.
 Campbell, William H.
 Canfield, Glenn R.
 Donovan, Peter B.
 Faini, Orlando R.
 Gay, William C.
 Goldberg, Sol

Hutchison, Frank
 McGroarty, Edward J.
 Mitchell, Leonard T.
 Nagle, Richard R.
 Neyer, Arthur E.
 Shrum, Wayne A.
 White, Charles R.
 Whitt, William F.
 Wright, Scott E.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Adcock, Cecil A.
 Albert, Cyril H.
 Anderson, Kenneth E.
 Asseier, August H.
 Bacon, Everett R.
 Baldwin, Joseph C.
 Barksdale, Leon K.
 Book, Mac
 Brad, Carl
 Brinson, Marion H.
 Brooks, Loyn R.
 Burdyslaw, Loyd R.
 Case, Alexander
 Christensen, Knud H.
 Crawford, Gordon H.
 Crosthwaite, Frederick N.
 Cunningham, Albert L.
 Danaher, John S.
 Dersham, George E.
 Dickenson, Waldo E.
 Dmoch, John
 Dorton, Charles C.
 Drechsler, Max K., Jr.
 Ettling, Sheldon
 Evans, Joseph L.
 Falconer, Leroy D.
 Farmer, Eddie L.
 Farmer, Paul E.
 Garrison, Randolph J.
 Grunwald, Otto A., Jr.
 Hamilton, Donald L.
 Hammock, James C.
 Harrell, Dexter E.
 Hart, Robert N.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jermers, Robert L.
 Schlegel, Kurt A.

Mary A. Curtis for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line of the U.S. Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Ayre, Donald
 Barry, Richard D.
 Benson, Peter H.
 Broglio, John D.
 Condit, Norman E.

Dooley, John J.
 Johns, James E.
 Partlow, Joseph A.
 Stevens, Stanley L.
 Young, Robert B.

SUPPLY CORPS

Goodman, David R. Myers, Cecil E., Jr.
Jaap, Joseph D. Paskawitz, Selwyn S.
Kee, William D., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Moran, John P.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy, serving in a higher grade, for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Hixson, James T.
Schlavone, Anthony J.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Clarke, Wlot L.
Corday, Earl F.
Mayle, Arthur E.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Benson, Louis R. Koerner, John G.
Brugler, Louis W. Leamons, John B.
Caporicci, Joseph A. McNiff, Eugene E.
Carden, James C. Stauffer, Donald W.
Cox, James T. Taylor, William K.
Elworth, Raymond F. Thompson, Perry T., Jr.
Evans, Richard L., Jr. Toomey, Robert B.
Ewing, John E., Jr. Triplett, Franklin I., Jr.
Ferguson, Gilbert C.
Frank, Delbert E. Ungemach, Seibert A.
Jackson, Lewis L., Jr. Warp, Arthur J.
Jones, Robert W. Welch, Stanley C.
Kayton, Kenneth B. Wright, Edwin A.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Carpenter, James
Carter, Richard W.
Moye, Edwin B.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

David W. Harned Thomas H. Oswald
Joseph A. Masterbone Allen R. Ruth

Charles M. Maskell, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

John F. Lynch III (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Jerome M. Kopel (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

John H. Leonard (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jerome H. Davis Alan C. Newburger
James M. Fitts, Jr. Emil E. Pollard
Thomas N. Markham

Robert M. Hoffman (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Bennie Krupa, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy, for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

Marvin A. Ennis, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W-3,

in the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 23, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commanders

Pentil A. Stark
Merlyn E. Natto
Alfred C. Holmes

To be lieutenants

Francis D. Moran Charles K. Paul
John W. Bricker Dee E. Kimbell
Donald J. Florwick

To be ensigns

James H. Alford Robert T. Coffin
Gordon E. Mills Henry L. Pitcock III
Paul W. Larsen Ronald W. Elonen
Michael Gemperle John B. Jones
Leland L. Reinke Thomas E. Ryder
Christian Andreasen Edgar N. Vail

To be captain

Glenn W. Moore

To be lieutenant commander

Kelly E. Taggart

To be lieutenants

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick

To be ensign

Danford A. Moore

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Monroney Delivers Oologah Dedication Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last month on July 20, members of Oklahoma's congressional delegation, leading business and political figures in Oklahoma, and hundreds of Oklahoma citizens joined together in dedicating the Oologah Dam and Reservoir.

