the Federal payment. Public Law 874, which would provide annual payments to the District of about $4 million, is one such source.

Furthermore, statistics show that the District has experienced a slight decline in total population but, at the same time, has had an enormous increase in the numbers of schoolchildren in the public schools. Bare statistics do not tell the whole story, however, of the flight of wealth to the suburbs coupled with the continued influx of socially underprivileged families into the heart of the capital. The children of these families require far more extensive services and far more intensive effort from our schools than do those children of more fortunate families. These children are just as much a part of the reality of America, and of the hopes we have for the future, as are those of more fortunate background. They deserve our best efforts. Even if the attention of the whole world were not focused upon Washington, D.C., our responsibility toward the children of our Capital would be the same. This is the one Federal responsibility of education which is undisputed, and which we must discharge with honor.

TO PREVENT THE REDUCTION OF STATE PAYMENT TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Finally, there are a number of States that reduce the local school district's entitlement from State funds when these local districts receive aid under the impacted areas program. The State of California is the best example of this. Under California law, 60 percent of the funds received by the local school districts under Public Law 874 are considered to be "local resources." Since the State contribution to the local school district is based on the local resources of the district, this provision has the effect of cutting down the State contribution to the local district by an amount equal to 60 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874. As a result, the Federal Government is not only aiding the impacted school district, but may be providing a form of general aid to education in the State if the State funds that would have been available to the impacted school districts if they had received no Federal payments are used for other educational purposes in the State.

My bill provides that Public Law 874 payments to the local school district are to be reduced by an amount equal to the reduction in the State entitlement. The State would thus be deterred from reducing its payment to federally impacted school districts.

I firmly believe that if these changes in the impacted areas legislation are adopted, a long step will have been taken toward making these laws both more equitable and more in line with their original purpose.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Wynn Myers, D.D., Washington Street Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious and loving Father, we stand before Thee this day, at the threshold of another week. We praise Thee for Thy creation and our own place of service among Thy people. This new day is given us full of promise and without blemish. It is ours for all the good we might do in Thy name.

Here in Washington we sense Thy presence in peculiar fashion. We know Thou art present with the Congress. The eyes of all the Nation are set upon Thy work done here. Across the crowded ways we hear the cries of our brother's need. In haunts of wretchedness we see Thy tears revealed. The challenge of our unfinished task is ever before us.

Grant to each of us the wisdom to know what is right.

Amidst the multitude of so many demands may we know where our first energies belong. Beyond the petty claims of selfish men may we hear Thy call and may we learn to do those services which render the largest good to the most people.

To these Thy chosen representatives, O Lord, give special blessing and endowment. May they possess a wisdom and an understanding come from Thee. As they work this day, may they possess the strong sense of Thy abiding presence in their midst. Grant to them a peace of mind and heart that comes when men know that they have done their best.

These things we ask that this Nation and Thy people may be blessed and Thy name may be glorified and honored throughout all the land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 26, 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 report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5555) entitled "An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5888) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, 21, 37, and 56 to the foregoing bill.

"ALONE NO LONGER," BY STANLEY STEIN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity of bringing to the attention of my colleagues what I regard as one of the most moving and courageous stories ever published. I refer to the book "Alone No Longer," written by Stanley Stein, a patient in the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Carville, La., and a dear personal friend of mine.

Mr. Stein's book is a composite of many stories about people at the hospital who suffer from Hansen's disease, one of whom is himself, and in the process of telling these stories the author also presents an authoritative discussion of the disease and the care and treatment of those who are afflicted by it.

Speaking to you as one who has considerable layman's knowledge concerning the subject-matter, I want to observe here that it is indeed unfortunate that Hansen's disease is still most generally referred to as "leprosy" and that the victims of this malady continue to be labeled "lepers."

In all the annals of history there is recorded no more terrible chapter of mankind's inhumanity to man than in the accounts of the treatment of those afflicted with leprosy, or Hansen's disease. The stigma attached to the disease is almost worse than the affliction itself and dates back even before the Middle Ages.

How regrettable it is, Mr. Speaker, that even in this age of compassion, the thinking and the attitudes of the general public about this malady have not materially changed.

I have visited the hospital at Carville on numerous occasions, have participated in various programs there, and have mingled freely with the people—patients and hospital personnel alike—and I have always felt completely safe and have enjoyed my associations there to the fullest extent. Doctors and nurses at "Carville"—more accurately described as U.S. Marine Hospital No. 66—which is the only so-called "leprosarium" in the United States, observe only common precautions, and none has ever contracted the malady.

No one knows exactly how Hansen's disease is transmitted, or how long the incubation period—except that it must be quite long—but the disease is commonest in warm climates. The fact that there are only a few hundred patients at Carville is further evidence that, fortunately, relatively few people ever contract the bacillus.

Until comparatively recent years the disease was dealt with on the basis that it was "incurable." Now, however, the relatively new sulphone drugs show great promise of eventual cure.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Stanley Stein, the author of "Alone No Longer," has

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

been a patient at the Hansen's disease hospital in Louisiana for the past 32 years. He has been blind for the past 19 years, but his indomitable courage has not been dampened. He founded, shortly after his arrival, and is still the editor of, the Carville Star, the hospital bimonthly newspaper, which has done so much to revise the treatment of the disease from which he suffers and the attitude relative to the afflicted patients, by disseminating accurate information and counteracting misinformation about what is probably the least understood and most exaggerated complaint affecting mankind. The Star today has a circulation of more than 15,000 in 60 countries of the world.

Mr. Stein has written what is surely a great and permanent book. I hope, sincerely, that many of my colleagues will read it.

Excellent—a light that dispels gloom—

The New Orleans Times-Picayune said of "Alone No Longer."

Dr. George Woodbury wrote in the Report:

More than anything else, "Alone No Longer" is a saga of unconscious courage, persistence in the face of dreadful odds, and high good humor.

Columnist Hermann Deutsch commented in the New Orleans States and Item:

From the standpoint of craftsmanship it is a superb job. First page to last, there isn't a line of mawkish sentimentality. The story development is excitingly done, almost breathlessly so in spots. * * * to a large degree "Alone No Longer" is startlingly frank in the honesty of its revelatory narrative * * * and is well worth perusing for the sheer excitement it conveys to the reader.

Said Newsday, Garden City, N.J.:

This is a powerful plea for intelligent understanding. * * * The book is tightly packed with information, not the least being that 90 percent of the world's population is immune to the disease which, at its worst, is only "very slightly contagious." "Alone No Longer" is must reading for all.

Mr. Stein's book was described by the Brownwood (Tex.) Bulletin as "the story of a man who refused to be one of the living dead."

There have been scores of such reviews, Mr. Speaker, since "Alone No Longer" was published last June by Funk & Wagnalls Co., Inc. Among the publications reviewing the book have been the Opelousas (La.) Daily World, the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, the New York Times—western edition—Kirkus (N.Y.) Bulletin, Publishers' Weekly, and the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, which said:

This book is as much a testimony to the personal courage of a single human being as it is a strong reminder that it takes society a long time to be disabused of superstition and prejudice.

Also, the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times:

An inspiring book, a testimonial to the effectiveness of one dedicated man's efforts.

The Hartford (Conn.) Times:

In addition to being an exciting and moving life story of a fine, philosophic man, this book is a stirring and eloquent plea for understanding.

The Indianapolis Star:

His story is a heartening record of heroic determination.

The Saturday Review Syndicate, and the Baton Rouge (La.) Sunday Advocate, which concluded a comprehensive review with this comment:

The Carville hospital is richer as a result of Stanley Stein having been sent there. Sufferers from Hansen's disease the world over are better off than they were in the days before Stanley Stein. And, readers of "Alone No Longer" will be grateful for the existence of Stanley Stein. * * * As his story unfolds, the reader, no doubt, will be shocked at society's cruelty to its members. But when it seems despair will overtake hope, Stein's writing reflects the calm of one who has lived long, seen much and perhaps understood even more in his blind years. That understanding he has passed along to his fellow men in this volume.

Also, the Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register:

An absorbing, informative and sometimes shocking book.

Drug Topics, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Christian Herald of New York City, in which Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, wrote:

This is the profoundly moving story of a man who discovered he was a leper but who refused to be one of the "living dead." No volume that I have ever read has dealt more intimately, more honestly, yes, and more convincingly, with an impossible subject. Something more than loneliness disappears, the loneliness of what through the centuries has been a repulsive horror, too, when this book is finished. But with the disappearance of loneliness comes a new birth of hope with a challenge to participate in one of mankind's great moral and physical adventures.

Call it Hansen's disease or "leprosy," as you may choose, but the fact is no longer greater than the cure, and in this book the promise of healing is like a trumpet over the sad ages.

Columnist Pie Dufour of the New Orleans States and Item concluded an extensive review with this observation:

"Alone No Longer" is a human document of honesty, sincerity, and sublime courage. It deserves to be a best seller.

Mr. Speaker, in following up these remarks, it is my wish to reiterate several large facts which are a constant part of Mr. Stein's text: The word "leper" is a hateful, misused, and unnecessary one; "leprosy," or Hansen's disease, is not very contagious—far less than tuberculosis, for instance; the disease translated as leprosy in the Bible is obviously not the Hansen's disease of today; Hansen's disease is not of venereal origin, and fingers and toes do not "drop off."

Another point which I wish to emphasize is that Stanley Stein saw the hospital at Carville change—and was highly instrumental in bringing about the changes—from a filth-ridden, ignorance-driven institution, where patients were treated as criminals, and where to enter the gate meant a one-way ticket to a living death, to a clean, modern hospital, where patients are treated intelligently and, in an increasing number of cases, eventually discharged, where patients are now rightfully permitted to vote and otherwise enjoy the privileges of full citizenship, and where the gates swing open both ways.

I shall ever be grateful, Mr. Speaker, that, as a Member of Congress, I have been able to contribute in at least a small measure to the betterment of conditions at U.S. Marine Hospital No. 66, and I shall continue to work toward providing sufficient funds to help improve the lot of these temporarily unfortunate citizens. And, my sense of appreciation to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY, is deep and enduring. As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling the money bill for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has endeavored to assure for the hospital at Carville as nearly as possible the measure of support that it so clearly deserves but which, unfortunately, until comparatively recent years was not made available.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that as many Americans as can do so, when in the Carville, La., area—near Baton Rouge—will avail themselves of the opportunity of visiting the hospital and meeting some of their fellow citizens there, who on the whole are people of exceptional moral strength and integrity.

PROVIDING CONGRESS WITH INFORMATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is again confronted with the case of a veteran Federal employee who is apparently being fired for providing Congress with information which it has every right to know.

I speak of Otto F. Otepka, a 48-year-old lawyer and former chief of the evaluation division of the State Department's security section.

Otepka has been served with a notice of charges that he provided the Senate Internal Security Committee with information in violation of State Department policy to refuse to produce such records.

Mr. Speaker, this latest attempt to deprive the Congress of information, which may well be vital to the security of this Nation is an outrage, and I am today writing Secretary of State Rusk demanding full details, including the names of all the principals involved.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: A TRIBUTE ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS APPOINTMENT TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren to the Supreme Court. In recognition of this event, the State bar of California honored him at its 36th annual meeting being held last week in San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate we honor Chief Justice Warren. In the comparatively short time since his appointment to the Court by President Eisenhower, he has established a record which will surely cause us to rank him among the outstanding Chief Justices in our history. In the tradition of our great Justices, he has steadfastly safeguarded the individual liberties which the American Constitution guarantees. He has endeavored to see the watchword of the Court—"Equal Justice Under Law"—made a living truth.

In his role as Chief Justice, Earl Warren has delivered many notable opinions in the area of civil rights. It was he, speaking for a unanimous Court, who ruled that segregated schools contradict the basic tenets of our Constitution and of modern democratic society. The force *of this decision* has been extended to State operated recreational facilities, intrastate transportation and local elections.

At the last term, Chief Justice Warren wrote the opinions in four cases which expanded the ban on segregation to public accommodations and public facilities. These were landmark cases for they were the first sit-in cases to reach the Court. These cases have now made it clear that State and local governments may not directly or indirectly enforce segregation. We can be proud that the Supreme Court, under the leadership of its present Chief Justice, has eradicated the evils of segregation from a large segment of our national life.

It was Chief Justice Warren who wrote the basic *decision* protecting the right of citizenship from divestment. Our citizenship is the most fundamental right we possess and when lost, we are left stateless and disgraced in the eyes of the world. Understandably, this right should not be withdrawn except under the most compelling circumstances. Chief Justice Warren's decision recognized this and held that such a sanction is penal in nature and violated the eighth amendment prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment." In so doing, he gave the amendment a contemporary interpretation, emphasizing that by modern standards of civilized treatment this sanction is barbarous.

Events over the past decade have shown legislative investigations can be of great danger to individual liberties. Chief Justice Warren wrote the first opinion curbing the abuses practiced by some of these committees. The opinion restricted the power to inquire into political beliefs and associations of individuals because these subjects have a measure of protection under the first amendment, which stands as the guarantee of our freedom of speech and association.

Chief Justice Warren has continued to play a leading role in the preservation of individual liberties from invasion by arbitrary and unreasonable investigation. In the most recent case decided by the Court, the Chief Justice rendered a decision which reversed the contempt conviction of a witness before one committee on the ground that in dealing with the witness, the committee had failed to comply with its own procedures and had treated him unfairly.

This brief recounting of some of the principal decisions written by Chief Justice Warren makes it evident that he possesses those qualities which make a great Chief Justice—a brilliant mind, strong leadership and an approach which applies the Constitution in the light of the realities of our modern world.

He has challenged passion, prejudice and intolerance whether supported by the multitude or by extremists who wrap their unprincipled attacks in the mantle of spurious patriotism. At all times Chief Justice Warren has remained unswerving in his devotion to the highest ideals of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the State Bar of California in honoring Chief Justice Warren on the completion of 10 years of distinguished service on the Supreme Court. We are truly proud of him and hope that he will continue to serve on the Court for many years to come.

HON. LESTER B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an address by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last night to be present at the annual award dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Cleveland where the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, received the National Human Relations Award from the hands of Dean Rusk, our distinguished Secretary of State.

At this great meeting of community leaders of all faiths, all colors, and all backgrounds, the Prime Minister delivered an address which is worthy of the thoughtful consideration of us all.

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE LESTER B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 29, 1963

With my deep personal gratitude for the honor conferred on me tonight go my thanks for the recognition you have also given to my country's efforts in promoting brotherhood through the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, which is affiliated with your own conference. Canadians join in the Annual Brotherhood Week which you sponsor, and Canadians, like most peoples in our Western world, appreciate and benefit from your program and your work.

The men who founded the National Conference of Christians and Jews 35 years ago did so to combat forces of intolerance, racism and bigotry which still threaten, as they have always threatened, to divide and destroy free societies. Your founders also set themselves a greater goal; that of promoting the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, which is the basic sacred teaching of both the Christian and Jewish religions.

In the period since 1928, the National Conference of Christians and Jews has reached its present and acknowledged position as the world's oldest and most effective organization in the field of brotherhood.

It is the nature of your work that its success can never be precisely measured at any given time. The process of ennobling human emotions and reducing human evils and weaknesses defies measurement. All the more so, because any outburst of racial violence or religious persecution—whether it is a stone hurled in ugliness at a negro or a sign painted in depravity on a synagogue; any assault by evil men against right and reason, seems, at the time, to dominate our view of the state of brotherhood. The immediate outburst overshadows steady achievement.

This, of course, is unfair to the progress toward brotherhood made by men of good will and high purpose over the years. Though you may do much by quiet endeavor to improve human relations among a million men, one man with paint or rock, or vicious word, can hurl his hatred across the large black headlines, and for the moment blot out all that has been done.

You have made ordinary people, in their homes and their schools; in their communities and in their work, conscious of the personal contribution they can and must make, through all their human relations, to better human understanding and brotherhood. It will only be through this kind of personal involvement, only by the right reaction in the hearts and lives of people, that today's great problems, of human rights and social welfare, of freedom, of international order and peace, will be solved.

The universal ideals of the National Conference of Christians and Jews suggest the extension of your brotherhood crusades far beyond their present bounds. A Moslem friend of mine, a former Foreign Minister of Pakistan, once gave eloquent expression to the concept of universality in brotherhood, when he said:

"Human brotherhood is universal. Its basis must also be universal. Islam requires that our concept of brotherhood should derive from our common relationship through God.

"Every one of my fellow beings is my brother, and has a claim upon the best that I have to give, because he is a creature, a servant, an ambassador, of my Lord and Maker. We are all bound together by the rope of God."

One specific aspect of brotherhood is good neighborhood; the good neighborhood of the street, of the city, of the nation, and of the world.

In the realm of national "neighborhood," I think first, of course, of the United States and Canada. Our two countries have shown the world how to link the neighborhood of geography with the neighborliness of good relations. We combine coexistence with the friendly cooperation which alone gives it any creative meaning.

This neighborliness, however, does not mean that we have no problems between us. We do not live side by side in good neighborhood without the difficulties which are bound to crop up in all human and political relationships. We have experienced such difficulties recently, on both sides of the border. They stem from measures taken by one or the other country, taken in good faith to protect its own national interests. But measures taken by one neighbor can at times hurt the other. Such hurts and difficulties may at times be unavoidable but we should keep them to a minimum. Only with good will and understanding on both sides, can this be done.

Just as in the work of your conference, there is a lesson for the world in brother-

hood, so in the case of the United States and Canada the relationship between our two countries should be such as to show the world how two free and independent nations—so widely different in their power and influence—can work together without fear on the part of the smaller, or force on the part of the larger.

We have our difficulties, as I have said, and our differences, especially in trade and finance. These differences and difficulties are facts of national and international life. But it is evidence of maturity that we do not allow them to poison or destroy our good neighborhood.

The closest and friendliest relations between our two countries are both natural and necessary. Geography, history, economics, a common dedication to freedom and a resolve to protect it, combine to make your interests in the world coincide largely with our interests. When your economy is depressed, our unemployment increases. When your security is weakened, we have cause for fear. When freedom falters in the United States, ours is diminished in Canada.