This was a memorable event in Oklahoma and it culminated the hopes and dreams of many who have followed the progress of the Oologah project for a quarter of a century since it was first authorized in 1938.

The Oologah Dam and Reservoir is the first major unit to be completed on the Arkansas-Verdigris River navigation project.

One of the highlights at the Oologah dedication ceremonies was the speech delivered by Oklahoma's able senior Senator, the Honorable MIKE MONRONEY.

Senator MONRONEY has been a champion of water conservation and development throughout his illustrious career in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

Senator MONRONEY's remarks point out in graphic terms the benefits to be derived from the Arkansas River development program and the necessity of continuing to develop and conserve our water resources. The complete text of his remarks follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY AT THE DEDICATION OF OOLOGAH DAM, JULY 20, 1963

Today we dedicate the first of three great projects that make possible the first man-made navigation channel in Oklahoma.

Mark Twain once said that the Army Engineers had started out to make the Mississippi over again—a task which he claimed was exceeded only by the original job. We are in the same posture as we envision the massive job undertaken on the unruly Arkansas.

But here we are—at a dedication service for the Oologah Dam and Reservoir, which was first authorized 25 years ago. Next year we will dedicate the Eufaula project (dam to be completed June 1964), which will control the Canadian River system, and the Keystone project (dam to be completed December 1964), which will control the upper Arkansas and all its major tributaries above

the confluence of the Verdigris, which is controlled by this great project.

Oologah, Eufaula, and Keystone—three great mountains of earth, rock, steel, and concrete erected across three unruly rivers. These had to be completed before we could direct our attention to the construction of the navigation canal.

The tons and tons of silt carried by the Canadian, the Arkansas, and the Verdigris had to be trapped—the torrents of flood waters had to be impounded—before we could begin the locks and dams, the revetments, and the channel straightening which will form our waterway to the sea.

The Corps of Engineers has adopted a unique way of putting all the pieces together in the right way at the right time. They call it the "Critical Path Method." This system is one devised by the armed services for programing construction of complex missile base systems. It was also used successfully in the Navy's Polaris program. I am told that by following the recommendations of the "mechanical brain" the construction schedule can be maintained with the reliable assurance of navigation to Pine Bluff in 1968, to Fort Smith in 1969, and to Catoosa in 1970, provided, of course, that Congress furnishes the money. I assure you that it is the objective of the Oklahoma delegation to see to that.

The Arkansas project is expected to exceed the benefits of the already developed Tennessee, which is used as the "showcase" of America to foreign visitors interested in

the field of conservation, and where private investment in job-creating industries along what was once a useless, dangerous river has already surpassed the total public investment required to control its waters.

We have no reason to believe that our Arkansas will not develop as profitably as the great Ohio, which is returning \$11 on each \$1 invested. The former chief of Engineers, Emerson Itchner, said at Tulsa that we had all the resources that made the industrial complex of the Ohio grow at the rate of \$1 billion per year, plus a great abundance of fuel resources and bauxite. Who here wishes to dispute the chief?

The Columbia River development is returning \$5 to \$1, the lower Mississippi \$6 to \$1, and the lower Colorado almost \$3 to \$1.

Where else can we invest to secure such a handsome return? I favor economy in Government. I favor, when possible a balanced budget. But I also favor accelerating the investments that we as a Government make in our soil and water programs.

Each project we create is the equivalent of a new industry. It creates jobs, which means payrolls. It creates new opportunity for industries and for recreation. Each visitor to this project will spend an average of \$3 per day. He will create a demand for capital investments of \$10 to supply him with goods and services.

Our good friend and colleague Senator FULBRIGHT, testifying before the Appropriations Committee, pointed out that since 1900 the United States had spent \$21.5 billion on Army Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tennessee Valley programs. He pointed out that this is less than one-third of the amount budgeted for defense purposes for the coming year. The Corps of Engineers has advised us that this project will create in excess of \$1 billion in new business each year for Oklahoma and Arkansas, and the direct benefits from its operation will amount to \$64.5 million a year, which is \$6 million more in annual benefits than is required to amortize the project in 50 years.

We are running out of time. We need to realize that our demands for conservation are growing much more rapidly than our development program.

The Russians are determined to overtake the United States in hydroelectric power and water development by 1975.

Congressional committees that have visited Russia report the Russians consider their mighty river systems their greatest inexhaustible resource. They are sparing no effort and no expense to have the greatest harnessed and utilized river system in the world (spending \$2 to our \$1).

The priority of river development is hydroelectric power, navigation, irrigation, flood control, fish, wildlife, and recreation, water supply.

The U.S.S.R. is catching up with the United States in electric power production, the basic field in which supremacy counts heavily in peaceful and economic competition or in event of war (10 percent of river investment going into power).

Although the United States is still far ahead, with 142 million installed kilowatts at the beginning of 1959, compared with 53 million in the U.S.S.R., the Russians could overtake us in 1975—in 12 years—unless we speed up or they slow down.

The U.S.S.R. allocates almost four-fifths of its power to industry. The United States uses a far smaller share of its power in goods-producing industry. This means that the U.S.S.R. could surpass the United States in the amount of power allocated to industry in 1973—in 10 years.

The U.S.S.R., vigorously pursuing its oft-stated goal of overtaking the United States in economic production, has undertaken

literally hundreds of new starts on water developments within the past 5 years.

Ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in bringing you the following greetings from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 13, 1963.

The completion of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir is an event of considerable satisfaction to me. Its relief of the misery and loss from floods, its needed water supply, and its enhancement of recreational and wild life opportunities will be important contributions to a better life for the people in the area. As a key reservoir in the multiple-purpose plan for development of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin, it signals a major milestone in bringing to the people Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas the benefit of an invaluable waterway connection to the Mississippi. This occasion is also a tribute to the late Senator Kerr and to those Members of Congress who are participating today in the dedication exercises.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Report of National Projects Committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the national projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 50th National—"Golden Anniversary"—Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, June 4-7, 1963.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while serving here on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public works program and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

I was honored to be asked to serve as chairman of this important committee, having previously served as its chairman for a number of years during my former service in the Congress of the United States. At that time I also had the honor of serving as a national vice president of the congress, and presently I am serving as its regional director for the lower Great Lakes region.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited

service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

Projects committee: Representative ROBERT T. SECREST of Senecaville, Ohio, chairman.

New England division: William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, U.S. Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Col. George W. Gillette, U.S. Army (retired), chairman, Wilmington Port and Waterway Development Commission, Wilmington, N.C.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Al. Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn., vice chairman.

Missouri River division: John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Col. Thomas J. Weed, U.S. Army (retired), vice president, National Defense Transportation Association, Washington, D.C.

Western Inter-Mountain Region: Harold H. Christy, second national vice president, National Reclamation Association, Pueblo, Colo.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE
50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE
NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

JUNE 7, 1963.

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on June 5, 1963, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 62 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 22 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of \$247,068,000. Fourteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 26 proposals, sur-

veys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to permit completion of these surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

On October 23, 1962, President Kennedy signed the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. This act authorized the Corps of Engineers to construct, modify, or otherwise participate in the provision of 199 flood control, navigation, water conservation, and other water resources projects, having an estimated Federal cost of \$2,260,218,300.

This includes 79 navigation projects at an estimated Federal cost of \$378,498,800; 12 beach erosion control projects at an estimated Federal cost of \$19,875,000; and 108 flood control (including multiple-purpose) projects at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,861,844,500.

The new law also authorizes amendment of existing beach erosion control laws to provide for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used, shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shore parks and conservation areas which meet certain criteria. Previously, it was 33½ percent in both cases. Authority is provided to construct small shore protection projects not specifically authorized by the Congress with the Federal share of the cost limited to \$400,000, and the law authorizes shore protection investigations at Federal expense in lieu of the present basis under which local interests participate equally in study costs.