The contacts between our two peoples are more intimate; our interdependence more compelling, than that between any two countries in the world.

This is bound to bring its tensions as well as its opportunities; tensions which are sometimes sharpened by the fact that we discuss our differences so openly and publicize them so freely. A Canadian going to Washington on Government business can, and usually does, speak as frankly as a Texan, and in roughly the same accent. The same holds true about a visitor to Ottawa from across the border. This sometimes leads to press exaggeration of a difference of opinion in the interest of a good story; rows always make headlines. It can also lead to consequent public misunderstanding.

A wise Canadian commentator on United States-Canadian relations, with a distinguished career in our public service, Mr. John Holmes, has recently, with wit and perception, written and I quote:

"Resistance to American pressures is endemic in Canada, but for goodness sake, in an age distorted by the kind of virus anti-Yankeeism rages within Peiping or Havana let's not call the Canadian phenomenon anti-Americanism. For Canadians as for all the Atlantic peoples, policies decided upon in Washington are so decisive that we look upon them in a sense as domestic—and claim the right to argue about them vociferously. But we are no more anti-American than those from whom we get our critical ideas—Walter Lippman or Mort Sahl."

And later:

"We are such unequal partners, and yet we struggle to understand ourselves through the inapplicable cliches of equality. * * * In world politics we are profoundly unequal in power and influence. We struggle constantly to find formulas to define what our relationship should be. How much right have the powerful to prescribe policy and weaker partners to go their own way? These are the dilemmas which flutter the border nowadays, these and the economic and cultural issues which also spring from our inequality. The answers are elusive; no problem has proved more intractable in this age than that of defining an appropriate relationship between allies which differ in power."

That relationship, while as friendly as ever, is bound to be somewhat less easy as it grows in importance and complexity.

There is more than economics, however, in our relationship—there is a common dedication to the same human and moral values. In each of our countries we are trying to build a society which gives first place to the individual—to his needs, his hopes, his rights, and his responsibilities. We often fall short of our objective. But the objective, and the effort to reach it, must remain. For without the freedom that is based on the individual personality, there can be no real security—or even salvation.

There is no cause for despair, though much for concern, as we seek this dual goal of freedom and security.

Haunted by the sad memories and the grim consequences of his failure to live peaceably with his fellows, man has many times accepted as inevitable a doom that he has somehow managed to escape. We must hope that, by the slow progress of the ideals of brotherhood, it will be so again this time.

There is, in fact, more hope for peace in the world today than yesterday. But this is no cause for premature rejoicing. The international atmosphere has improved. The cold war is a little less frigid and a little less warlike. For that we can be thankful.

But a better international atmosphere is only a means to an end, better international action. The test, therefore, will be in policy and not in perorations.

It is paradoxical that the first test has been a test ban. That test has been met in a way which we were assured, even a few months ago was impossible, by a ban acceptable to both sides. This is good. But more difficult tests remain to be met and overcome. Therefore, we should not go overboard with optimism because Mr. Gromyko applauds Mr. Kennedy at the United Nations, instead of banging his shoe on his desk.

It is essential to exploit every opportunity to promote peace and security that the better atmosphere gives us; to show patience and perseverance and good will. We must do this now, but without any illusions; without throwing our caps in the air, or our defenses to the ground.

Wisdom, understanding, and strength are needed now as never before.

The challenges we face have never been equaled in scope or intensity; never has the penalty for failure ever been so great.

There are conflicting cultures and philosophies and ideologies, as there always have been, but now the pressures and tensions from their conflicts have the energy and force of our supersonic nuclear age. Today we can be sure of only one thing; the inevitability of accelerating change. The pace of such change—the multiple revolutions and explosions, of nations, of knowledge, of population, of science—approaches the incomprehensible.

Revolutions in political wills are accentuated by the revolutions in economic wants. Those who strive to be free, not illogically, demand to be fed.

Yet as the world echoes to the drumbeat of change, our inability to cope with insistent human demands in so many places increases. The gap widens between the hungry and the fed; between haves and have-nots.

There is also a developing spiritual gap between the protestations and the practices of brotherhood within nations, including yours and mine.

As a guest of the conference at this particular time, may I say that, if I comment on your country's present racial problems, it is because they are ours also. On an issue which your President has described a "the conflict between bigotry and the Holy Word," I speak with human feeling but with no sense of national criticism or national smugness.

I have no desire to whisper hesitantly in bland generalities nor any right to shout stridently in accusation. For here, of all places, at a brotherhood dinner, neither whispers nor shouts are needed to underline the concern of all of us with the ugly challenge of racial violence—wherever or whenever it appears.

Racial problems are the concern of all mankind. When President Kennedy expresses alarm over what he has described to Congress as "the growing moral crisis in American race relations," when he makes his earnest pledge to the United Nations to end racial discrimination, he is speaking to us all and for us all.

So it is that I can discuss racial discrimination as frankly here, where the problem is close and critical, as I would in my own country, where it is less pressing only because our situation is different. Discrimination and injustice and cruelty and violence know no national boundary. So the blind eye, the deaf ear, turned anywhere toward any injustice, toward any form or degree of discrimination, bigotry, or prejudice, serves only to encourage evil. We must condemn these things wherever they appear and whatever form they take. And they take many forms.

As long as hush-hush social discrimination remains, the roots of more violent bigotry remain. And as long as the roots remain, they are a threat to the principles of all true believers in the Christian and Jewish ideal: the universal brotherhood of man.

I warn you, however, not to seek for the solutions to these problems in governmental action alone; either national or international.

Neither national governments nor a world assembly can legislate human emotions. The ideals of brotherhood are not enforceable. There is no formula for making human relations smooth and without friction.

There are serious limitations on what can be achieved by political action in the area of national ugliness.

Governments, laws, and courts, can no more put brotherhood into the hearts of men than the United Nations can put brotherhood into the hearts of nations.

No written law and no mere declaration—no matter how eloquent—can insure good behavior or create human dignity.

Brotherhood, and all it stands for, begins in man's heart. If it does not live there, then you will not be able to impose it by decree on the family, the community, the Nation or on humanity.

This does not mean that governments and courts do not have an important part to play. They do. When bigots detect a stammer in the voice of authority, they are emboldened to new outrages. I am not advocating political cowardice in the passing or the administration of antidiscrimination laws. I urge only that society guard against expecting governments to insure freedom, and to control emotions, by statute alone. That cannot be done. History—littered with the wreckage of high-sounding declarations and pious expressions—shows abundantly that words alone are frail packages for human hopes.

The rule and the role of law, likewise, must not become confused with the will of man. Law must make force its servant—not its enemy. Like government, it cannot achieve the impossible but, backed by freemen, it can help freemen to do what you, in the National Conference of Christians and Jews, are doing; actively expose and combat prejudice, bigotry, and arbitrary power wherever it is found.

A great U.S. jurist, the late Judge Learned Hand, once put this thought into noble words, when he wrote:

"I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes.

"Liberty (and brotherhood) lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court, can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it.

"While it lives there it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it.

"What, then, is the spirit of liberty?

"I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith.

"The spirit of liberty (and brotherhood) is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias.

"The spirit of liberty (again, and brotherhood) remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him, who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

I believe that if today all men, individually and collectively, believed, acted and lived in the spirit of those words—accepting their own responsibilities toward humankind, instead of expecting governments, courts, and laws to do all things—the great crusade for the brotherhood of man would indeed be possible of realization; if they did that, the essential values of the civilization we are striving to preserve would approach invulnerability—invulnerability to attack from without and to erosion from within.

We may not hope for more.
We dare not strive for less.

USING U.S. FORCE TO REINSTATE JUAN BOSCH IS IDIOTIC AND WOULD RISK A COMMUNIST TAKEOVER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the restoration of Juan Bosch to power because it would be the height of idiocy and would risk the eventual Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. All reports since the ouster of Bosch indicate what had been generally known but not admitted before—that Bosch was incapable of coping with the country's problems, that he fomented raids on Haiti to cover up his own inadequacies, that he permitted the Communists to run wild, and that his policies were ultra-left.

General Wessen, who helped spearhead the overthrow, called Bosch a Communist and stated:

The way he worked in the 7 months he was President all seems to indicate that he was a Communist.

And added:

Bosch was warned on July 13 that unless he changed his attitude about the advance of communism, the military would take action. The situation went from bad to worse, culminating in the overthrow.

Reports of a Communist buildup have been coming out of the Dominican Republic for some time and I have warned many times of the Communist buildup. Hal Hendrix, the highly respected Latin American news editor of the Miami News, stated recently that the Communists were making disturbing gains and no effort was being made to stop an eventual Communist takeover. On May 21, he accurately predicted that the army would serve an ultimatum if the Communist buildup continued. In his May 21 article, Hendrix said:

There is, unfortunately, puzzling evidence that Washington, which has extended its wholehearted support and praise to the Bosch regime, was not being candidly advised of the sustained Communist developments here by U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin.

Sources closely familiar with the American Embassy confide that full reports on the gravity of the situation have not been transmitted by Ambassador Martin to the State Department or to the White House.

Since Bosch's inauguration, more than 150 previously deported Communists have been allowed to return to the Dominican Republic, many of whom are teaching in the Communist-front school called the Institute of Social Sciences and Economic Planning. Others have infiltrated labor organizations and the University of Santo Domingo.

Now the far-leftists in Latin America are calling for U.S. action to reinstate Communist-sympathetic Bosch. They are being joined by leftist supporters in this country, including Teodoro Moscoso, in charge of our Alliance for Progress program; Gonzalo Facio, president of the OAS, and Ambassador from Costa Rica; and the Ambassadors of other far-left countries including El Salvador and Colombia.

It is interesting that these same people are the ones who vociferously object when someone suggests stronger measures—short of war—to oust Communist Castro from Cuba because they object to usage of the "big stick" by the United States.

How swiftly they turn and ask for intervention when one of their far-left rulers is being deposed.

It is amazing that even a Member of Congress should fall for this and go so far as to suggest military intervention to reinstate Bosch. Such action would be tantamount to using our military forces to put the Communists eventually in control of another Latin nation.

Military coups have been used for decades to prevent Communist takeovers in Latin America and the United States even participated in such a coup for the same purpose in Guatemala in 1954. We cannot reverse this anti-Communist policy in the Dominican Republic unless we want to welcome a Communist takeover.

I include the four articles as printed in the Miami News on May 21, 22, 23, and 24, which called public attention to the Communist buildup in the Dominican Republic.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, May 21, 1963]

RED TIDE RISING IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—Subtle and peaceful Communist penetration of the Dominican Republic is progressing with incredible speed and efficiency.

There is ample evidence—ominous evidence—that Communist forces closely alined with Cuba and the Kremlin, aided by native supporting leftist elements, are working both openly and covertly to turn this country into a second Communist-dominated bastion in the Caribbean.

It is not a noisy and spectacular transition such as the world witnessed in Cuba. It is being accomplished with considerable sophistication and has managed so far to use a number of well-meaning Americans and Latins as dupes.

Echoes and reflections of Cuba in mid-1959, a few months after Fidel Castro catapulted to power in Havana, are becoming increasingly audible and visible. Missing from the Dominican scene are the "barbudos," Castro's bearded gun toting guerrillas, and the quick elimination of the organized armed forces at the Castro-type execution walls. Otherwise, many of the sounds and sights are alarmingly similar to those which punctuated the early, "social revolution" days of 1959 in what has since become a Communist regime in Cuba.

The transformation process is being unhampered by the often proclaimed democratic government of President Bosch, which was inaugurated only 2 months ago and hailed by the U.S. Government and some Latin American nations as a "champion of democracy."

Top officials and behind-the-scenes advisers in the Bosch government steadfastly deny that communism here poses any real threat or that its influence in Dominican politics and life is growing.

These officials argue vigorously that after 31 years of dictatorial rule by Rafael Trujillo and a year of council-of-state government, the Dominican Republic is at last becoming a "true democracy," and that contrary statements are only the work of last year's election losers. However, behind this smokescreen, the government of the Dominican Government today is slipping rapidly into Communist control.

One western diplomat, familiar with the Communist takeover in Cuba, declares that the situation here "is moving 10 times faster than it did in Havana, and this has been called a 'showcase of democracy.' "

There is, unfortunately, puzzling evidence that Washington, which has extended its wholehearted support and praise to the Bosch regime, is not being candidly advised of the sustained Communist developments here by U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin.

Sources closely familiar with the American Embassy confide that full reports on the gravity of the situation here have not been transmitted by Ambassador Martin to the State Department or to the White House.

And it is known that one of Bosch's key advisers, Rumanian-born Sasha Volman, who is a naturalized U.S. citizen, has a direct line to a Presidential aid in the White House to press the Bosch goverment's position, philosophies and line. The Western diplomatic colony here, apart from the American Embassy, feels that Washington consequently is getting a "snow job."

The lack of accurate communication between the American Embassy here and Washington is viewed by some responsible observers as another echo of Havana in mid-1959, when the U.S. envoy, Ambassador Philip Bonsel, was bottling up significant trends and developments.

* * * * *

Many responsible Dominicans and others here fear that the State Department and White House now are similarly miscalculating the true Dominican picture and developments.

They point out that the deception taking place in the Dominician Republic is made easier because, relatively speaking, the historically troubled nation which shares the turbulent island of Hispanola with Haiti has experienced a remarkably peaceful period in the wake of the assassination of Dictator Trujillo 2 years ago May 30.

There was no great bloodbath after the collapse of the prolonged one-man dictator-

ship, even though long pent-up hatreds made it susceptible. The chances also were enhanced by the power vacuum which was Trujillo's principal legacy.

While a seven-man council of state ruled the country last year, an orderly and free election was held last December and Bosch who had spent more than half his life out of the country as a political exile, won the Presidency as head of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD).

It had been expected that after the death of Trujillo, the Communists would move in quickly to take advantage of the anticipated chaos and confusion. They were only moderately successful in their infiltration schemes.

Last fall, during the October crisis over Soviet offensive missiles and bombers, secretly implanted in Communist Cuba, the ruling Dominican council of state ordered deportation of known Communists under an emergency law.

COMMIES DEPORTED

A substantial number of Communists were expelled, but the council was somewhat lax in carrying out its announced cleanup of known Red troublemakers.

However, since President Bosch's inauguration, more than 150 of the deported Communists have been allowed to return home and circulate freely.

Some have found government jobs. Others are teaching in a new Communist-front school called the Institute of Social Sciences and Economic Planning. Still others have infiltrated into labor organizations and the University of Santo Domingo.

Many of the returning Communists came from Cuba. Others are known to have returned from Prague. Some came from the Soviet Union and various Iron Curtain countries by way of Paris.

"You can bet your life that these Communists just aren't sitting around enjoying the sunshine after the trips to Havana and Eastern Europe," commented a responsible and concerned Dominican professional leader.

Since the Communists began returning last March, the Bosch government had laid the foundation for a civilian militia. Ostensibly this organization is supposed to merely be for the purpose of protecting sugarcane fields from fires. But many observers here point out there is no need for firefighting vigilantes to have political indoctrination and militia-type drill instruction.

There also is puzzlement over the need for 17,000 of the so-called fire watchers.

INFILTRATION OF ARMY

There are continuing reports that there has been some Communist infiltration in the ranks of the Dominican army, especially among the lower ranking officer corps and enlisted personnel. A similar toehold is suspected in the police ranks.

Military and police field grade officers are frankly worried about the visible Communist gains in political and public fields—and the lack of a firm stand against it by President Bosch.

There is growing whispered conversation that the day soon may be approaching when the military will demand that Bosch adopt a firm position against the Communists.

The Dominican business community is plainly scared about the Communist direction in the country.

Foreign investors also are apprehensive. There has been no new foreign investment in the country for the last year, and the Bosch regime did nothing to encourage it by driving the Standard Oil Co. (Esso) out of business here shortly after taking office.

"There won't be 10 centavos' worth of new investment in this country until Bosch speaks out in favor of Western policies and against the Communists, especially against Communist Cuba," declared one Dominican business executive.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, May 22, 1963]

RED SETUP PARALLELS BOSCH RULE

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—A swiftly developing Communist apparatus here, increasingly active since the inauguration of what many believe to be a naive Bosch government 2 months ago, has drafted a master plan providing for creation of a "parallel government" which would be capable of assuming control of the country, in a moment of crisis.

Western diplomats have learned that copies of the document have been given to President Juan Bosch and to Angel Miolan, president of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). Bosch is the titular head of the PRD.

One copy was made available recently to a resident foreign envoy after an anti-Communist relative of one of the key Communist leaders sneaked one of the drafts from its place of safekeeping and had a photostatic reproduction made before restoring it.

The 11-page document, called "Data and Plan of Action" and dated March 22, 1963, reportedly was drafted by Rafael Faxas Canto, one of the well-known Communists here. Faxas was deported as a Communist subversive last fall. He returned here from Communist Cuba early in March.

After a detailed financial analysis of the United States and Dominican Republic Governments, the document spells out strategy and tactics for absorbing control of industries through workers, the agrarian structure through the peasants and the professional and intellectual elements of the country.

The working instrument would be called the Committee of Local-National Liberation.

"* * * we believe that this is the proper moment," the document states in its conclusions, "the most opportune moment for the creation of that work team, as well as to create the infrastructure organizations which on a given moment of crisis are capable of assuming charge of the Government—creating now what might be called a parallel government.

"In part we can accomplish this by using as nuclei the thousands of committees and subcommittees (now in existence). In addition to being a functional structure, it would permit, in time, the decentralization of power and the advent of a type of self-government whose original cells would be in this nucleus."

The document stated that the correlation of progressive forces, at this moment, is formidable.

"History is on our side," it stated. "The strengthening of the socialist camp, the progress of the national liberation movements in the entire world, and the consolidation of the Cuban revolution in our continent back the progressive forces of history.

"Every day there are deeper and greater contradictions in the capitalist world.

"Their methods of fighting are perfected and become more inhuman. After the Cuban triumph, the imperialists have training camps for their armies and the lackey armies of other countries.