In addition, the new law increases the Chief of Engineers' small flood control project authority from \$400,000 to \$1 million for a single project. The limitation on the overall amount which may be used for this program in any one fiscal year was increased from \$10 to \$25 million.

Other items of interest in the bill include amendment of the flood control emergency law to provide for repair and restoration of Federal hurricane and shore protection works, and authority for the Chief of Engineers to develop recreational opportunities at all Army water resource projects (previously limited to reservoir projects).

The new omnibus act also authorizes 18 surveys for flood control and allied purposes and 8 surveys in the interest of navigation.

It will be recalled that the Senate version of the 1962 Authorization Act included increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans. However, when the bill went to conference, these increases, along with several projects on which the House committee had not held hearings, were deleted from the bill. The managers on the part of the House made the commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings on those projects as soon as practicable after the next Congress convened.

As a result of the hearings during April 1963, a bill, H.R. 6016, authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, was reported by the House Public Works Committee on May 15, 1963. The bill provides increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans, totaling \$684 million. It is understood that monetary authorizations for certain river basins have become so deficient that funds which might be made available cannot be used in the fiscal year 1964. Your

projects committee recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to take early action on this bill.

Your projects committee feels it is fitting at this time, the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, to cite the accomplishments in the field of water resources.

The Corps of Engineers civil works program statistics, as of June 30, 1962, are as follows:

Navigation

Number of improved harbors (commercial).....	500
Improved Federal waterways in commercial use (miles).....	19,100
Commerce during calendar year 1962 (billion tons).....	1.1

Active navigation projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed.....	2,289	\$1,972,400,000
Under construction.....	110	2,639,200,000
Balance.....	130	1,611,400,000
Total.....	2,529	6,223,000,000

Flood control

Number of reservoirs in operation.....	195
Number of local protection projects in operation.....	536
Flood-control storage in reservoirs in operation (acre-feet).....	65,800,000
Flood damages prevented during fiscal year 1962.....	\$662,637,000
Cumulative flood damages prevented to date.....	\$11,295,187,000

Active flood control projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed.....	484	\$1,604,100,000
Under construction.....	168	2,993,100,000
Balance.....	259	2,297,600,000
Total.....	911	6,894,800,000

Multiple-purpose projects producing hydroelectric power

Number of reservoirs in operation for hydroelectric power.....	36
Installed capacity of projects producing power (kilowatts).....	7,531,400
Generating capacity installed during fiscal year 1962 (kilowatts).....	657,000
Generating capacity under construction (kilowatts).....	4,030,000
Ultimate capacity of projects completed and under construction (kilowatts).....	15,677,400

Active multiple-purpose projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed.....	29	\$1,678,600,000
Under construction.....	30	3,741,900,000
Balance.....	17	1,480,600,000
Total.....	76	6,900,500,000

NOTE.—Net hydroelectric power generation during fiscal year 1962: 29,924,100,000 kilowatt-hours.

IRRIGATION

Irrigation storage was provided by 16 reservoirs, having 796,000 acre-feet exclusively for irrigation, and 4,043,000 acre-feet jointly for that and other purposes, making a total of 4,839,000.

LOW-FLOW REGULATION

There were 35 reservoirs in operation which provided low-flow regulation.

WATER SUPPLY

There were 20 reservoirs in operation which provided approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet of water supply storage for 64 cities, towns, and rural areas.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

The total estimated Federal cost of the 92 authorized projects, involving partial reimbursement for construction by local interests, is \$44,400,000, of which \$8,800,000 has been appropriated to date for 48 of these projects, leaving a balance of \$35,600,000 to complete.

RECREATION

Outdoor recreational facilities for public use have been provided at more than 300 projects, at a Federal cost of \$27,500,000 and a local cost of about \$56 million. During calendar year 1962, there were 127 million visits to these facilities.