"These men are trained in antiguerrilla warfare and will be used against those who make a liberation effort and in future aggressions against Cuba unless we adopt adequate measures we will see the disappearance of our progressive leaders, perhaps sooner than we think."

The document accused the United States of sabotaging three airliners in Latin America last year to "eliminate progressive leaders."

Among its recommendations, the document called for the "personal and political preservation of Manolo, as a leader capable of advancing or retarding the Dominican revolutionary process." (Inasmuch as the most prominent Manolo in the pro-Communist circles is Manual Tavarez Justo, head of the violent June 14 movement, it is presumed by observers here that the document was referring to him.)

Tavarez Justo up to now has appeared to relish playing the role of a sort of lone wolf of the extremist element, not always immediately responsive to strict Communist party discipline.

"In view of the fact that the daily task of our leaders is overwhelming (trips, meetings, etc.)," the document stated, "they are unable to undertake the necessary study and investigation required to be properly posted on economy, politics, sociology, history and the world correlation of forces."

The plan then called for preparation of a continuing analysis of the world situation, of the advance and strength of the socialist countries in the "political and economic camps, the uneven development of capitalism, its crises, its antagonistic contradictions, situations of underdeveloped nations and the advance of national liberation movements" for the forementioned busy leaders.

The plan also called for increased use of Marxist manuals and closer regulation of "the acquisition of the better known capitalistic publications."

How many copies of the planning documents are in circulation here and what happened to the ones allegedly placed in the in the hands of President Bosch and Miolan, are two large unanswered questions.

Its first known appearance here has been linked to a move initiated by Jose Espaillat Rodriguez, who was among the first of last fall's Communist deportees to return from Communist Cuba last March, to unite the Red forces and related extremist groups into a United National Liberation Front (FULN).

The unity move was designed to include the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD), National Revolutionary Party (PNR), the Popular Socialist Party (PSP) and the June 14 movement and to push the straight orthodox Communist Party line for "peaceful transition to socialism."

So far, Taverez Justo's June 14 movement has not openly joined the proposed bloc, reportedly because all the terms did not suit the ambitious Tavarez Justo. Thus, the reference to "Manolo" on the Communist master plan.

The Dominican military hierarchy, the Catholic church and other observers here are on the alert for any and all hints of action which may be related to the "Data and Plan of Action" manual. They see in it too much of a Communist Cuba flavor for comfort.

Dominican and foreign observers also are fully aware of the extent of Communist infiltration which already has been scored in various government departments and ministries and see no reason to scoff at references to creation of a "parallel government" for a "given moment of crisis."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, May 23, 1963]

A SECRET CARIBBEAN CRUISE

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—In mid-April, President Juan Bosch, U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin, and a small group of Dominican Government officials and military leaders sailed out of Santo Domingo for a leisurely cruise in the blue Caribbean waters surrounding this island republic.

President Bosch had become aware that high-ranking segments of the military and others in the country were becoming restive about an easily visible increase in Communist activity here.

A short sea excursion was decided upon to clear the atmosphere.

Reliable reports, leaking from the Dominicans, later indicated that President Bosch spent almost 3 days expounding his ideas and philosophies about conditions in the Dominican Republic and how he believed communism could best be dealt with here.

According to the reports, the discussion was more like a monolog, as though a professor was delivering a series of lectures to a group of students.

Basically, President Bosch is said to have expressed the philosophy that it was wiser to give the Communists the same freedoms as other Dominicans and keep them in the open where their activities could be observed easily.

CONFIDANT

As explained subsequently by Sascha Volman, Rumanian-born naturalized U.S. citizen who serves as a sort of "gray eminence" for President Bosch, the nub of the Dominican chief executive's thinking on communism is that he refuses to "make the same mistakes as President Romulo Betancourt in declaring open war against the Communists and then spending 24 hours every day fighting them."

During the boat ride, according to responsible sources, Ambassador Martin remained virtually silent. The military officers reportedly interpreted the silence as tacit approval or endorsement by the Ambassador of President Bosch's extensive discourse.

The cruise ended Sunday, April 14.

The following day, according to Western diplomatic sources here, President Bosch held a meeting in the outskirts of Santo Domingo with Thelma Frias de Rodriguez, a Bosch leader in the senate; Dato Pagan Perdomo of the Communist-lining National Revolutionary Party (PNR), and Pedro A. (Corpito) Perez Cabral of the PNR.

Reportedly the cruise was discussed and President Bosch told the group that because of information he had on concern about the Communist activity, it would be wise to stir up some government criticism from the extreme leftist element.

Reliable sources said it was decided that the weekly newspaper of the June 14 movement would be the instrument of criticism. It had maintained a passive line with respect to the Bosch government.

THE ATTACK

The May 10 issue of the June 14 paper launched the attack, declaring that the Bosch government was really no different from that of the oligarchy and was far from the position embraced by the left.

Authoritative Dominican sources claim that the formula agreed upon for the June 14 movement paper, which has consistently followed a pro-Communist and anti-American line, is to attack the government, withdraw, attack and withdraw.

Last month, a few days before the yacht cruise, the June 14 movement was clamoring for the ouster of Ambassador Martin.

"In the face of the attitude of the Dominican reactionaries," the organization stated, "and the events which are developing in our country, we are calling on the people, the military who are honest and loyal to the people, not to let themselves be surprised by a maneuver that is afoot to destroy the liberties we have conquered.

WITHDRAWAL ASKED

"In the face of the chain of attacks loosed by the North American and foreign news agencies, facing the agitation promoted by the Yankee ambassador in our country, using groups of reactionaries as a vehicle, we ask President Bosch to demand that undesirable imperialistic person, Mr. Bartlow Martin, to leave Dominican territory."

There was then a behind-the-scenes maneuver to remove Ambassador Martin from the Dominican picture. But after the yacht cruise, the pressure eased. So did the attacks in the June 14 movement newspaper.

Counselor Volman subsequently disclosed that he had spoken directly with one of President Kennedy's advisers, and "got it fixed for Martin to stay on."

The June 14 movement paper also has served to fan the restiveness among the military hierarchy.

Late last month the newspaper published what it alleged to be a photostatic copy of a manifesto it claimed was being circulated among junior grade officers in the army.

RED MOVE

The document urged the young officers to kill their field grade superiors and assume the key commands as part of an overall move by the Reds to grab full control of the Republic.

The Secretary of the armed forces, Maj. Gen. Elby Vinas-Roman, declared that the document was a fake, but the June 14 movement insisted that it was genuine.

These are sporadic whispers here that the military is secretely planning a showdown with President Bosch and might attempt a coup if he doesn't crack down on the increasingly bold actions of the Communists.

However, there does not appear to be any real strong leadership among the officer corps. There is no apparent single budding strongman. Observers point out that under the Trujillo dictatorship, the officers who now are in their thirties and forties were not trained to be leaders but to follow orders almost blindly.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, May 24, 1963]

LITTLE RED SCHOOL OPENS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—There's a new Communist front night school here at Calle Las Mercedes 33.

Although it is a "private enterprise" educational plant, the government of Juan Bosch, in its present policy of free speech for all, made available the classroom facilities in a government-owned building—the Padre Billini Day School.

The night school, which opened a month ago, is called the Institute of Social Sciences and Economic Planning.

Half of its corps of professors are known Communists—and most of them have returned from Communist Cuba since Bosch's inauguration in March.

Promotion for the school states it is a "new Dominican institution for new solutions demanded by national necessities."

It also is stated that no special examinations are necessary for enrollment, which has reached 230.

The cost of all courses is listed as $10 a semester. Most last a year, broken into two semesters. Classes are limited to 40 "students."

Responsible sources here report the Communists have invested about $10,000 a month in the school operation.

For their investment the Communists have professors teaching their views on economic planning and development, organization and management of business, formation of social investigations, social security, modern unionism and political sciences.

Political philosophies, history and ideologies are sprinkled liberally through the unionism and political science courses.

The school ostensibly was begun under the direction of Dato Pagan Perdomo, one of the most active recognized Communists here. He was under deportation order last fall, but managed to elude authorities until this spring. Now he has no problem with the authorities.

Other recognized Communists listed with Pagan on the night roster include:

Dr. Jose Estrella Jacobo, who was deported to Paris last October, went on to Prague and left there December 15 with Maximo Lopez Molina, most widely known Dominican Red, for Havana—where he remained until returning here in March.

Alfredo Manzano, an engineer, member of the central committee of the June 14 movement.

Dr. Ramon Pina Acevedo, member of the June 14 executive committee.

Pedro A. (Corpito) Perez Cabral, a lawyer, head of National Revolutionary Party (PNR) and one of biggest noisemakers for the return of all Dominican exiles and deportees.

Miguel Angel Mendoza, a wheelhorse in the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD).

Manuel Emilio Gomez Pieter, one of the Communist group deported last fall, believed to have visited in Communist Cuba and behind the Iron Curtain before returning in March.

Hugo Toyo, one of a group deported last October and close associate of Rafael Faxas Canto, behind-the-scenes Red strategy planner.

Victor Villegas, head of the "Dominican League of the Rights of Man," believed to be little more than a paper organization in the forefront of last fall's Communist-led demonstrations against Communist deportations.

Rafael Astasio Hernandez, secretary general of the aforementioned league.

In addition to the school operation, the Communists are opening a similar teaching plant at Barahona.

Western diplomats and others who travel frequently about the country report the Reds have started at least 50 small cell-type schools for political indoctrination in smaller towns and villages under the guise of technical training. Instruction is being supervised by deported Communists who have returned since March.

It also has been learned that Communist ideological indoctrination is being given to the peasant members of the sugarcane field vigilantes, estimated to be about 17,000 strong.

President Bosch has stated it was necessary to form this group because of numerous fires in the cane fields and forests. It is believed fire watchers soon will become the "people's civil militia" in what is being hailed as the Dominican Republic's "democratic social revolution."

URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES IN NONRESIDENTIAL AREAS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am prompted by another excellent editorial to again make a few remarks on the recent action of a Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee in reporting out a bill, with crippling amendments, to permit the District of Columbia to undertake urban renewal activities in nonresidential areas the way other cities in the Nation are permitted to do. This editorial appeared in the September 27 edition of the Evening Star and I add it to these brief remarks.

As this editorial very properly points out that if these restrictions with which this measure was amended by the subcommittee "have any merit, they should be considered by Congress as national legislation effective everywhere" and not applying solely to the District of Colum-

bia. The editorial further points out, quite accurately I may say, that unless these amendments are removed "the job of trying to revitalize the deteriorating section of downtown Washington will be dealt a serious, and very possibly a fatal blow."

I hope and pray that this bill may be considered by the full District Committee at an early date and I trust that it will be amended to conform with the legislation passed by the Senate. It is high time that the Nation's Capital City should not be discriminated against in this way.

The Evening Star editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 27, 1963]

DISCRIMINATION

It is good that the Dowdy subcommittee has finally reported out the District of Columbia's downtown urban renewal bill. But it is unfortunate that it has encumbered this measure with a group of amendments which have no reason to be there, and which ought to be stricken forthwith by the full House District Committee.

Chairman DOWDY says his five amendments are necessary "safeguards" against what he considers excessive urban renewal authority.

But Mr. DOWDY is confused. For most of the amendments, which reflect Mr. DOWDY's own views of the rights and wrongs of urban renewal, have nothing whatever to do with this bill. Some of them are relatively innocuous. Some could severely hamper effective renewal. They all, however, single out the District among all the cities of the country for discriminatory treatment. If the restrictive measures proposed by Mr. DOWDY have any merit, they should be considered by Congress as national legislation, effective everywhere.

Let us be clear about this. Without the Dowdy amendments, the bill reported by the House subcommittee has only one major purpose: To permit the District to conduct urban renewal activity in commercial areas. In its unamended form, the bill, H.R. 3189, is identical to a measure already passed by the Senate. Unless the House concurs, the job of trying to revitalize the deteriorating section of downtown Washington will be dealt a serious, and very possibly a fatal, blow.

Every effort was made at public hearings to persuade the subcommittee that the powers being sought here are similar to those already authorized in most other cities. In order to corroborate its position on this point, the National Capital Downtown Committee sought a formal opinion from Federal Urban Renewal Administrator William L. Slayton. The pertinent portion of Mr. Slayton's response, dated September 6, follows:

"We feel that this authority will be vitally necessary for the urban renewal program here in Washington. Our 10 largest cities, aside from Washington, have already been authorized to carry urban renewal projects in nonresidential areas, and most of these are already undertaking such projects. We doubt that a major city such as Washington can hope to mount a successful overall attack on deterioration and blight without a certain amount of urban renewal activity in its commercial and industrial areas.

H.R. 3189 would put the District of Columbia on substantially the same basis as other major cities in the country with respect to authority for the undertaking of the urban renewal activities, and would not grant to the District of Columbia powers in excess of those presently available in most States."

What could be clearer than that? If Mr. DOWDY feels that H.R. 3189 is a dangerous bill, his quarrel is not with the District, but with urban renewal as it is practiced throughout the country. Until Congress draws up a new set of urban renewal ground rules for the Nation as a whole, the District should be permitted to attack downtown blight on the same basis as everyone else.

"INDIANA"—OFFICIAL STATE POEM

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to introduce to my colleagues the now-famous Hoosier poem, entitled "Indiana." This is Hoosierdom's official poem, portraying the great blessings which have been bestowed upon our sovereign State.

During the recent session of the Indiana General Assembly, the legislators adopted a resolution making this poem our official one. To me, it has added significance since it was written by one of my constituents—Mr. Arthur Franklin Mapes, of Kendallville, Ind.

Indiana is a great State. Its beauty, traditions, and history are clearly referred to in this lovely poem. Anyone who has not been privileged to visit our wonderful State will, I am sure, want to do so soon:

INDIANA

(Official State Poem)

God crowned her hills with beauty,
Gave her lakes and winding streams,
Then He edged them all with woodlands
As the settings for our dreams.
Lovely are her moonlit rivers,
Shadowed by the sycamores,
Where the fragant winds of summer
Play along the willowed shores.
I must roam those wooded hillsides,
I must heed the native call,
For a pagan voice within me
Seems to answer to it all.
I must walk where squirrels scamper
Down a rustic old rail fence,
Where a choir of birds is singing
In the woodland * * * green and dense.
I must learn more of my homeland
For it's paradise to me,
There's no haven quite as peaceful,
There's no place I'd rather be.
Indiana * * * is a garden
Where the seeds of peace have grown,
Where each tree, and vine, and flower
Has a beauty * * * all its own.
Lovely are the fields and meadows,
That reach out to hills that rise
Where the dreamy Wabash River
Wanders on * * * through paradise.

—*Arthur Franklin Mapes.*

KENDALLVILLE, AUGUST 6, 1963.

GREETINGS TO USWV ENCAMPMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the oldest active veterans organization of our country, the United Spanish War Veterans, is convening in its 65th annual encampment in Lansing, the capital city of my native State of Michigan. For the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States I am confident I bespeak the sentiment of my colleagues in sending warm greetings of appreciation and of affection.

Sixty and five years have passed since the commencement of the war with Spain, 60 and 1 years since the close of the 4-year period that included the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Expedition in China. It was a war fought on land and sea in the Atlantic and the Pacific, exclusively by volunteers, most of them with little training, that triggered a chain of events that changed the political face of the world and brought the United States to world leadership.

Ninety-two veterans of that war of long ago, the war that started our country on the road to world destiny, later served in the Congress. I am the last remaining.

On the wall of my office here in Washington, immediately back of my desk, is a framed photograph of Company I, 33d Michigan Voluntary Infantry, which landed in Cuba some 3 days after the Rough Riders and participated with Teddy Roosevelt in all the campaign at Santiago. Only two members of Company I remain—Archie House, who this week will be elected by rotation to the post of commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, and the gentleman from Illinois now in the well.

The present commander in chief is Morris G. Oesterreich, a Navy man from Wisconsin, whose brilliant leadership of the oldest active veterans organization of the country has been a source of pride to his comrades and of benefit to our country and the veterans cause. He will be succeeded by my old buddy in Company I, Archie House, an infantryman, and then in 1964 the highest post in the United Spanish War Veterans will revert again to the Navy in the person of Sam Black, a fellow member of Columbia Camp in Chicago. Sam and I can remember when Columbia Camp had over 1,000 members, including the late U.S. Senator James Hamilton Lewis. Now we are down to 13, with only half able to attend meetings.

Sunday I passed in warm comradeship with my fellow veterans and the ladies of our auxiliary, returning to Washington on an early morning plane that I might be present at my post of duty when the House convened at noon. I can assure my colleagues that I could detect no sign at Lansing of the wear and tear of the years. In fact some of the Spanish War vets I met were well past 90 and so fit and agile that they might have been mistaken for contenders for a world's championship about to step into the ring.

As the last Spanish War veteran in Congress, I was honored by my selection to deliver the annual memorial address on Sunday. In my remarks I said:

To us is the sacred mission of safeguarding and preserving the spirit of '98 as the guideline of American conduct, now and forever, in our relationship with the other peoples of the world. Until the last we will remain

faithful to that mission. When the last veteran of the War with Spain has answered the final summons, the spirit of '98 will have been so imbedded in the character of the American people that always it will be a living and vibrant part of succeeding generations.

The spirit of '98 is the weaving together of old-fashioned American patriotism and old-fashioned faith in God and country.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks in the daily RECORD to include the details of one of the great newspaper scoops of the period of the Spanish-American war, how the Chicago Tribune scooped even Admiral Dewey in getting to the United States news of Dewey's stunning naval victory at Manila on May 1, 1898.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to an abuse of Public Law 480, the food for peace program. If this situation continues, it threatens the existence of an important American industry and jeopardizes the economic welfare of thousands of American citizens. In spite of the fact that Public Law 480 is clearly limited to "surplus agricultural commodities," purchases under Public Law 480 are, at this very moment, resulting in an artificial shortage of wheat "clears," the basic raw material which processing plants in three States, employing more than 800 persons, must have to stay in business. The products of these plants are vital wheat gluten, monosodium glutanate (MSG), grain neutral spirits, wheat starch, and hydrolyzed vegetable protein.

These processing operations in the States of Michigan, Kansas, and Ohio, are conducted by the Hercules Powder Co., the Midwest Solvents Co., and the National Industrial Products Co. When one of these companies recently attempted to purchase "second clears," a byproduct of the production of patent flour, for delivery during September and October, from 18 of the largest milling companies in the United States, it was told that no "second clears" were available. Some millers indicated they would have none for sale to domestic industries until January of next year. The experience of the other two companies was similar.

The reason given for the disappearance of "second clears" from the domestic market was their export in large volume as flour under Government programs. The present shortage was attributed in particular to large shipments of flour to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

Public Law 480 purchase authorizations for the United Arab Republic shipment are so framed as to permit the mills to supply material with a maximum ash—mineral content—above straight run of the mill flour. As a consequence, mills are "stuffing" most of their supply of "clears"—not considered to be a flour in this country—back into straight run flour and still complying with the unrealistic mineral content limits of the purchase authorization.

The effect of their action is to strip the domestic market of "second clears" which have been used by this industry as its basic raw material since 1902. Obviously, if domestic companies cannot buy wheat "clears," they are not in surplus. Their export under Public Law 480, either alone or as "stuffing" in straight-grade flour, is illegal.

The irreparable injury done to American processors of wheat "clears" is, however, not the only distortion of congressional intent resulting from Public Law 480 shipments of "stuffed straights." A major objective of Public Law 480 is the removal of surplus agricultural commodities. Not only are "clears" not in surplus supply, but every pound of "clears" stuffed back into straight-run flour in meeting Public Law 480 orders reduces the amount of surplus wheat which will be milled. In the current UAR order alone, "clears" stuffed back into straights have reduced the total wheat milled in filling this order by more than three-quarters of a million bushels.

I have consistently supported the food-for-peace program since coming to Congress nearly 5 years ago. I have done so in the firm belief that this program represents one of the more effective instruments of foreign policy available to us. In addition to helping to raise the standard of living in less fortunate nations abroad, it has helped to put our agricultural surpluses to constructive use.

I shall continue to support the food-for-peace program. But this does not mean that I shall stand idly by and watch mistakes in this program put three domestic producers out of business and their employees out of work. I am deeply concerned about this abuse of congressional intent in the administration of the act. I urge that the responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture immediately take the steps necessary to repair the damage this bureaucratic bungling has inflicted upon three domestic industries now threatened with extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought this problem to the attention of the Department of Agriculture. I believe the Department should immediately change its maximum purchase specifications to stop the export of "clears" under Government programs. Unless prompt action is taken, plant operations of long standing, making industrial use of a wheat product, will be driven out of business, and the communities in which they are located will be severely injured.

This situation has now become acute. Unless remedial action is taken, I believe that the Congress itself should investigate this abuse of Public Law 480 and insure that the intent of Congress is followed.

I would like again to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE OF 1963 HELD AT BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, SEPTEMBER 12 TO 21

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the 52d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union was held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, on September 12 to 21.

As president of the U.S. group I want to give the Congress a report on the Conference and on the work of your delegates.

The 52d Conference was the largest ever held in the history of the Union. There were 480 delegates representing the parliaments of 58 nations.

May I say that this was a very large number of people coming into Belgrade, which is a small city, and it also imposed a considerable burden on the host nation. I cannot say too much about the hospitality, the kindness, and the generosity of the Yugoslav Government. I would like also very highly to commend Dr. Vilfan of the Yugoslav Assemoly, who presided daily at our conference. He was a splendid presiding officer. He was fair, and every delegate said he could not possibly, even in their own country, have received better treatment.

The parliamentary systems vary tremendously, many being based on the one party system. Nevertheless no one can be a member of the Union who has not been elected to his or her parliament and this conference therefore represented the largest body of lawmakers ever assembled.

Your delegation consisted of the following members: Representative Katharine St. George, president of the group. Senators Gordon Allott, Ernest Gruening, Edward M. Kennedy, Thomas H. Kuchel, Mike Mansfield, A. S. Mike Monroney, James B. Pearson, Abraham A. Ribicoff, Leverett Staltonstall, Homer Ferguson, and Congressmen E. Ross Adair, Harold D. Cooley, Emilio Q. Daddario, Edward J. Derwinski, Gerald R. Ford, Charles B. Hoeven, Paul C. Jones, Alexander Pirnie, W. Robert Poage, Thor C. Tollefson. We were also accompanied by our executive secretary, Dr. George B. Galloway, and Mrs. Galloway. Without Dr. Galloway's tremendous work in preparing position papers and speech material our work could not have been successful, and the delegation is deeply grateful to him. Mrs. Galloway is our expert in space law and was invaluable

in her assistance in this most important and highly technical field.

The work of the Conference centered on five subjects of world importance in which resolutions were presented. These resolutions had been prepared at the committee meetings held in Lausanne in the spring. They were worked over in the committees and in some cases amended and then brought to the plenary session for a final vote.

The five subjects were: First, functional representation.

The next subject was world development, under the Economic and Social Committee, Mr. Kapteyn, of the Netherlands, Chairman. Our representatives on this Committee were Senator MONRONEY and Congressmen COOLEY, HOEVEN, JONES, and POAGE.

The third subject was space law, under the Juridicial Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. P. de Montesquiou, of France. On this our representatives were Senator KENNEDY and Congressman DADDARIO.

The fourth subject was racial discrimination under the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions, under the chairmanship of Mr. A. Polednak, of Czechoslavakia. Our delegates on this Committee were Senators KENNEDY and GRUENING.

Finally, safeguarding peace, from the Committee on Political Questions, under the joint chairmanship of Mr. M. Drulovic, of Yugoslavia, and Mr. F. Elwyn Jones, of Great Britain. This last Committee had to redraft the resolution written last spring, as the Moscow treaty, as it is known throughout the world and as it will be known to history, had completely altered the picture, and considerably brightened it.

Mr. Speaker, the Conference brought very forcibly to us the great change in the relations between East and West, and most notably between our country and the Soviet Union, the two opposing giants, as they have been pictured in many parts of the world. We seemed to be in thorough agreement in Belgrade as to the mutual desire to maintain peace and to strive toward world disarmament. This is, of course, only a hope, but a hope that is at last beginning to be freely expressed on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Another thing that struck some of us very forcibly was the constant statement from many parliamentarians, not excepting those from the so-called underdeveloped countries, that they wanted trade, not aid.

The question of world development is one that must concern all parliamentarians. Unless the people of the world are well fed, well clothed, and well housed, they will quite naturally be looking anxiously for means to remedy their situation. As conditions get worse, the remedies resorted to will become more drastic and will, indeed, lead to violence. It is a fact today that the industrialized countries are getting richer while the underdeveloped countries are getting poorer. The reason for this situation is that the produce of the industrialized countries is constantly increasing in price, while that of the underdeveloped countries goes down in price. In other words, "the rich get richer, and the poor get poorer."

It has repeatedly been said and proved in our deliberations that aid today is no longer the answer and that trade is. We must trade freely with the underdeveloped countries. We must abolish the barriers impeding such trade, and we must open the markets of the world to open competition.

These are still pious hopes. They will mean sacrifices of considerable amounts on the part of the highly industrialized nations. Will they make these sacrifices for a brighter tomorrow? That is the question. If it is not answered affirmatively we will continue to see the "haves" and the "have nots" fighting it out as they have from the beginning of recorded history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that our country has got to decide whether it will go forward in the paths of world trade, or continue a somewhat unsuccessful and unpopular aid program. One thing is certain. We cannot promote both unless we are bent on suicide.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, the brilliant and well-known columnist, was in Belgrade during the Conference. He sized up the function of the Union better than anyone who has so far written on the subject. His last article was placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], of the U.S. group. Nevertheless, I would like to repeat a few sentences for the benefit of some doubting Thomases who have, in their ignorance, labeled the U.S. participation "a junket." Mr. Drummond says:

> My own conviction is that the Inter-Parliamentary Union made a grave mistake when it voted a few years ago to take in the Communist countries except Red China. Theirs are not parliamentary governments. Their lawmakers speak for their governments, not for their parliaments. Ever since the Communist nations were invited to join, they have used the Inter-Parliamentary Union as a form of the cold war. It was only a little less so this year because of the mellow glow of the test ban. That doesn't mean we should withdraw. It would be foolish and fatal. It would be leaving the field to the adversary. What is needed is for more of the informed and articulate Congressmen to realize what they are neglecting in shunning these interparliamentary conferences.

Whether we like it or not, Mr. Speaker, We are all in world politics today. This all started away back at the start of the 20th century. We have got to play our part, indeed, a leading part, and if our Congress is to leave all of this important work and all the information to the executive branch, they have only themselves to blame when things are not to their liking.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the speeches made at the Conference by our delegation as a part of my report. These speeches were well prepared and were well received and deserve to be incorporated in the RECORD.

I also would like to include Congressman DADDARIO's closing remarks on an amendment that we were able to have passed in the plenary session after it had been defeated in committee. The amendment concerns the denuclearizing of central Europe.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to tell an anecdote that was heartening to me and I think of some slight interest. After I had made my opening speech which was on the question of parliamentary governments, where they are going, how they could be reformed and changed in the future, I met, informally, the presiding officer of our conference, Dr. Vilfan. Dr. Vilfan said to me, a little bit sadly, I thought:

> Madam, I am afraid from your speech that you do not altogether approve of our system of parliamentary government.

I said:

> Well, as a matter of fact, I do not, because to my way of thinking there is no true parliament without an opposition party.

He replied:

> Well, you know, you inherited your system from the British that is over a thousand years old. We have only just started, and maybe we will change and reform and do better.

This from a Communist, I think, is quite a startling and quite an interesting statement.

FUNCTIONAL REPRESENTATION STRENGTHENING PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Chairman, U.S. Delegation in the Opening Debate (Sept. 12, 1963), at the 52d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Sept. 12–20, 1963)

Mr. President and fellow delegates: The U.S. delegation is happy to be here and we are grateful to the Government and people of Yugoslavia for their hospitality. We are glad to participate in this Conference with the representatives of the new Yugoslav Parliament which has been elected under the provisions of the new Yugoslav constitution. And we hope that your new parliament will have more influence in the governmental process than perhaps has been the case in the past.

We understand that President Tito will soon be leaving on a 2-month trip to the Western Hemisphere. I am confident that his trip and our visit here will make a real contribution to improved international understanding. The Government and people of the United States have long been dedicated to peace. This is seen in our persistent search for specific international agreements to buttress peace.

I might also mention the fact that the United States not only has a deep and abiding interest in the progress of underdeveloped countries, but has made a great contribution to their development without as a rule attaching any strings to its assistance. The bridge over the Sava River here in Belgrade (which was built with counterpart funds) may be cited as an example of U.S. aid to countries seeking to develop their economies and to maintain their independence.

Let me also compliment our distinguished Secretary General upon his report. It is a gold mine of information on the international developments of the past year and a lasting monument to his scholarship and industry.

I would especially commend to my colleagues the Secretary's opening reference to the encyclical of the late Pope John XXIII: Pacem in Terris. In his reference to the encyclical, the Secretary General brings into clear relief the fact that the first object of our Union is the promotion of peace. As

representatives of the peoples of the world we know that the desire for peace is the longing and burning ambition of all and that we who are parliamentarians must do everything possible to express, proclaim and fulfill this desire.

The Secretary General covers the history of the past year in all countries having parliaments represented in our Union. He is, quite properly, completely objective, which at times will probably not please us all. However, it is a good thing to see ourselves as others see us, even if, at times, it is deflating. After all, we have been told on pretty high authority that man is nothing but vanity.

We meet here today at a time when parliamentary government is on the defensive all over the world, and when it has been eclipsed by dictatorships in many countries. The crisis in parliamentarianism has been developing and deepening for many years. At the London Conference of the Union in 1957, I remarked that "the parliamentary system has suffered grievously as a result of two world wars, and that it no longer has the vigor, strength and dignity that it possessed" in earlier times. "There are many parliaments in the present age," I said, "that are nothing but rubber stamps, representing only one party, and therefore only the opinion of the government in power." And I ventured to suggest that we might be entering the twilight of parliamentary government in the world.

Little has happened since 1957 to modify these pessimistic predictions. The clouds that menace parliamentary governments all over the world have not lifted. At our Brussels Conference in 1961 I observed that "the world situation has deteriorated because the parliamentary forms of government have deteriorated. We have allowed our system to degenerate into debating societies in the free world and into inspired government mouthpieces in the rest of the world. The people's voice is rarely heard, and we are in most cases ruled by articulate and powerful minorities."

There is not time now for me to discuss the causes of the decline of parliament as an institution. But I would like to suggest some methods whereby parliamentary democracy could be strengthened around the world, where need be. I assume that we are all agreed upon the essential conditions of genuine parliamentary democracy. They include respect for the supremacy of law, the enjoyment of equal status and equal rights by all citizens, freedom of expression, debate, and association. They also include regular sessions of parliament at specified intervals, the right of parliament to review and pass upon the executive budget, and the consent of parliament to treaties and foreign agreements. They also include competition for elective offices, refusal to resort to violence, continual consultations among men and groups, checks and balances, civil liberties, and recognition of the rights and functions of a strong opposition.

Specifically, I suggest that parliamentary democracy can be strengthened in the following ways:

1. By making the composition of parliament truly representative of the people and empowered to express their will.

2. By state assumption of campaign expenses. They have grown too big for the average candidate to cope with. The rising cost of running for public office exposes politicians to pressures from affluent groups with special interests. Responsibility for financing political campaigns should be shifted to the public at large.

3. By preventing the executive from monopolizing the means of mass communication. Parliaments, as well as executives, could use radio and television to enter in direct contact with the people.

4. By expanding the legislature's own research staff aids. Statistical and information services should be equally available to legislators and administrators. We need to restore the balance of knowledge by equipping our parliaments with adequate libraries and research services.

5. By eternal vigilance to prevent military dictators from seizing power and dissolving parliament or converting it into a a puppet regime.

6. By requiring the consent of parliament to treaties with foreign nations and to appointments of high officials.

7. By strengthening parliamentary control of public expenditures. Financial control is the most powerful weapon that parliament possesses over the executive. Yet some legislatures are said to be losing control of the purse strings. We need to develop machinery for strengthening the power of the purse.

8. By giving the national legislature power to supervise and control the activities of the government. Public problems have become too numerous and technical for legislatures to handle alone. It is necessary to delegate their adjustment to administrative agencies. The chief modern task of parliament is to oversee the exercise of delegated power.

9. By reducing the extraneous workload on parliament in various ways. The growing demands on Members' time and the increasing claims of essential business impel modern legislatures to search for ways and means of expediting the legislative process and relieving parliament of part of its burdens.

10. And, finally, by setting up a system of standing committees and delegating to them both the function of considering legislative proposals and also the task of supervising the execution of the laws. Although admittedly inconsistent with Cabinet government, the standing committee system has worked well in the United States and the continental legislatures which have adopted it.

If parliaments are to survive as effective instruments of mankind, they must adapt themselves to the great social and political forces and problems of our time. Parliaments cannot be aloof to historical trends, nor in opposition to them, but must be in the forefront of change.

World Development

(By Senator A. S. Mike Monroney)

Since the conclusion of World War II, we have seen the most amazing period of acceleration in the establishment of new nations in the world's history.

Unfortunately, the great blessing of liberty and the right to self-government did not automatically bring into being the physical plant, economic base, skills, and markets necessary to sustain a healthy growth toward peace and prosperity. Freedom only opened a new right-of-way on which a highway of commerce must be built.

The miracle of the Marshall plan cannot be repeated in these areas. In Western Europe there existed an industrial base for the wise use of the $13 billion we invested in rebuilding plants and industries. However, this is not the case in these new nations. The industrial know-how, education, basic transportation, water and power—the infracstructure of an industrial complex is missing.

This problem is spelled out well in the draft resolution. It correctly points out that the average per capita incomes of the industrialized countries are much larger than those in the developing countries and that the gap is becoming wider.

Even the transfer of nearly $9 billion in 1961, including private investment and official international aid from the Western World and $300 million from the Communist bloc, has failed completely to meet more than a fraction of the requirements for a development base. This, despite an increase in 1 year of $1.4 billion.

In the long run, however, four-fifths of the foreign exchange acquired by these developing nations has had to be earned from their own production. One-fifth has come from the various international sources of aid.

Therefore, the primary problem is to find methods of improving trade opportunities, stability of markets and prices, and methods of production and agricultural development so that they will have hope of progress toward eventual self-sufficiency.

It would make little sense if, after spending some $9 billion a year to help develop them, these new nations found themselves denied opportunity to earn their way into progress by barriers against reasonable access to world markets.

Unstable prices for their products, frequent gluts on the world market of their single export product, capricious tariff manipulation, limited opportunity for new product marketing—all hinder and cripple their efforts to grow in industrial development. Trade is obviously preferable to aid, from the viewpoint of both the recipient country and the donor country.

In the U.S. Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the President of the United States was given greater powers than ever before to remove trade barriers against tropical products. It would offer a new ray of hope to dozens of developing nations if the Common Market and the other industrial countries would be more liberal in their treatment of imports of coffee, cocoa, and other products from the tropical countries than they have been in the past. These items do not compete with their own products, and a greater volume of imports would mean greater trade and earning for the exporting countries of Africa, Asia, and South America.

Ways must be found to improve trade among the developing areas. Trade among these nations, who need so much and have so little foreign exchange to use in trade, was close to a balance. These areas exported 22.3 percent of their trade to their developing neighbors. They imported 20.6 percent from each other. This was virtually an even trade.

But barter is undesirable and an irregular method of trade. I am sure the International Bank or the Monetary Fund could find ways to set up a convertibility fund to take over any disparity in local currency trade accounts among the developing nations. A similar plan worked to establish currency convertibility throughout all Western European nations under the Marshall plan. It should be tried with the developing nations trading with each other. Dollar credits would be used for payment of balances only after certain periods of time.

One nation's surplus could be put to use in exports to its neighbor and the account settled largely without reliance on dollar reserves but instead by balancing the amounts of local currency at the end of each 3-month period. A small dollar reserve would be required only for striking a balance.