It is to be noted that great progress has been made in water resource development, but much remains to be done. The problems in water resource and land use developments are ever increasing in an expanding Nation such as ours. The committee is gratified to note that not only is increasing attention being given to the need for comprehensive planning for water resources development but even more important, numerous recent actions are designed to facilitate true comprehensive planning in the water resource field. These actions include section 207 of the 1962 Flood Control Act in the interest of public parks and recreational facilities at water resource development projects; also Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2d session, prepared under the direction of the President's Water Resources Council, has been issued setting forth policies, standards, and procedures in the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for use and development of water and related land resources.

The studies and recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has provided the primary stimulus for the currently increasing emphasis on comprehensive basin planning. The requirements placed upon our water and related land resources are many and varied. They must serve domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other human activities. Senate Document No. 97 states that "The basic objective in the formulation of plans is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs." That document also established the scope of multiple-purpose planning; the needs and possibilities for all significant resource uses and purposes of development. As of June 1962 comprehensive basin planning had reached the stage where the areal extent was considered as an entire river basin or major tributary thereof. As a result of the need for such planning Congress has authorized many comprehensive river basin investigations. The budget for fiscal year 1963 included funds for completion of three comprehensive basin studies, continuation of two and initiation of 19 other studies. The fiscal year 1964 budget request includes funds for initiation of 4 and continuation of 21 comprehensive basin studies.

In closing, your committee desires to direct the attention of the Congress to the urgent need for initiating and completing authorized water resource projects and investigations. It is hoped that the committees of Congress will see fit to include in the annual public works appropriations bills for the various Federal agencies concerned with water resource developments, funds necessary

to carry out their assigned responsibilities in this highly important field during the next fiscal year.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT T. SECRET,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no

project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each calendar year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

Endorsed. This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
867-R	Kawainui Swamp	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1008-R4	Calcasieu River salt water barrier	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1096-R5	Port San Luis deep draft and small craft harbor development	California	South Pacific.
1102-R	Trinity River and tributaries	Texas	Southwest.
1163A-R2	Savannah Harbor	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1235-R	Campit-Clarence flood control	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1239-R	Green Bay Harbor, deepening of entrance and river channels	Wisconsin	North Central.
1254-R	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	Tennessee	Ohio River.
1266	Hyder Wing Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1267	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach and vicinity	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1268	Savery-Pot Hook, reclamation	Colorado and Wyoming	South Pacific.
1269	Bostwick Park, reclamation	Colorado	Do.
1270	Fruitland Mesa, reclamation	do.	Do.
1275	Fremont flood control, Sandusky River	Ohio	North Central.
1276	Salt Creek Reservoir	do.	Ohio River.
1277	Crab Creek	do.	Do.
1280	Laurel River Reservoir	Kentucky	Do.
1281	Cordell Hull Dam	Tennessee	Do.
1285	Key West Harbor modifications, Key West Bight	Florida	South Atlantic.
1286	Key West Harbor, Garrison Bight	do.	Do.
1287	Great Lakes harbors study, interim report on Saginaw River	Michigan	North Carolina.
1296	Elkhorn Basin flood control and irrigation project	Nebraska	Missouri River.

DIVISION II

Meritorious

Meritorious. This means that the com-

mittee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing

to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1092-R3	Passaic River Basin	New Jersey	North Atlantic.
1126-R4	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News	Virginia	Do.
1157-R3	Waikiki Beach improvement	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1165-R	Trenton Channel extension (All American Channel)	Michigan	North Central.
1168-R3	Haleiwa Beach erosion project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1170-R3	Harbors for light-draft vessels, coast of Hawaiian Islands	do.	Do.
1213-R2	Northeast (Cape Fear) River above Hilton Bridge	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1220-R2	Cape Fear River above Wilmington	do.	Do.
1234-R	Salem Church Reservoir	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1256-R	Norfolk & Western Ry. bridge	do.	Do.
1271	Animas-LaPlata, Reclamation	Colorado and New Mexico	South Pacific.
1272	Waterloo flood protection project	Iowa	North Central.
1279	Devils Jumps Reservoir	Kentucky and Tennessee	Ohio River.
1295	Central Arizona project	Arizona and New Mexico	South Pacific.