It would seem to me that neighbors would find vastly improved markets in this manner.

The International Development Association, born as a result of the activities of the IPU, is in full and successful operation. This branch of the World Bank has made credit available at very low interest rates, with long-term repayment provisions, for dozens of smaller nations.

IDA needs to be expanded. This international operation permits the borrowing nation to receive loans, not from one nation, but from all of the 70 members who join in furnishing the capital of the World Bank. Other nations as well as the United States have agreed to expand the capital structure of this useful banking facility, whose liberal

terms bring world banking loans within reach of the smaller nations.

Regional credit groups, patterned on this IDA system, could be established among neighboring nations.

Finally, I am certain that the starting point, particularly for the 50 percent of the nations who yet have a difficult time in getting started toward self-sustained growth, lies first in the direction of improving their agricultural resources. Here their manpower, their land, their resources can be their primary source of strength. If a satisfactory agricultural economy is first established, it can serve as a foundation for small industry. This is the foundation on which the industrial nations of the world were built and which gave them their original credit.

The development of livestock, fruits, and products peculiarly suited for the area is a start. From there, development of superior agricultural products, marketing facilities, and the specialized agricultural commodities to fill the need of their neighbors and for world export would prove to be the take-off base for industrial growth.

Agriculture, if properly developed, will first supply the food necessary for the growth of a healthy population, including urban expansion, second, provide working capital for nonagricultural expansion, and third, provide markets for industrial development of chemical fertilizers, agricultural equipment and manufactured consumer goods. It can also provide important tax revenues.

Communist China has proven that no program of heavy industrialization can succeed without a sound agricultural program. No matter how successful industrial development might be, a nation must be able first to feed itself and provide for its basic needs.

Agricultural development can lead to areas of small industry for consumer goods for first phase manufacturing, such as bicycles, sewing machines, pails, farm tools, fertilizers. This can help to dampen the flow of workers from the countryside to the overcrowded slums, and would act as a seedbed for other industrial expansion.

SPEECH TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION IN SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(By Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY)

It is a very great privilege for me to be here at this Conference. I have had the good fortune of being able to visit many of the nations of Europe at various times of my life, but this is my first opportunity to visit Yugoslavia. This nation and its leaders have been most hospitable to us. I think it is very significant that the delegates from so many nations can get together here, in pursuit of their mutual interest in parliamentary government. It is clear proof that the interests and problems we have in common can transcend the disagreements of diplomacy and the ideologies of politics.

I speak today on behalf of the U.S. delegation, in support of the draft resolution on racial discrimination of the committee non-self-governing territories and ethnic questions. Racial discrimination is not limited to any one country or one racial group or one period of history. The gypsies in Central Europe, the "colored" in South Africa, the Negroes in England and the United States and the minority racial groups in many European nations suffer from discrimination. My own Irish ancestors felt the sting of prejudice, both in the nation they left and, initially, in the country where they settled.

But racial discrimination in 1963 certainly is most publicized in the United States. In a sense, my nation has asked to be judged in this area, because of the leadership we have taken in the cause of freedom and democracy around the world. I am sure all of you read about the gathering that occurred on the 28th of August in our Capital City of Washington. There came together at that time over 200,000 citizens—Negroes and white people who believe deeply in the Negro cause. They exercised the traditional right of American citizens to petition their Government for redress of grievances. This demonstration was impressive both in its numbers and its dignity. I believe it made a lasting mark upon the conscience of the people of the world.

In a sense this demonstration showed both how much has been done and how much must be done to alleviate racial discrimination. The Negro race was brought to America, against their will, as part of the slave trade. The effort to free them from slavery precipitated the only Civil War my Nation has known. While this war freed the Negroes from their status as property, they were left without property, without education, without the means to participate fully in the democratic parliamentary process.

In the hundreds of years that have passed, the Negroes in the United States, despite discrimination, have made significant advances in their life. The average income today of the American Negro is more than that of white citizens in most of the nations of Europe. The men and women who participated in the demonstration in Washington had means enough to travel hundreds of miles in modern forms of transportation. Among the participants were Negro business leaders, professional men, teachers, ministers, and entertainers.

But as I said before, the very fact that a demonstration was necessary shows how much must still be done if discrimination is to be ended.

The Negroes in America were asking for protection of their right to vote, which is denied in some parts of the United States.

They were asking for more jobs, higher wages, better education for their children; and most of all for the chance to enjoy, on an equal plane with white people, the accommodations of restaurants, motion picture houses, and hotels.

Most of the United States is free of this form of discrimination. In my own State of Massachusetts, where the movement to abolish slavery began 130 years ago, a Negro today can eat in any restaurant, live in any neighborhood, apply for any job. He is protected by strong laws against discrimination which are enforced by the attorney general of our State who is himself a Negro.

And so I say to you, despite our failings, we of the U.S. delegation can support this resolution in good conscience. We have come to grips with our problem. We realize our special responsibilities. We are determined to clean our hands of racial prejudice so we can go before the world with deeds to match our words.

The American people have solved problems of discrimination before. Our Nation could not have prospered unless groups of immigrants from Europe, all of whom faced hostility when they arrived, had not become an integrated part of our society.

Neither I, nor the President of the United States, would hold the positions we do, if America had not taken down the sign that said, "No Irish need apply."

I am sure that every nation represented here can point, as we can, to chapters in its history where the breaking down of discrimination—be it racial, religious or geographic—help unify and strengthen the country:

Whether it be the unification of Italy in 1861; of the unification of Germany in 1871 or the union of the Serbs, Croates, and Slovenes into Yugoslavia after World War I.

Let us all unite in supporting this resolution. Let us declare together that racial discrimination is wrong. It is legally wrong, morally wrong, and is bad for humanity.

Let us make an effort to end discrimination wherever it is, wherever it weakens and dilutes the principles upon which all our nations were founded. And in doing so, let us work together to achieve that happy situation best described in the words of the Scottish poet Robert Burns:

"For all that and all that
Its coming yet for all that
When man to man the world around
Shall brothers be, for all that."

DISCRIMINATION

(By Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is with the utmost candor that we of the United States acknowledge that our own practices fall short of our religious traditions of equality before God and our ethical convictions as to the brotherhood of man. Yet we can declare that we are committed to the realization of this, the profoundest injunction of our political philosophy, that governments are instituted among men to secure the rights of equality and liberty and justice for all. For our American governmental faith, unlike totalitarian philosophy, is founded upon the belief that there are certain inherent and inalienable rights of individuals which are not the prerogative of the State to grant or deny. This basic division in governmental theory was illustrated in the position of States toward the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which we endorsed and voted for.

In the United States, our Government is leading the way in ending the remaining vestiges of the evil of racial discrimination. The Constitution under which our land has developed and flourished, was founded upon the proposition of individual liberty and human dignity. Much of our history is the record of our national efforts to root out notions and practices inconsistent with the ideals set forth in that great document.

While regretting the incidents of racial difficulties that occur, we, at the same time, point to the fact that these instances illustrate the determination, as expounded by our President, that we are dedicated to the immediate realization of those human rights to which our Government has always been committed, and is fully and actively seeking to guarantee the right of equal opportunity to every man, woman, and child in the United States. We would also draw attention to the record of our local State governments in their progress, legally, educationally, and economically, in this area. We also direct your attention to the fact that progress has far surpassed disappointments in all sections of our country as we perfect the rights of all men.

In order to clarify phraseology may I remind you that in the United States the movement to end all discrimination is waged under the slogan of "civil rights." Civil rights includes the right to vote, right to free speech, free press, right to education, right to all the economic blessings that an individual's energy and ability permit him to acquire.

We must point out that our people working zealously to maintain civil rights for all Americans are disturbed at the denial of equivalent rights to the people of Eastern Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other areas of the world dominated by an atheist totalitarian philosophy. The rights of all men will always be in jeopardy as long as an international movement continues to advance a philosophy which is contrary to "civil rights." We feel it extremely practical and timely to remind the delegates of our determination to maintain rights for all of our citizens, and of our equally strong interest in peoples in the world who have been

deprived of these rights. May I also remind the delegates of the support which the American Government and people give to the historic principle of "self-determination of peoples," which principle has also been disregarded by the totalitarian movement that threatens world freedom.

For specific examples of discrimination and the denial of civil rights to people, the greatest is the wall of shame in Berlin. In the same spirit, it is necessary to call to the attention of the delegates the vast prison camps in Siberia where political prisoners from numerous countries remain under conditions of slave labor. They suffer from political discrimination, racial and nationality discrimination and are deprived of all rights.

We of the U.S. delegation endorse the philosophy of this draft resolution as an official declaration by the Interparliamentary Union of the goal toward which we, the individual members, should strive in our national legislature; namely, the education of our youth in the principles of equality, and the eradication of all manifestations of racial, nationality and religious hatred and discrimination, to the end that we, in the national and international sphere, can develop as one family of mankind, working together toward the highest development of our society and the fulfillment of our destiny under God.

Representation of Social and Economic Interests in Parliament

(By Representative Gerald R. Ford)

Our subject matter at this session, "Representation of Social and Economic Interests in the National Legislature," is of the utmost significance in the years ahead—perhaps more so than ever before. The basic question, however, is how best these objectives can be accomplished.

I hope I may be forgiven if I sound a national note, but in my country this problem was recognized from the very founding of our Nation. James Madison, perhaps the chief architect of our Constitution, wrote in Number 10 of the Federalist in which he was arguing for the adoption of that historic document: "A landed interest, the manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a monied interest, with many lesser interests, grows up of necessity in civilized nations and divides them into different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operation of the Government."

This clash of economic interest groups which Madison discussed is still with us. Quite frankly, it invigorates our politics in the United States. One of the chief functions of our political party system is to blunt the severity of this clash, to serve as a funnel through which competing interests may be molded into a single viewpoint.

Functional organizations such as labor unions, management organizations, agricultural associations and professional groups must find expression in our various parliaments if representative institutions are to be truly meaningful. Specific parliamentary representation according to significant economic pressure groups is one way to accomplish this aim.

I am informed that different versions of functional representation were used by the Fascist regime in Italy and by the Weimar Republic in Germany as well. Some modern-day theorists in Government argue that lobbying organizations in America are a form of functional representation. As I see it, this is stretching the point to a considerable degree. Lobbyists in America are not in any way whatsoever an official part of or an adjunct to our Government. For further clarification, I should say such groups are controlled in many ways by legislation and conceivably may be more so in the future.

Despite the previous attempts to put into practice functional representation in Government, despite the theories of some contemporary political writers, the overwhelming weight of the evidence on hand argues convincingly against the adoption of this approach to just and effective representation in our modern day parliamentary systems.

For example, elected delegates representing specific units of society such as agricultural or industrial workers, or management, would obviously possess far too narrow a focus on the multitude of problems facing the Nation. These individuals identified by a precise economic interest would owe their basic allegiance to rigidly alined groups and, in my judgment, would lack the breadth of viewpoint to perform effectively their true legislative function.

Another difficulty that arises is purely quantitative. If people are to be represented according to their memberships in interest groups, how would you apportion the weight to be allotted to the various interests in order to approximate justice? How many representatives of labor must there be? How many of capital? How many for agriculture? How many for professional and technical associations?

From a positive point of view, the most persuasive argument against this new theory is that one's interest as a citizen in its broadest context takes precedence over one's interest as a member of a particular group.

The proponents of functional representation will argue that people have less in common as inhabitants of their particular community than they have in ways of earning a living. Therefore, they contend that geography as a basis of representation has been and should be demoted in the representative system and that loyalty to locality should be replaced by allegiance to function. Allegedly this is a result of the division of labor and the high degree of specialization in a modern industrial society.

From practical experience in our country, and I trust in yours, our people place their principal loyalty and allegiance to the national government. They are first and foremost citizens of the nation. They expect their elected representatives to act on their behalf with original and primary focus on the national aspect of all problems. This does not mean that our citizens do not have strong and divergent ideological, philosophical or economic views. I only say that all interests other than the nation's are secondary on the ladder of priorities.

This being true, it is my belief that our representative government should be based on a pattern that in practice has not divided, but solidified a people. We find from experience the average legislator chosen on a geographical basis is responsibly conscious of the territorial, economic and social interests in his constituency and does his best to represent them. However, when the choice is drawn between the national interest on the one hand, and any other—be it geographic, economic or social—the decision is easy. The legislative representative votes for the broader choice. In my judgment, this would be the true reflection of the people, who look upon themselves first as citizens and thereafter as a part of an economic or social segment of society.

Furthermore, history records that the key programs of important social and economic groups—once such social problems and policies have established their merit and have won acceptance of popular majorities—usually are enacted into law. Finally, from our experience, the legislature based on the territorial constituency is far more likely to attain consensus of a broad national scale than one organized to give voice to economic and social interests.

In conclusion: If we have deficiencies, if our efforts are not perfect, let us make those essential changes in a constructive manner with the tools at hand. To achieve the goal of better representation, let us not tear asunder tried and true systems of representative government that, over the years, have brought cohesion to our people.

World Development

(By Representative W. R. Poage)

Nations exist primarily to secure for their people the highest possible standard of living, economically as well as politically, socially and culturally. Indeed, the degree to which these latter aspirations can be fulfilled depends in large part on the fulfillment of economic development. There is, therefore, no more basic problem than that of world development.

If the delegates will refer to page 11 of the English edition of your "Preliminary Documents" you will find the very fine draft resolution on this subject. This resolution very appropriately and correctly points out that the economic development of all nations, the poor as well as the rich, is vital to all nations; that enlightened self-interest impels the industrialized countries to aid their less-developed neighbors. The resolution properly points to the ever-widening gap between the average per capita income of people in the developed, as contrasted with the underdeveloped, nations. It refers to the need for higher prices for "primary products," the raw goods which account for most of the meager income of underdeveloped people. It courageously points to the enormous increase of population as one of the greatest deterrents to economic progress.

With all of this I heartily agree. My country has shown its good faith by extending more than $100 billion worth of aid to less fortunate people since the close of the war, and to do this our own people have paid some of the highest taxes in the whole world. Indeed, our people have ofttimes paid heavier taxes than have the very people to whom our aid has gone. I do not believe that we need any further evidence of our willingness to help.

Therefore, if I were to find any fault with this draft resolution, it would be that it overemphasizes dependence on the industrial nations and it plays down the necessary cooperation of the underdeveloped nations themselves.

May I, therefore, my colleagues, in the few minutes available, speak very frankly. I speak as a friend, as one who wants to see all people enjoy a higher living standard, but I hope I speak as a realist.

First. The developed nations cannot contribute enough to maintain the standards of the underdeveloped nations. If you were to divide all of the wealth in the United States of America, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom between all of the people of India and of China, each individual would have less than the present average wealth of the people of Mexico and the great industrial productivity of these three nations would be dismantled and lost to the world. Nor can these developed nations hope to divert enough of their current production to raise the standard of living in the underdeveloped nations without a return of goods of comparable value, because to continue to do so

would bankrupt their own economies, and thus kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Second. The developing nations must increase their own contribution to the world economy, for even with the present high level of foreign aid from industrial nations, 80 percent of the developing countries' foreign currency receipts come from exports. These exports are basically "primary products"—food, fiber, timber, and minerals. The underdeveloped nations need higher prices, and as a representative of a developed nation I feel that we stand ready to pay a fair price for these products, but we cannot pay a fair price and they cannot receive a fair price unless the same underdeveloped nations will cooperate among themselves to prevent the breaking of world markets with surpluses. We all agree that trade is better than aid, and we agree that primary products should bring a price which will enable underdeveloped people to buy the industrial goods of their developed neighbors. But again, it is a twoway street, and so long as the African nations try to undersell the South Americans, or vice versa, the price of coffee is going to stay down.

Third. The world tendency to establish independent "nations" everywhere makes economic efficiency impossible. I believe that one of the reasons we see this great city here at Belgrade is the fact that six peoples have united to make one Yugoslavia. (Of course, the fact that the United States has extended over $2½ billion of aid has helped.) I believe that a major reason that the United States has become so productive is the fact that 50 States have united. I believe that much of the strength of the U.S.S.R. comes from the fact that their union consists of 15 republics. When I remember that there are 82 nations of this world with fewer people than in my home State of Texas, and 86 nations with less territory, I am convinced that there must be larger national units if we are to have the needed economic program. I congratulate our African colleagues who are working for greater unity rather than for more units of government.

Fourth. And finally I would point out that no matter what contributions the developed nations may make, that the underdeveloped nations can never raise their living standards so long as population increases faster than wealth. Although your wealth doubles, if your population triples in the same period of time, every one of your people is going to be poorer. Again, this is a problem which can only be solved by the underdeveloped people themselves.

Therefore, in conclusion, my colleagues, may I again assure you that while the United States of America stands ready to help all people who are trying to help themselves, we cannot assume the responsibility which the local people should assume, and no one else is going to assume such a responsibility without some kind of colonial relationship no matter what that relationship may be called.

Safeguarding Peace

(By Representative E. Ross Adair)

Ladies and gentlemen, the American delegation feels that the test ban treaty may be an important step toward universal acceptance of the principle that international conflicts can be settled by peaceful means. We believe that the contamination of the human environment by radioactive fallout should be controlled. We believe that adoption by the 52d Interparliamentary Conference—the largest international assemblage of law makers in the history of mankind—of a resolution in support of these points of view will add an important moral force on behalf of these principles.

The American delegation does, however, wish to offer a few amendments to the draft resolution before the Conference. The amendments which we offer are based on two fundamental thoughts.

First, we wish to stress the importance of the role played by many nations in the preparation and signing of the treaty, rather than to assign sole credit for the treaty to the three nuclear powers which have signed it. We feel that the work of many nations during the preparatory talks, and the signing of the treaty by a number of nations which by now has reached a total of almost 90, have been of profound value not only in the achievement of the treaty but also in creating an international atmosphere which may facilitate further progress toward relaxation of international tensions, toward international security, and freedom from the fear of aggression. We believe therefore, that the resolution to be adopted by this Conference should take note of the fact that the test ban treaty is indeed a treaty among many nations and not merely among three nuclear powers.