DIVISION III

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey

requested. This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any au-

thorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
776-R	Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Key West	Florida	South Atlantic.
797-R	Perdido Pass	Alabama	Do.
1069-R	Knik Arm Causeway Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1138-R2	Mississinewa River channel improvement	Indiana	Ohio River.
1158-R3	Iao Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1162-R3	Kihel District	do.	Do.
1163-R2	Palolo and Manoa Streams	do.	Do.
1169-R3	Honolulu Harbor, deepening and widening of harbor and survey for a harbor at Barbers Point	do.	Do.
1172-R3	Port Allen Harbor modification	do.	Do.
1174-R3	Explosive handling facilities within Hawaii harbors	do.	Do.
1219-R2	Kahoma Stream	do.	Do.
1251-R	Kanalei River flood control	do.	Do.
1257-R	Thimble Shoal Channel, Norfolk Harbor, and channel to Newport News	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1273	Kulonou Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1274	Potomac River channel improvement project	Virginia and Maryland	North Atlantic.
1278	Heppner Dam and Reservoir	Oregon	North Pacific.
1282	Pupukea-Paumotu flood control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1283	Kapaakea flood control	do.	Do.
1284	Kawela Gulch flood control	do.	Do.
1288	Kawaihae Harbor modifications	do.	Do.
1289	Hocking River survey	Ohio	Ohio River.
1290	Champlain Waterway	New Jersey, New York, Vermont and Canada.	North Atlantic.
1291	Lafayette River, tributary or estuary of Hampton Roads	Virginia	Do.
1292	Cliff Walk	Rhode Island	Northeast.
1293	Touchet division, Walla Walla project	Washington	North Pacific.
1294	Susquehanna River watershed, comprehensive development	New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.	North Atlantic.

**Statement Commemorating the First
National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio, on
Its 100th Anniversary**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the 100th anniversary of a bank whose constant goal has been dedication and service, the First National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio.

On September 11 ceremonies commemorating a century of service by this bank to both the citizens of Gallipolis and the Ohio Valley will be observed in Gallipolis.

From its very inception in 1863 the bank under the guidance and through the administration of capable and dedicated men and women has served its customers in the highest tradition of banking. It has grown from a small rural institution to a landmark of the Ohio Valley. It is a landmark not because of unusual financial prowess in the banking world, but because of dependability, integrity, and an awareness of how it could meet the financial needs of its customers and the community. In this space-age world we sometimes have a tendency to forget some of our smaller, but enduring and dedicated business firms and institutions. We overlook institutions that serve the many needs of our smaller communities and outlying areas—better than our larger and better known banks that sometimes tend to be insufficiently aware of the needs of smaller cities.

But, it is difficult to overlook a bank that has accepted the challenge of adversity and overcome it to grow in the finest American tradition. Nor can one overlook a man who has dedicated over 50 of his 82 years to the banking world. Mr. Joe Moch is in his golden year as its president. Thus not only do we have a banking institution of note in Gallipolis, but one of the grand old gentlemen of banking.

A half century ago when Mr. Moch became president of the bank deposits totaled just over \$200,000, but since have reached new heights of over \$5 million. This in itself is a tribute to his devotion, service, and obviously untiring leadership. Many other statistics could be cited, such as the growth of the bank's surplus from \$31,000 in 1913 to \$600,000 in 1963 but statistics could never tell the story of the First National Bank nor of its president, Mr. Moch.

There are many First National Banks in this country. But few, if any, are as worthy of the name of First National Bank as is this First National Bank of Gallipolis. It has the distinction of being one of the very first banks to be chartered under the National Banking Act of 1863. For 100 years it has been faithful to the trust that was accorded to it by the granting of this charter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider it entirely fitting for the Congress of the United States to salute the First National Bank of Gallipolis on its centenary and to extend our heartiest congratulations to its distinguished president, Mr. Joe Moch, who has guided its destinies for exactly half of its first hundred years. We are confident that the First National Bank will continue to contribute to its community and to the Nation in the same spirit of dedication and service that have characterized its first century.

Mexican Independence Day

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, all Mexican citizens, Americans of Mexican descent, and citizens of the United States whose lives have been touched by the Spanish-Mexican cultural influence, will celebrate the 153d anniversary of Mexican Independence Day.

Mexico was the first of Spain's New World colonies to rise up in a war for independence, and the cost of this independence was high in numbers of patriots and expended treasure. But the commodity sought—freedom and sovereignty—was, and remains, priceless. There are few nations in the world which can match Mexico's boundless pride and reverence for its historic struggle for freedom.

In 1810 Mexico was in a ferment of revolutionary ideas and plans for independence. Among the Mexican leaders of this movement was a simple parish priest, Father Miguel Hidalgo, who administered to the Indians and peasants of Dolores. In September of that year, upon learning that the Spanish Government had learned of a plot that he was involved in, Father Hidalgo boldly chose to strike before the government rounded up the revolutionaries. On Sunday morning, September 16, 1810, he rang the church bells to summon the simple people of his parish—the church and churchyard were soon crowded with humble peasants and Indians. Hidalgo spoke to them from the pulpit:

My children, this day comes to us a new dispensation. Are you ready to receive it? Will you be free? Will you make the effort to recover from the hated Spaniards the lands stolen from your forefathers 300 years ago?

As the crowd roared its approval, Hidalgo cried out what became known as the grito de Dolores, the battle cry of the Mexican War of Independence:

Long live our Lady of Guadalupe, down with bad government, death to the Spaniards.

Although Hidalgo's army of Indians did not gain complete Mexican independence—for Hidalgo himself was tricked, captured, and shot—the grito de Dolores electrified and rallied Mexican

patriots to the long task of earning their freedom. Thus, this day, September 16, like our Fourth of July, is celebrated as the day of the declaration of independence.

Mr. Speaker, we Californians, of course, have particularly close ties with the history and culture of Spain and Mexico, for we have been deeply affected by the gentle arts and customs which our heritage has bequeathed us from Mexico. There are many Mexican-Americans residing in California—over 30,000 in the San Francisco Bay area alone—and we join with them wholeheartedly in their celebration of this day of independence.

From the people of the United States comes the warmest and most affectionate good wishes to the people of Mexico on this, their national day of independence. You are, of all our good neighbors in Latin America, our closest and best neighbors.

Pork?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, unrefuted in the recent speechmaking on the floor of the House in which Members rebutted the smear-like tactics of Life magazine in its issue of August 16 on the subject of so-called pork was that portion of the story pertaining to the U.S. Employment Service under the heading of "The Steaming Pork Casserole—Tasty Items in the Dish." After speaking of the scope and cost of the U.S. Employment Service, the article says:

Here is where the pork gets mixed into the dish. To attract professional people, some State agencies build elaborate offices with free parking lots in downtown districts. * * * Last year only 40 percent of the people USES placed were unemployed.

Judging from the reaction to this article of Mr. Gil Johnson, Commissioner of Labor of Alaska, who is also head of the Alaska State Employment Service, the subject statement about the employment service is far afield indeed, as evidenced by the telegram which I have received from him, as follows:

Following wire sent to editor of Life magazine: "I must take exception to your statement in August 16 issue that only 40 percent of the people placed by the U.S. Employment Service were unemployed. Alaska State employment is affiliated with Public Employment Service. Our records show that of the nearly 10,000 persons placed in jobs during the 12-month period ending July 30, 1963, 87 percent were unemployed. Unfortunately your writers apparently ignored the job-finding services provided by the employment service network to the physically handicapped and unemployed veterans. The job-counseling service given applicants and the activities of the service in combating automation and obsolescence of skills through

retraining programs. You have apparently been misled by the current campaign being conducted across the Nation by the fee-charging employment agencies. I would appreciate it if you would give your readers a complete report on the activities of the U.S. Employment Service."

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I say that although Life magazine went far out of its way to broaden its attack to include worthwhile programs based upon public policy and the general welfare, it said nothing about

the highly preferential and deficit-producing second-class mail rate under which it mails its magazine each week to its subscribers. Honest reporting should include a fair evaluation and balanced presentation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. John W. Wright, Bethesda Baptist Church, Jersey City, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we desire with reverence to approach Thy throne.

We draw near with confidence, relying on the worthiness of Christ, through whom alone we look for pardon and acceptance.