Secondly, the American delegation feels that whatever resolution on this subject is adopted by the Conference, should reflect a genuine desire on the part of all concerned for a relaxation of tensions based on respect for the needs and concepts of all sides, and not the wish for one side or another to gain strategic advantage. Unfortunately, there are elements in the draft resolution before the Conference which represent an effort to impose one-sided concepts upon the entire Conference. This effort is discouraging to those who hope that the test ban treaty is a first step toward more general international understanding. Therefore, the American delegation offers certain amendments which are designed to bring out the fact that the treaty is a multi-lateral, and not merely a tripartite act; not a cold war document. Morally the resolution should be a genuine contribution to international understanding rather than merely another cold war document.

With respect to the particular amendments which the American delegation offers, I would like to make the following comments:

1. In paragraph one, beginning with the word "Noting," we propose that credit be given to the approximately 90 nations which have already signed the treaty, and delete the reference to Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and the United States. We propose that the resolution state positively the grave concern which has developed universally over the nuclear contamination of the human environment and of the hope of relief afforded in this respect by the test ban treaty.

2. In paragraph two, beginning with the word "convinced," we propose to remove the reference to "peaceful coexistence"—a term which has acquired a polemic cold war content through years of misuse—and to substitute a forthright reference to peaceful means of settling international disputes whatever the political or social regimes of the states involved may be.

3. In paragraph three, beginning with the word "considering," we propose to delete the words "and looking toward general and complete disarmament, the indispensable condition for the consolidation of peace among people." We propose this because we feel that those who are responsible for negotiating further agreements leading to a detente in international relations should have the necessary flexibility in exploring various existing possibilities which may include not only further steps toward disarmament but also outstanding substantive issues. Furthermore, we are all aware that there are important differences of opinion among nations concerning the importance of strict international control and verification of disarmament—in fact, the American delegation regards such strict international control and verification as an essential element of disarmament. For these reasons—to afford the greatest possible degree of flexibility in seeking further avenues of progress, and to concentrate on areas of agreement among the powers rather than on matters in which there still exist basic disagreements—this amendment is offered to the third paragraph.

4. In the fourth paragraph beginning with the word "appeals," we propose deletion of the two references to parliaments and the addition of a reference to the lawful procedures of the various countries simply in recognition of the fact that each country has its own procedures of adherence and ratification and that it would be inaccurate to assume that all countries require ratification by a parliament or that the respective roles of various parliaments are identical. The original resolution is meaningless because it contradicts known facts of government systems.

5. With respect to the fifth paragraph, which begins with the word "Urges", we propose that this paragraph be deleted because it reads an intent into the treaty which is not to be found in the text of the treaty. What is meant by: "any new extension of nuclear arms"? Does it mean preventing nations which now possess nuclear arms from basing such arms in areas where they do not now exist? Does it mean that they cannot be based in areas where they do not exist now as a deterrent to aggression? Does it mean preventing nations which do not possess nuclear arms from acquiring them? Does it mean preventing nations which now possess nuclear arms from acquiring new nuclear arms? Or does it mean all of these? We believe that it would be better for the Conference to delete this paragraph. The intent of the resolution is to support the nuclear test ban treaty. Why clutter it with extraneous matters which only create further disagreement?

6. In paragraph six, beginning with the word "Invites", we propose that the reference to banning underground tests include the phrase "under strict international control". We believe that underground tests, as contrasted with tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater, can be securely banned only if placed under strict international control; and we would like to point out to the delegates that this language which we propose is taken directly from the text of the test ban treaty iself.

7. Parts of the original text of paragraph seven of the draft resolution, beginning with the word "Appeals", seem to us to be completely foreign in spirit not only to the purposes of the treaty itself but also to the spirit of this Conference. Instead of concentrating on those areas in which the common interests of all nations make possible further progress toward international agreement, they revive proposals the content and intention of which are the subject of disagreement rather than agreement among nations. The U.S. delegation supports the amendments to this paragraph offered by the Australian delegation. These amendments would give to this paragraph language and content to which all those who would like to see further progress toward international understanding could subscribe.

Safeguarding Peace

(Remarks of Representative Alexander Pirnie, Member, U.S. Delegation, on September 17, 1963, at the 52d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, September 12–20, 1963)

Mr. President and my colleagues, I would like to address my remarks to the committee

resolution on denuclearized zones and disarmament, as drafted in Lausanne. It reflects a conscientious effort to deal with a very complex subject but requires some modification to assure sound objectivity.

Ever since the end of the Second World War, when the first atomic bomb increased the destructive capacity of a single shell by more than a thousand times, the United States has sought to bring nuclear weapons under safeguarded international control. In recent years, the destructive capacity of single weapons has again multiplied many thousand times, and the United States has intensified its efforts to build a world in which peace is not threatened by uncontrolled armaments, yet security is enhanced by effective international peacekeeping machinery.

It has endorsed the goal of general and complete disarmament and submitted a detailed proposal for bringing it about. It has vigorously sought measures which might be suitable as first steps in the direction of disarmament, pending the time that agreement became possible on a comprehensive program.

For this reason the United States delegation is very pleased that the resolution before us has been outdated in one respect since the spring meeting at Lausanne when it was drafted. A first step toward general and complete disarmament has been taken with the conclusion of the "Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Underwater." I know that other delegations share our hope that eventually all the nations of the world adhere to this treaty and the problem of atmospheric pollution with radioactive fallout from tests will come to an end. I know that other delegations share our belief that this treaty is, as President Kennedy has said, "a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war—a step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement."

The test ban treaty is not the only progress which can be reported. In addition, at the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva on June 20, 1963, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to establish a direct communications link between their respective capitals. This was taken as a first step to help reduce the risk of war occurring by accident or miscalculation, a risk which has become very real in a world of automation and intercontinental missiles.

The United States delegation supports the underlying theme in this resolution, that the creation of adequately verified denuclearized zones or other regional arms control measures is one approach which should be explored. Under certain circumstances we believe that such measures could contribute to peace and security. First, it may be possible to achieve some measures of disarmament in limited geographical areas before it is possible to achieve them throughout the world. Second, disarmament measures in specified zones might serve as pilot projects and provide invaluable experience on which additional arms control arrangements elsewhere in the world could be based. Third, regional arrangements might contribute to relieving international tension within an area and create a climate in which the underlying political problems could be more easily solved. The United States delegation is aware of these possibilities and is not opposed to the entire idea of denuclearized zones.

Nevertheless, the United States delegation is disturbed about two aspects of the "believes" paragraph, both of which could be corrected by amendment. First, it believes that the phrase "particularly one in central Europe," must be removed. The whole advantage of the regional approach is that agreement might be possible in limited geographical zones outside the areas of confrontation between the major powers before agreements involving the major powers are possible. Central Europe, where the Communist world and free world meet, is at the very heart of the East-West struggle, not outside it. Moreover, nuclear weapons have already been deployed in this area and it would be extremely difficult to devise any denuclearization plan or other plan for arms limitations in this area which would not alter the balance of military forces. The United States has made clear its view on many occasions that proposals which would denuclearize this area without dealing with nuclear weapons located nearby would result in a serious military imbalance and, while creating the illusion of progress, would really endanger the peace of the world.

Second, the United States delegation believes that zonal arrangements cannot be imposed from outside, but must be the product of the initiative of the states within a given area. We believe this principle should be recognized within the resolution, and that it should be made clear that it applies to both denuclearized zones and other zones of limited armaments. Therefore, we propose to amend the paragraph accordingly:

"Believes that the efforts to create adequately verified denuclearized zones and limited armaments zones in different parts of the world, provided they are arrived at freely by all the parties concerned in the region and do not alter the balance of military forces, would serve the cause of peace and represent a step toward the achievement of general and complete disarmament."

Amended this way, so that central Europe is not singled out and so that it is made clear that any regional arrangements must be the result of the initiative of the states within that region, the United States will be happy to support this resolution.

Although we in America seek peace with all our hearts, no one should be deceived as to the depth of our devotion to the cause of freedom. We cherish the free institutions which have evolved from our dearest dreams, as expressions of the dignity and brotherhood of man. We are charged with their survival. So we are mindful that the peace we so sincerely seek will not be fully assured by arms control treaties alone since renunciation of evil weapons must be supported by renunciation of evil purposes. True protection exists only in the hearts of people of good will.

Space Law

(By Representative Thor C. Tollefson)

Five years ago, in adopting basic principles for the law which guides the U.S. space program, our Congress declared that "activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind" and directed that "the aeronautical and space activities of the United States shall be conducted so as to contribute materially to * * * cooperation with other nations, and groups of nations, in work done pursuant to this act, and in the peaceful applications of the results thereof."

In response to the mandate from the Congress, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, established an Office of International Programs, to work with interested scientific agencies of other nations, and to build their interest into cooperative efforts, of substantive content.

Since that time, NASA, as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is commonly called, has been associated with more than 60 countries in cooperative programs of scientific space research, in cooperative experiments with communications and weather satellites, in the establishment and operation of a worldwide satellite tracking and data acquisition network, and in education and training in the space disciplines. These associations have been truly cooperative with the oversea partners fully responsible for decisionmaking, planning and funding of their portion of the programs.

In 1959, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences was asked to convey to the International Committee for Space Research, NASA's readiness to launch aboard American rockets scientific experiments and entire satellites prepared by scientists of other countries. As a result, the first two international satellites are today in orbit. The British satellite Ariel was launched in April 1962, and the Canadian satellite Alouette in September 1962, both aboard NASA boosters. Among the several future international satellite programs already agreed to is the Italian San Marco project, in which the first satellite to go into equatorial orbit will be prepared and launched by Italian teams from platforms in the Indian Ocean, using a NASA booster. Future satellite projects with the United Kingdom, with Canada, and with France are already underway or in the planning stage.

The past year has seen the first substantial fruits of NASA's international program with sounding rockets, which probe vertically into the earth's atmosphere at altitudes inaccessible to satellites. Cooperative sounding rocket launchings have already taken place with 10 different countries. Many of these launchings have been overseas: in Sweden, in Norway (with Danish cooperation), in Pakistan, in Italy, in Canada, in New Zealand. Other countries have joined with us in experiments from the United States—they are Australia, France, and Japan. Still others are now approaching such experiments—India and Argentina. Responsibility for the basic elements in these programs—that is, the scientific instrumentation, the rocket, the ground instrumentation necessary to receive the data and the data analysis—is shared by the cooperative countries.

In the perhaps more dramatic area of practical application of space technology, more than 3 dozen countries have participated with the United States in cooperative projects relating to communications and meteorological satellites. Joint testing of the U.S. communications satellites, Relay, Telstar, Syncom, has been conducted between North America and the continents of Europe, Africa, and South America, demonstrating the worldwide interest in these new tools for exchange of information.

The dramatic capabilities of NASA's experimental weather satellites have been shared with countries throughout the world, and now NASA has developed specialized, relatively inexpensive equipment which can be used by weather services in any country to obtain photographs of local weather conditions directly from NASA's weather satellites as they pass over their own country.

Nor have human resources been neglected. Two years ago NASA inaugurated a program whereby senior scientists of established repute from other countries might avail themselves of the advanced facilities for research and study at NASA's research and space flight centers. A companion program provides fellowships on a joint funding basis for promising graduate students in the scientific and engineering disciplines related to outer space, at universities in the United States where active work is being pursued in these fields. And finally, to insure maximum benefit from agreed cooperative space flight programs, over 100 scientists and technicians from the cooperating countries have

received special training at NASA facilities such as the Goddard Space Flight Center, the Langley Research Center, and the Wallops Island launching station.

Now, in the 6th year of the space age, the ties of NASA's associations in international cooperative programs stretch westward to Japan and Australia, south to Argentina and Chile, deep into the heart of Africa and, with the completion last month of the first agreement with the Soviet Union, eastward across Europe to the Caucasus.

We in the United States believe that the full promise which outer space holds for the expansion of human knowledge can be realized through steady progress in international collaboration in the exploration of this newly accessible frontier.

SPACE LAW

(By Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

On behalf of the U.S. group I should like to express our support for the resolution on space law which the executive committee has forwarded to us, together with some thoughts about its content. This text is identical to the resolution unanimously adopted by the Subcommittee on Space Law of the Parliamentary and Judicial Committee. Our group interprets this resolution as a stimulus to action toward strengthening international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. As we are all aware, such action by governments must be based upon the latest available factual knowledge of the science and technology of space activities. The pace of progress is so rapid that already we are faced with the necessity of interpreting various provisions of the resolution so that members of the Interparliamentary Union will be able to base recommendations to their governments upon an up-to-date appraisal of present and probable future developments.

We wish to point out that tremendous advances have been made in space activities, not only in manned space flight but also in spacecraft for comunications, meteorology, and navigation. By August 1963, the United States had successfully launched 134 space vehicles of various types while the Soviet Union had launched 46. Outstanding successes have been achieved, therefore, by both nations in deep space probes. Numerous other countries have made contributions to space research and some of them are working in combination so that even more will be accomplished. The pace of development has been so rapid, and the number of nations engaged in the peaceful purposes of outer space has increased to such extent, that we must recognize that the term "several" satellites as used in the resolution is inadequate in describing the full scope of successful space activities.

We feel that far from condemning the United Nations for not having made further progress in working out the basic principles of space law, the situation has now developed to the point where we should simply urge the United Nations to continue its efforts in this area and give it our support. Substantial progress has in fact been made in the unanimous adoption of United Nations resolutions defining guidelines and general principles for the conduct of international peaceful space activities. Successful reports have been submitted to the U.N. by the World Meterological Organization and the International Telecommunications Union. The same point can be made for the progress evident in the records of the United Nations Registry of Space Vehicles. The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee of the Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space successfully achieved agreement on their reports in 1962 and 1963. The Legal Subcommittee is dealing with questions which are not easy to solve, but we should not despair—certainly not condemn—simply because 2 years have gone by before agreement has reached the point of consensus. The Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has just concluded a meeting at the United Nations in New York. The most harmful probabilities in outer space fall in the field of activities which will be eliminated by the limited nuclear test ban treaty. Through international consultation with appropriate scientific groups which now exist, a nation can obtain expert opinion about space probes which it believes may create harmful after effects. The United States is willing to subscribe to the principle of participation in such consultations.

The U.S. group recognizes that space law problems are urgent and that governments should be stimulated to seek agreed arrangements covering general principles, assistance, and return of astronauts and space vehicles, and liability for space vehicle accidents. The United States believes strongly that the United Nations General Assembly should advance the rule of law in outer space by proclaiming basic principles in addition to those unanimously adopted by the General Assembly in December 1961. The Soviet Union has recently taken the position in the United Nations that certain advances in the field of space law require the conclusion of international agreements—of treaties. But even more recently—and since the IPU space law draft resolution was adopted at the spring meeting for the conference agenda—the United States and the Soviet Union agreed upon arrangements to cooperate in space communications, in space meteorology, and in a world magnetic survey. This particular agreement, effective on August 1, 1963, is not a treaty but it is an appropriate arrangement for international cooperation. Similarly, the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in accordance with basic principles enacted into law in 1958, has international cooperative arrangements of various kinds with some 69 countries and locations throughout the world.

On the other hand, the United States and the Soviet Union were among those nations which have prepared the way so that a nuclear test ban treaty which includes a prohibition against nuclear testing in outer space will soon become a reality. This action was also taken since the IPU draft resolution on space law was adopted last spring.

It is clear, therefore, that flexibility is required in making international cooperative arrangements, and that substance should not be sacrificed for form by insistence upon only one rigid formula—that is, international agreements in the form of treaties. Informal arrangements for international cooperation should not be precluded by insisting that cooperation cannot take place unless it is in the form of a certain type of agreement. It is for this reason that nations should continue patterns affording wide latitude in methods by which cooperation can be expeditiously achieved.

Finally, I should like to interpret that part of the resolution which calls upon national groups to recommend, through their respective parliaments, that their government should "refrain from space experiments or any activities which may interfere with the peaceful use of outer space by other countries." The statement on "United States Policy in Outer Space" made in the United Nations on December 3, 1962, sets forth our belief "that nations which conduct activities in outer space should take all reasonable steps to avoid experiments or other activities which seriously threaten to deny or to limit the use of outer space to other nations." Furthermore, the United States is among many nations which support the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR) and its Consultative Group on Potentially Harmful Effects of Space Experiments. It has recommended to the General Assembly that: "Contacts and exchanges of views, which have been initiated, should continue for purpose of reaching agreement on questions which have not been settled." There is a feeling that all countries are getting closer on points at issue. We have an opportunity here to be of assistance in obtaining a wider consensus on these differences.

The U.S. group considers that the space law resolution is one which the Interparliamentary Union may take justifiable pride in adopting. Our work in this area must continue, of course, and as it does, we can look back upon this resolution as a first step on which to build.

(Comments by Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

This amendment was the subject of general discussion at the Lausanne meeting. At that time my distinguished and able colleague, Mr. PIRNIE, who was the U.S. member on the drafting committee, pointed out that the subject was of such importance that it should be considered by the Conference at Belgrade. He advised then that the question involving the delineation of a specific zone would continue to be at issue. In committee during this past week the U.S. group has attempted to adjust the differences which continue to exist. We are now asking the full Conference to participate and urge your careful consideration.

The amendment we offer supports a fundamental proposal which would apply throughout the world. It proposes the establishment of nuclear free zones; it recognizes that this must come from the free will of the countries concerned; it realistically includes the maintenance of military balance as a necessary criteria. It is an amendment which would, to use its own words, "serve the cause of peace."

In seeking to amend paragraph six, we also have in mind that the inclusion of Central Europe immediately raises a conflict. By specifically referring to that area, by isolating it from the rest of the world it accentuates the separate problems which are peculiar to that area. It is not right that it be set apart and our amendment will allow those special problems to be placed in proper perspective to the world at large, and in such relationship, those problems become not so bitter and more amenable to adjustment. Our responsibility lies in the "advancement of the work of international peace and cooperation." This is spelled out in the Statutes of the Interparliamentary Union under article I, section I, aptly entitled "Its Purpose and Constitution." Adopted by the Vienna Conference of 1922 it has been our guide line through the years. It is the wisdom of this document that we should follow. We need not be partisan or restrictive in this instance. Indeed, it is our duty to be otherwise.