We adore Thee in Thy wise and righteous government. The word of Thine authority is right; and all Thy works are done in truth.

Today and for all times, we beseech Thy guidance and help; look Thou upon us with compassion. Help this Nation, Thy people, to recall to memory the richness of Thy blessings promised, if only Thy name is honored and obedience to Thee is practiced.

May we all now, the people of this great and blessed Nation, begin to meet the conditions that will enable Thee to fulfill Thy promises.

Bring us to the knowledge that right living exalteth a nation and that in Thy will can genuine peace and joy be had.

Help us, O God, to be living examples of the same.

With so much strife and bitterness within the Nation among Thy people, some are free and some are not; in Thy omnipotence touch the hearts of men that a closer relationship among the races abound, that true freedom and lasting liberty are had and felt by all.

"What makes a nation truly great, Not the strength of arms, nor men of states;

Nor vast domains by conquerors won Who know not the rising or the setting of the sun.

Not sophisticated schools nor learned clans;

Nor laws that bind the will of man, For these have proved in ages past like fatal dreams that could not last."

Help all men of this Nation to know no barriers of creed or race, that our love may be like Thine—a love that sees all men as Thy children and our brothers.

O God, who knoweth the secret of every heart, bless, we pray Thee, the leaders of this Nation.

Strengthen the courage of the Representatives in Congress assembled—men of sincerity and of good report desiring to do that which is right and acceptable to Thee. Make Thy righteousness clear to them, O Lord, that by them the Nation is guided into a finer way of life.

Forgive the errors they have made and grant to them the courage to admit mistakes.

Save our leaders, O God; let no personal ambition blind them from that which is right—give to them, if Thou wilt, commonsense and a selflessness that shall make them credits to the Nation.

Holy Father, in this hour, we would pray for the President of these United States, that he too will have the spiritual courage and grace with which to shoulder his obligations.

Be Thou near unto him we pray, filling him with the spirit of God that shall make him fearless to seek, to know, to do the right.

May in his perspective, he has been tried and never denied and is willing to be tried again.

Crown his family with heavenly benedictions and guard their hearts and thoughts always in Thy will.

Strengthen and empower his advisers that they too may know the truth and that their ideals and procedure square with Thy criteria, that by their example and influence all the people will be taught to praise Thee, O God.

Finally, let the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength, and our redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 23, 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 agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. DORN. 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. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the French Congo was overthrown last week by a howling mob in the streets of its capital city. Reports from Saigon, South Vietnam, hourly bring incredible tales of mob violence and demonstrations. This friendly government on which we are spending a million

dollars a day is in grave danger of being overthrown by mobs.

The march on Washington this week will set a dangerous precedent. It is reminiscent of the Mussolini Fascist blackshirt march on Rome in 1922. It is reminiscent of the Socialist Hitler's government-sponsored rallies in Nuremberg.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been submitted a written threat by George Lincoln Rockwell, commander of the American Nazi Party, to parade and counterdemonstrate. His organization has demanded permission to parade and hold a rally at the Washington Monument. I am reliably informed that 40 additional organizations have also asked for permission to counterdemonstrate.

While this Federal Government-sponsored demonstration on the 28th may be "peaceful" under the watchful eye of thousands of Federal troops, Secret Service, National Guardsmen, and police, it is a bad precedent and could lead to a takeover of the Federal Government by future mobs. The Federal Government has created a Frankenstein monster. The might of the Federal Government is being mobilized to insure a "politically successful" demonstration. Political expediency in this case calls for the utmost caution to insure order. The very fact that the Federal Government is going to such extensive and expensive preparations to guarantee a "peaceful march" indicates the stark potential danger of such demonstrations in the Nation's Capital. After this precedent, the next march on Washington may bring a million demonstrators carrying concealed weapons.

The Constitution guarantees peaceful assembly and the right of petition. However, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of our Nation that the Federal Government itself has encouraged a "march on Washington."

The law against mass demonstrations in the Capitol Building and on the grounds should be extended by the Congress to cover the entire District of Columbia to protect the seat of Government of our Republic.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MARKET NEWS SERVICE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.