I urge your support of the amendment we have drafted.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the control and elimination of juvenile delinquency is a subject of concern to us all. Bold and imaginative programs have been advanced and implemented by Federal and local governments to thwart the spread of juvenile delinquency. I am convinced, however, that greater grassroots participation is necessary. That is why I would like to call your attention to a unique plan suggested by Nassau County Family Court Judge Elizabeth Bass Golding. Mindful of the fact that juvenile delinquency is indeed "everybody's business," Judge Golding has outlined a program which could help make significant inroads into the juvenile delinquency problem.

An intense appeal is being made by Judge Golding to social service, business, labor, educational, civic, and religious organizations throughout Nassau County to offer support and active participation in developing an effective volunteer parents corps. Such a corps could become a potent factor in the rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

The parent volunteers, working closely with the court and the probation department, would be asked to spend some time with a youngster who has been released from a State training center, as well as those drifting toward delinquency.

From her experience in the family court, Judge Golding has become convinced that most youngsters brought before the court are the products of broken homes. The warmth, understanding, and moral support which the volunteers would give to the youth could mean the difference between a court repeater and a well-adjusted, responsible citizen.

Civic-minded businessmen, professional people, teachers, social workers, and housewives with qualified backgrounds are being urged to consider taking a youngster in hand, and a series of meetings to develop the volunteer parents corps is being held throughout Nassau County.

Judge Golding has evidenced a wonderful feeling for the troubled youth in her community and a deep desire to do something more than weep and moan about the terrible problem of juvenile delinquency. She has been deeply gratified by the tremendous response to her appeal from the people of Nassau County, who have come forth in great numbers to volunteer their time, talents, and efforts in the work of the volunteer parents corps.

The willingness to work together for the betterment of their youth is a great credit to the people of Nassau County. They have set an example of community spirit which other areas throughout the Nation would do well to emulate in a fervent effort to cure the ills of delinquency which have beset an ever-increasing number of American children.

DICTATOR SUKARNO—A SELF-STYLED DICTATOR OF FREEDOM?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if history has taught us one lesson, that lesson most certainly is that you cannot appease a power-mad dictator.

To feed him with soft words and generous gifts only whets his appetite for more and greater conquests.

He mistakes concern for weakness, generosity for fear, and tolerance for indecision.

Unfortunately, our Nation has made each of these mistakes in regard to Sukarno and Indonesia.

We attempted to appease a bully. Every act of aggression, every Hitler-like tantrum that Sukarno threw had its apologists in this country.

Those of us who criticized this international juvenile delinquent were told we "simply didn't understand."

Unfortunately, recent events have shown the world exactly what Sukarno is and how he operates, and I am sure that even the most avid of his former fans are now disillusioned and disgusted.

Here is a man who would pretend to be the champion of freedom, the voice of self-determination, who would deny these rights to everyone but himself.

He is picking on a neighbor only one-tenth his size, a neighbor which has just suffered the pangs of birth and drawn its first breath in the world as a free nation.

He has solemnly pledged the destruction of this neighbor, at all costs. He has moved his crack troops, many of whose senior officers were trained here in the United States, I am sorry to say, to the borders of Malaysia. He has openly supported raids across the border, burning, pillaging, killing.

He has neglected the welfare of his own people in his insatiable thirst for power and for real estate, anybody's real estate as long as it belongs to somebody else and he does not have to pay for it.

In short, Sukarno has acted like a despot.

The French philosopher, Montesquieu, once said that "when the savages wish to have fruit, they cut down the tree and gather it. That is exactly a despotic government."

Sukarno fits this definition in every respect.

Rather than creation, he is bent on destruction, and perhaps self-destruction as well.

Rather than thinking of tomorrow for his fellow countrymen, he thinks only of what he can grab today, with no thought of future consequences for his people.

Unfortunately, a great deal of the blame for Sukarno being as powerful and as belligerent as he is rests on our shouders.

We coddled Sukarno. We pampered him. We gave in to his demands. When Sukarno threatened to use force in his efforts to secure West New Guinea, we backed him, even though our backing was in direct violation of the United Nations Charter.

When Russia showered Sukarno with military aid, we were not satisfied until we had given him hundreds of millions in economic assistance so that he would not turn further toward the Communist camp.

Further, our own Government supplied his top officers with military training in guerrilla warfare, training which is now being used against neighboring Malaysia by Sukarno with a vengeance.

Only now, after Sukarno has ordered his crack paratroopers to the border, only now, after the British Embassy in Djakarta has been burned and sacked, only now is our Government considering—on a temporary basis—the suspension of further aid to Indonesia.

Most certainly, the State Department and the Agency for International Development had been warned months ago of the consequences of their acts in attempting to appease Sukarno. But the appeasement continued.

Let us hope that we are through with it. Let us hope that we will begin treating Sukarno as he is instead of as we wish him to be.

Let us face up to reality and realize that this man will not be satisfied until all of southeast Asia is under his thumb, no matter what the cost or consequences to the people of Indonesia.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a portion of an article by Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times of September 20, 1963, and also an article which appeared in the London Times of the same date:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1963]

SURRENDER

The fate of the administration's experiment of trying to buy peace in southeast Asia by paying his blackmail price to President Sukarno of Indonesia is, however, no longer in doubt. Once the administration, in concert with Secretary General Thant of the U.N. condoned and promoted Sukarno's use of force to annex Dutch New Guinea, in clear violation of the U.N. Charter, the usual effects of surrender to illegal violence were not long in coming. First, Sukarno found too slow the timetable for the award to Indonesia of territory for which it had neither ethnic nor historical claim. Then he became, if possible, cozier than before with the national agents of world communism, definitely including Communist China. Most recently, after attempting and failing to frighten former British possessions from adhering to the peaceful new nation of Malaysia, his troops and police stood by in Djakarta while the mob the Indonesian Government had incited destroyed the British Embassy and endangered the lives of the Ambassador and his staff.

These are the merited and prophesied results of an immoral United States and United Nations policy by which a loyal ally of this country and a people faithful to the Charter were denied even the transport of their own facilities to protect their territory from seizure by military aggression.

[From the London Times, Sept. 20, 1963]

GUERRILLA WARFARE IN BORNEO THE MAIN THREAT

The following is a guide to the defense arrangements for the Federation of Malaysia:

AGREEMENTS AND TREATIES

The Federation of Malaysia is not a member of the southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the alliance responsible for the collective defense of Western interests in southeast Asia. Its defense is based upon a bilateral agreement concluded in 1957 between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Malaya; as a result of talks held in London in November 1961, the arrangements were extended to apply to the new federation when it came into being on September 16.

Under the terms of the agreement the United Kingdom is committed to give the Federation any help it may need for the defense of its territory against outside attack. In exchange the federation allows Britain to station naval, land, and air forces in Malaysia and to keep bases in the area.

The principal base is Singapore, the status of which was the subject of much discussion at the time of the 1961 talks; it is generally assumed that the United Kingdom may use the base, with the approval of the Malaysian Government, to fulfill its international obligations in the area. It would certainly be available for operations in defense of Malaysia.

The Commonwealth Strategic Reserve, provided joinly by Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, is stationed in Malaya, mainly in support of the Commonwealth's commitment to SEATO. There is, however, little doubt that Australia and New Zealand would readily cooperate with Britain and Malaya if it became necessary to use the force to defend Malaysia under the terms of the defense agreement.

THE THREAT

Malaysia was conceived as an anti-Communist political union, but the immediate threat to its stability comes from Indonesia. Although in terms of military strength the Indonesian threat is potentially serious, political factors and the presence of powerful British forces in the area are likely to deter the Government of Indonesia from overt military action.

Indonesian Armed Forces: The Indonesian Army has an estimated strength of over 300,000. While the general standard of training and efficiency is not high by Western standards, there is a corps d'élite of parachute troops and commando-type units. A number of Indonesian officers have been trained in guerrilla warfare at the Special Warfare Center of the U.S. Army.

The Navy's main unit is a Russian heavy cruiser. There are also four destroyers of the Russian *Skoryi* class, 6 Russian W-class long-range submarines, and a force of frigates, submarine chasers and patrol boats. An important element of the fleet is the force of 11 tank landing ships and three American infantry landing craft.

The Indonesian Air Force is mainly equipped with Russian aircraft. There are four bomber squadrons, four fighter squadrons, and one coastal patrol squadron. There are also at least two transport squadrons and a number of training units. Although the Air Force has over 400 aircraft of all types, the shortage of spares makes it impossible for them to be simultaneously in operational use.

Assessment of Indonesian intentions: Although the Indonesian armed forces are large by the standards of a small developing power, it is unlikely that their full potential would be realized in formal military operations against Malaysia. The United States, Britain, Australia and New Zealand all have an interest in the stability of the area and it is unlikely that Indonesia would be prepared to face either the political unpopularity or the risk of almost certain military disaster involved in an overt attack.

Indonesian action is likely to be restricted to the sort of operations that can be conducted without open official approval—mob violence against foreigners and their possessions in Indonesia, and guerrilla operations by "volunteers" in Sabah, Brunei and Sarawak. A force of a few thousand determined terrorists operating in the jungles on the borders of Indonesia and Malaysia could tie down many times their number of security forces.

The main defense against a military threat of any sort from Indonesia is the strong British force in the area.

Royal Navy: The Naval base at Singapore provides facilities for the powerful task forces which can be concentrated in southeast Asia at short notice. Coastal minesweepers are permanently based at the dockyard. At present two carrier task forces are within easy reach of the Malaysian area. *Victorious*, with a strong escort, is expected in Malayan waters from Aden on Monday or Tuesday; *Ark Royal* with another task force is exercising in the South China Sea. Either of these fleets is capable of mounting operations in support of land operations at ranges of up to 200 miles from shore.

The commando ship *Albion* is in Hong Kong; but two Royal Marine commandos are ashore in southeast Asia with their helicopters—No. 42 commando in Kuching and No. 40 commando in Singapore. The 10,000-ton cruiser *Lion* is also in Singapore.

The Army: There is a strong force in the North Borneo territories. The infantry units are three battalions of Gurkha Rifles and one battalion of British infantry (the 1st Greenjackets). There is a small detachment of armored cars of the Queen's Royal Irish Hussars, and enough administrative and communications units to make, with the Royal Marine commando, a strong brigade group. The total strength is between 5,000 and 6,000.

Royal Air Force: As well as the transport aircraft from Singapore engaged in carrying British residents from Indonesia, the Far East Air Force has powerful strategic and tactical bomber units, fighter squadrons, maritime search and rescue squadrons, and photographic reconnaissance units.

The force is equipped with Canberra bombers, Javelin all-weather fighters, and Hunter fighter-ground attack aircraft.

COMMONWEALTH STRATEGIC RESERVE

This is stationed at Malacca and at Butterworth near Penang. The ground troops consist of a brigade group made up of British, Australian, and New Zealand infantry battalions with artillery and other supporting troops. The Royal Australian Air Force station at Butterworth has two fighter squadrons, a light bomber squadron, a transport squadron, and a helicopter squadron.

MALAYSIAN ARMED FORCES

These are still in the development stage. It was originally planned to have an army of one division. The present strength is six infantry battalions, with some armored cars, artillery, and engineers in Malaya, two infantry battalions in Singapore, and small numbers of soldiers and para-military police in the Borneo territories.

The Royal Malayan Navy has only coastal minesweepers and light patrol vessels, and the Royal Malayan Air Force is equipped principally with tactical transport aircraft and helicopters for use in support of ground forces. It has no offensive capability.

COMMAND AND PLANNING

The overall command of all British forces in the area is the responsibility of the commander in chief, Far East, Adm. Sir Varyl Begg, who has his headquarters in Singapore. A forward headquarters has been set up at Labuan under Maj. Gen. W. C. Walker, an officer with long experience of jungle operations against guerrilla forces.

The operational plan for the defense of the Borneo territories is formulated by the joint planners at the Ministry of Defense in consultation with the planners in the Far East and approved by the chiefs of staff in London. It is reviewed from time to time and it is safe to assume that it has been brought up to date in the light of recent developments.

There is little doubt that any Indonesian military move against Malaysia, whether by regular or guerrilla forces, could be contained without much difficulty. If, however, the Indonesians decide to settle down to a prolonged irregular warfare in the Borneo territories, British troops could be involved for a long time to come. Although the Government of Malaysia is reported to be expanding its armed forces and reorganizing its reserves, it will be many years before the federation will be able to defend itself without outside help.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called wheat deal with Russia, which has been so much discussed in the last few days, is a matter of vital concern to the farmers in my State of Minnesota and many of our neighbor States.

It seems to me that there is a great deal of emotion involved in the discussion, whether one happens to be in favor or against such a trade. On the one hand, some people are prone to view it as doing business with the enemy. On the other, it is viewed as the salvation of the wheat farmer who has courageously voted away the strict controls his own Government would have been willing to clamp on him and who now stands faced with our giant surpluses, the prospect of bumper crops, and an uncertain tomorrow.

It is now time that we view this proposed trade in the cold light of day. I believe that it is time we reevaluate our entire trade policy in regard to the Soviet Union. This reevaluation seems necessary to me and I believe it should be undertaken by the Congress, because the problem of trade with the Communists is greater than merely making a decision on whether or not wheat should be sold to the Soviet Union. The Congress ought to seriously study the whole question of

U.S. sales to the U.S.S.R., many of which I believe border on being strategic materials.

In one way it is a little surprising that the discussion of selling wheat to the Russians should cause such a stir, for the fact is we have never had a year in which we did not trade with the Communist regime of Russia. Even before President Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to the Reds, we were trading with them and in whopping quanities. In 1930, for instance, our trade with Russia was a quarter of a billion dollars in volume. In 1946 when we still thought of them as allies against Nazi Germany, the volume was nearly a half-billion. Though trade fell off to a total-volume trickle of $11 million in 1953, as a result of the Korean war, it is significant that trade never stopped.

In fact, looking back over the trade statistics of United States-Soviet exchanges since World War II, it becomes obvious that they have followed the ups and downs of the political storms. It is significant that while at times we drastically cut our exports to Russia, we always continued to buy from her at a much higher rate.

United States trade with the U.S.S.R.

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Exports (including reexports)	Imports (general)
1946	357,921	100,752
1947	149,069	77,102
1948	27,879	[1] 86,825
1949	6,617	39,140
1950	752	38,296
1951	55	27,396
1952	20	16,818
1953	19	10,791
1954	219	11,809
1955	252	16,875
1956	3,823	24,561
1957	[2] 4,483	16,784
1958	3,422	17,319
1959	7,398	28,624
1960	39,264	22,644
1961	45,561	23,230
1962	20,141	16,175

[1] Includes $7,855,000 of returned lend-lease vessels.
[2] Includes $977,000 exported to Latvia in 1957 and $7,000 to Estonia.

Source: U.S. Foreign Trade Statistics, Department of Commerce.

In 1948, in protest of Russia's swallowing up of smaller neighboring states, we imposed sanctions on trade with them which cut trade in 1948 down to a little more than $100 million. Trade continued to fall until it reached the low point in 1953 which I have cited. It gradually built up again until it reached not quite $70 million in 1961. Then, due to the Cuban crisis, it fell to about $36 million last year. It also showed a dip in 1958, when the Berlin wall was erected.

This year, it will obviously be more than that, even without the wheat deal. We have already sold foodstuffs to Russia this year. We have sold them machine tools, and issued export licenses in August 1963 for the export of petroleum coke for the manufacture of aluminum, antioxidants for use in rubber production and $9.5 million of automated mining equipment, ostensibly to mine potash for fertilizer, is to be sold the Soviets.

I am sure that most citizens of the United States are not fully aware of the amount of trade with which we have indulged with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

I have here charts, included in the Department of Commerce Publication OBR–63–115, dated August 1963, titled "Overseas Business Reports" showing trade in 1961 and 1962 with the total Sino-Soviet bloc. These charts show in a breakdown, sales of specific products to the U.S.S.R., to Poland, and to other satellites, and our imports from them:

Exports to total Sino-Soviet bloc, European satellites, and U.S.S.R., 1961–62

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc		European satellites				U.S.S.R.	
			Poland		Other satellites [1]			
	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962
Exports, total	[2] 133,331	[2] 125,14	74,791	94,454	15,871	15,429	42,662	15,253
Dairy products	565	1	565					1
Hides and skins, raw, except fur	4,291	7,838	792	386	3,499	5,513		1,939
Tallow, inedible	19,062	8,208	3,361	4,022	579	175	15,122	4,011
Barley, except pearl barley	3,138	9,873	3,138	9,873			[3]	
Corn, except seed	481	1,857	481	1,857				
Grain sorghums	444	2,973	444	2,958	[3]	15		
Rice		3,003		3,003				
Wheat	27,769	26,237	27,769	26,237				
Fruits and preparations	26	377	17	10	9	367		
Vegetable fats and oils, edible	2,821	3,246	2,821	3,246				
Rubber, synthetic	2,246	3,144	772	1,44-	11	243	1,463	1,459
Soybeans	3,360	1,905	1,025	479	2,335	1,426		
Flaxseed	1,082		1,079		3			
Soybean oil, crude, inedible	2,664	4,305	521	4,305	2,143			
Seeds, except oilseeds	184	427	149	3	35	424		
Tobacco and manufactures	1,979	1,450	678	339	1,301	1,067		44
Hops	326	1,538		73	326	1,465		
Cotton, unmanufactured	16,635	20,524	16,635	20,524				
Wool rags and used clothing of wool	625	563	623	563	2			
Synthetic fibers and manufactures	5,488	2,632	729	639	100	7	4,659	1,986
Pencil slats	304	361	17	8	287	353		
Coal	354	123			354	123		
Sulfur, crude	470	1,012			470	1,012		
Iron and steel-mill products	2,254	177	223	177	944		1,087	[3]
Aluminum ores and concentrates	1,550	733	1,550	733				
Electric machinery and apparatus	818	384	405	238	25	82	388	64
Construction, excavating, and related machinery	3,264	330	191	221	66	21	3,007	88
Metalworking machinery and parts	2,386	2,128	1,524	2,125	28	3	834	
Textile, sewing, and shoe machinery	10,174	400	34	79	212	145	9,928	176
Food- and beverage-processing machinery	522	291	320	2	9	5	193	284
Paper, pulp, and paper-processing machinery	27	2,195	1		19	27	7	2,168
Laundry and drycleaning equipment, commercial	1,149	21	6				1,143	21
Machinery, industrial, other	1,295	1,632	289	230	183	274	823	1,128
Printing and bookbinding machinery	504	39	93	18	21	16	390	5
Coal-tar products	1,290	380	162	51	358	19	770	310
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	1,291	1,885	786	851	390	1,012	115	22
Chemical specialties	805	336	101	77	176	94	528	165
Industrial chemicals	899	730	97	87	210	353	592	290
Pigments	995	42	2	1	165	41	828	
Scientific and professional instruments, apparatus, and supplies	576	298	189	112	132	84	255	102
Private relief shipments	5,415	7,924	5,328	7,885	87	23		16
Other domestic exports	3,465	3,306	1,797	1,550	1,141	858	527	894
Reexports	331	312	77	50	251	182	3	80

[1] Includes Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.
[2] Includes exports to China of cars shipped to the diplomatic missions of friendly countries, valued at $7,000 in 1961 and $4,000 in 1962. There were no exports to Outer Mongolia and North Korea in 1961 and 1962.
[3] Less than $500.

Imports from total Sino-Soviet bloc, European satellites, U.S.S.R., and Soviet bloc in Asia, 1961–62

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Total from Sino-Soviet bloc		European satellites				U.S.S.R.		Soviet bloc in Asia	
			Poland		Other satellites [1]					
	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962
General imports, total	84,641	82,380	41,316	45,936	16,525	16,783	23,228	16,180	3,572	3,481
Imports for consumption, total [2]	83,960	82,732	41,248	45,586	16,354	16,526	22,785	16,360	3,573	3,900
Meat and meat products	26,850	26,269	26,158	25,649	692	589		31		
Hides and skins, raw, except fur	794	1,385	773	1,385	21					
Pig and hog leather	261	642	261	642						
Leather manufactures	187	413	9	145	178	268				(3)
Furs, undressed	9,084	11,400	1,939	3,033	362	847	6,762	7,462	21	5
Bristles	649	425	213	246	129	20	307	159		
Feathers, crude	1,165	1,254	975	1,091	190	163				
Casein	2,122	1,399	2,058	1,383	7	16	57			
Vegetables and preparations	685	448	345	291	312	111	28	46	(3)	
Spices	1,154	954	118	124	1,036	830				
Molasses, inedible	862				862					
Essential or distilled oils	295	418	9	30	205	282	81	106		
Cotton linters	541	597					541	597		
Cotton manufactures	111	530	9	372	100	117	2	41		(3)
Flax, hemp, ramie, and manufactures	1,008	1,966	620	1,483	388	483				
Wool and fine animal hair, unmanufactured	3,320	3,907			256	349		26	3,064	3,532
Artificial fruits and flowers	497	274	(3)	(3)	497	274				
Wood manufactures	1,562	2,108	1,202	1,688	349	416	11	3	(3)	1
Cement	406	280	407	280						
Glass and glass products	4,340	4,887	1,459	1,515	2,449	2,767	432	605		
Clay and clay products	435	371	175	150	254	221	6			
Imitation precious and semiprecious stones	739	652			739	652	(3)			
Steel mill products; pig iron and scrap	148	684	94	619	28	64	26	1		
Chrome ore	502	916					502	916		
Platinum	2,019	1,045			136		1,883	1,045		
Palladium	4,238	1,945					4,238	1,945		
Rhodium	131	1,101					131	1,101		
Typewriters	533	556			533	556				
Machinery, other	728	689	43	112	684	575	1	2		
Bicycles and parts	1,495	1,944	694	1,003	801	941				
Benzene	4,454	536	783	303		233	3,671			
Naphthalene	3,116	571	900	162	198		2,018	409		
Coal-tar products, other	489	1,097	161	1,095	1	66	327	26		
Fertilizers and fertilizer materials	690	622	281	335	7	15	402	272		
Photographic goods	468	356	21		419	339	28	17		
Dolls, toys, and athletic and sporting goods	392	520	271	330	121	189	(3)	1		
Books, maps, and other printed matter	1,178	1,215	87	225	842	866	249	124		
Artworks and antiques	686	648	41	26	137	207	61	192	447	223
Beads, beaded fabrics, and articles of beads	739	861	(3)	(3)	739	861				
Other imports [4]	4,886	6,487	1,142	1,959	2,682	3,209	1,021	1,233	41	86

[1] Includes Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.
[2] Commodity data are reported on the basis of imports for consumption.
[3] Less than $500.
[4] Includes an estimate of low-value shipments of $250 or less each on informal entry shipments and under $100 each on formal entry shipments.

It is contrary to our policy to sell the Russians strategic goods, but apparently the interpretation of what is strategic is extremely liberal. Armies, as well as civilians, must eat. Any of us who remember the Second World War will recall that one of our problems was obtaining rubber for our war machines. We were also interested in alumimum, which was vitally needed in war production.

Therefore, some of our trade with Russia must certainly be viewed as bordering on strategic materials—much more so than wheat.

This must be kept in mind, when considering that through our system of sanctions against trade of strategic goods, we have adopted a method of using economic tools to fashion political hardware. But the Russians, by the very nature of their state-controlled economy, do the same thing and are probably much better at it.

It is this, then, that we must keep in mind in considering any sale of any goods to Russia—is it in the best political interests of the United States on the international scene or does it significantly strengthen us domestically?

It is not unprecedented in world history for nations who are politically and militarily at odds with one another to keep up economic trade. As we have seen, the United States has never shut off trade with Russia, even when we knew she was helping to finance the war machines which was fighting our troops in bloody conflict in Korea.

By the same token, we must also realize that Russia wants trade with us for reasons of strengthening her own political influence, both domestic and foreign. Are we to forget so soon Nikita Khrushchev's threat to "bury us?" And, you recall, he said he would "bury us" not by armed might, but on the economic front.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time on this very important subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of advantages and disadvantages to the United States involved in the still somewhat nebulous Russian wheat transaction. The advantages or arguments in support of such a policy include the following:

First. Surplus disposal: The Commodity Credit Corporation now has in its inventory approximately 1 billion bushels of surplus wheat. This surplus is well beyond our normal carryover needs and is, of course, expensive to store.

Second. Balance of payments: Although the United States enjoys a favorable balance of trade, our country for a number of years has been suffering from an unfavorable balance-of-payments problem which has created heavy demand upon our limited gold supply by foreigners holding dollars. It is argued that a sale of surplus wheat for either Russian gold or for U.S. dollars would help alleviate the balance-of-payments problem.

Third. A help in the cold war: It is argued that the Communist nations have only a limited amount of export credit and that if this is used by the United States and other Western nations in financing agricultural sales, then these Communist resources cannot be spent for industrial and other more strategic goods.

Fourth. Strategic value to the United States: If Soviet Russia became dependent on the United States for a significant portion of its food supplies, this would give our Government a lever in future negotiations with the Communists to force diplomatic concessions in other areas.

Fifth. Propaganda value: Russian purchases of U.S. wheat, it is argued, would prove to the world that communism is much less successful than the free enterprise system in producing agricultural commodities, and would be an admission of failure on behalf of the Communist farm system.

Sixth. A step to world peace: It is further argued that the easing of trade restrictions between the two chief nuclear

powers of the world will lessen the danger of a war in which millions of people on the earth might perish.

Seventh. Strengthening U.S. farm prices: It is also argued that substantial sales of U.S. wheat would have a beneficial effect on market prices received by farmers for their current crop of wheat and that farmers would not be able to understand why our Government failed to sell to Russia if wheat should fall to $1 to $1.25 per bushel range next year.

Eighth. Continuation of present policy not realistic: It is argued that since Canada has agreed to sell Russia its surplus wheat that our refusal to do so injures only ourselves and does not deny the Communists the wheat they seek.

The disadvantages and arguments in opposition to such a policy include the following:

First. Bailing out the Communists: It has become increasingly evident that there is a shortage of wheat and other grains in the Soviet Union. As Secretary Freeman stated, the Soviet Union has canceled its export commitments to the Scandanavian countries and to the Red bloc satellites. It is argued that if we now give the Russians the opportunity to accumulate a full inventory of wheat they will be able to more effectively withstand the internal presures within the Soviet Union for more capitalistic, private ownership type of agriculture.

Second. Subsidizing communism: This entire deal is being considered in the context of world prices, which are approximately 50 to 60 cents per bushel lower than U.S. prices. Although the export subsidy on wheat is designed to protect American producers and is actually paid to American exporters, the final effect would be to allow Russian consumers to purchase American wheat for a substantially lower price than could American consumers. It is, therefore, argued that this proposal would mean a subsidy to Communist Russia.

Third. A dangerous precedent: If a transaction of this nature were consummated, it would, many feel, be a precedent for trade with Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba. If Russian gold can buy U.S. wheat, why should not Chinese gold achieve the same result? It is also contended that this precedent would have a very adverse effect on our free world allies whom we are asking to stand firm and make sacrifices in the struggle against communism. Example: South Vietnam.

Fourth. Not mutually advantageous: Secretary Freeman noted that free world supplies of wheat will be short next year. Thus, the sale to Russia at current world prices might turn out to be an unwise business decision for the United States. If Russia is able to corner the world wheat market with a reserve acquired from the United States and Canada and its current wheat crop, the Soviets would of course also be able to divert some of their internal resources to other uses if they were assured of large amounts of wheat and perhaps other agricultural commodities from Western nations, including the United States.

Fifth. Trading with the enemy: A basic national policy goal is involved in this transaction. Is Russia an enemy of our country and our system, or is she merely a friendly competitor? Is it our national purpose to eliminate world communism, or is it merely to tolerate it in the hope that it will not spread into the West? At a time when the United States is considering selling wheat to Russia, our defense budget is ostensibly for the purpose of defeating world communism and stands at a record $50 billion.

Sixth. Legal barriers: Public Law 480 transactions with Soviet Russia are clearly prohibited by law. See section 107 of that act. Commercial sales involving an export subsidy are contrary to the policy of Congress as expressed in the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961. See section 2(c) of that act. In addition, there are a number of legal difficulties involved in the establishment of a cartel of American grain firms to export wheat to the Soviet Union. It is questionable whether all these legal obstacles can be overcome by administrative interpretation, and for proper clarification, the proposal should be submitted to the Congress for its consideration.

Conclusion: Based on the statements of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, and Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs G. Griffith Johnson, the administration has not made a formal decision on this matter. The details of the alleged Communist offer are not known. The terms of payment and the method of delivery are not decided. Until all these facts are known, it is very difficult to make an intelligent decision as to whether this offer of Soviet trade should be accepted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that it is time for Congress to reevaluate our trade with Russia, so that we can be sure we are gaining what is to our political benefit from trading with her and that the benefit to us overweighs the benefit to Russia and her satellites.

Keeping this consideration in mind, let us first consider the wheat deal as it stands now and then consider some of the total implications of trade with the Soviet Union.

Though we know nothing definite as yet concerning the method in which wheat might be sold to the Russians, we have the experience of the recent talks in Ottawa, in which it seems the idea was to set up a cartel, through which the United States Government could deal with the Soviet Government, apparently selling out of our surpluses. This would put the U.S. Government in competition with its own farmers and would do little to strengthen the domestic position of our farmers and through them, our entire economy.

Two organizations which regularly deal in wheat have stated the position clearly.

The following statement is, in part, taken from a Radio Roundup of Friday, September 27, 1963, prepared and distributed by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

Very obvious is the fact that here is the Government's big opportunity to do and to show that it wants to do something about the farm problem * * * something to help farm people who have been penalized for years through low prices and incomes by the very abundance they produce.

You see, if the Government decides that grain sales to Russia can be made, it has the power to take over the negotiations completely. It can fill the Russian orders out of CCC stockpiles. But this would leave our farmers with little or no grain in the market places because the Government stockpile would not be reduced enough to take off the pressure that holds market prices down.

On the other hand (and this is what we'd recommend), the Government could show its good faith with farmers by staying on the sidelines and letting sales be made out of current free market stocks. Market experts believe this would have a very healthy effect on prices to the benefit of farmers who certainly could use it.

The farmer cooperatives and the entire grain industry would have the work of moving the grain through their normal trade channels, which they are thoroughly capable of doing with dispatch and efficiency.

GTA has not been involved in negotiations for any sales to Russia, has not even been approached, but it would be moving the farmers' wheat if such sales are made. And, as Mr. Thatcher, president of GTA said, our farmers should not be asked to compete with their own Government in such transactions. We would hope that such sales would be made out of current production and not out of stocks of wheat now held by the Government.

Now we'll see what happens. Will the Government take the farmers' side?

And, Cargill, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., which was for a time involved in the discussion at Ottawa, submitted recommendations after leaving the conference. This is what those recommendations were:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1963.

Cargill submits the following recommendations with respect to proposed sales of U.S. wheat to Russia:

1. The first step must be a decision by our Government, whether the so-called Latta amendment prohibits these sales. The question cannot be avoided on the theory that sales of Government stocks at the world prices are not "subsidized sales." The legislative history, the language of the amendment itself and the definition of a "subsidized agricultural commodity" in the Comprehensive Export Schedule all rule out any attempt to distinguish between such sales and sales of wheat obtained in the free market and subsidized by Government payment-in-kind certificates.

If questions raised by the Latta amendment can be satisfied, we believe that the following considerations should govern sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

2. Wheat should be supplied through normal trade channels under the wheat export program "payment-in-kind" (GR 345).

Since 1956 the great bulk of U.S. wheat exports have been made under this program, which provides for export of wheat from free market supplies and payment of the subsidy "in kind" from Government stocks. The value of this program to producers, Government and the private trade has been widely recognized. They include (1) producer price benefits of acquisition of wheat export stocks in the free market, (2) competitive handling and marketing by private trade institutions and (3) reduced Government handling and storage costs.

No compelling reason has been given to depart from this practice. As we have noted, the Latta amendment offers no impediment to sales under this program which does not exist in sales from Government stocks. Domestic consumers are adequately pro-

tected from unfair price advances by formula provisions in existing price support legislation which permit sale of Government stocks for unrestricted use if prices rise significantly.

Two alternative suggestions involve: (1) sales from Government stocks at world prices to private traders who will then re-sell them to the Russians and (2) direct state-to-state trading.

A major disadvantage of either system involves denying U.S. wheat producers the price strengthening effect of this important and unexpected demand for U.S. wheat. Wheat producers recently rejected Government proposals which would have offered high Government price supports in exchange for compulsory production controls. In doing so, they chose to rely on the movement of price in essentially a free market situation. Having accepted the risks involved in surrendering Government price protection, they should not be denied the price benefits of export demand. In short, they should not be required to compete with their own Government under these circumstances.

The suggestion of state-to-state trading in this case is particularly offensive. In recent years, our Government has properly denied friendly democratic governments the privilege of buying wheat from this country on a state-to-state basis. In part, this has been based on clear legislative mandates to this administration and past administrations to use private, competitive marketing facilities to the maximum extent practicable in executing the Government's export responsibilities. There is much less reason to ignore these requirements in dealing with a Communist government. It is a dangerous precedent, difficult to justify in our relationships with traditional buyers of U.S. wheat.

In view of the way in which this matter has developed, we urge that the Russians be invited to purchase U.S. wheat, if at all, through a public tender, as do most of our large government buyers. Doubt about our Government policy with respect to these sales has led some exporters to refrain from efforts to arrange sales to the Russians pending a policy decision by our Government. Others, who did not observe this restraint, will be given an advantage if negotiations held prior to Government approval of such sales are permitted to stand.

3. The prospect of sales to Russia neither requires nor justifies the creation of a Webb Pomerene Corp. under which shares of the business and terms of the sale are agreed upon in advance by those who otherwise would be competing for the business. None of the facts which traditionally justify the Webb-Pomerene approach are evident here.

These are (1) a foreign cartel not subject to U.S. antitrust laws competing with American sellers, and (2) overwhelming power of the foreign buyer vis-a-vis competing sellers. Obviously neither situation exists here. Evidence indicates that only the United States possesses and can make available the kind and quality of wheat Russia needs. U.S. exporters are at no greater disadvantage in dealing with the Russians than they are with any other large institutional U.S. buyers of wheat.

It is interesting to note that the Webb-Pomerene Act is designed to provide relief for exporters who fear the weakness of their bargaining position. There is little evidence in the discussions to date that this motivates the organizers of the proposed corporation.

We can see by these statements that part of the dilemma today over wheat is not whether it should be sold to the Russians, but in what method it should be sold. It would certainly not be in our best domestic interests to find ourselves in a position in which Government is competing for these sales with the farmers it is, in part, pledged to represent.

This being the case, it is then imperative that we must resolve this issue for our domestic well-being. What about our well-being on the international scene?

It would seem that today we are being led by the nose in our trade relations with the Soviet Union. Because Canada sells wheat to the Russians does not necessarily mean it is in our best interests to do the same. We have poured over a billion dollars of American taxpayers' money into Tito's Yugoslavia, on the ethereal hope that it might loosen the strings binding him to Moscow.

What I am saying is that we must recognize that trade with Russia and the Soviet bloc nations is a weapon in the cold war, probably, more than hydrogen bombs, the ultimate weapon. Khrushchev recognized this when he promised to "bury us."

It is for us to decide how best to utilize this economic weapon for our own well-being. If expanded trade with the Soviets helps us solve our internal problems and strengthen ourselves, it may be to our benefit. But a very hard look must be given to the entire picture, before we can be convinced that this is the case. For this is a relative question. Though trade in certain areas may strengthen us, does it strengthen the Russians more? If it does, then it tends to defeat us. For we must recognize that in a battle, both sides lose men, but one army leaves the field a victor.

In October 1961 the State Department issued a bulletin, State Department publication 7234, titled "The Threat of Soviet Economic Policy." The preface of that publication said:

> It is evident that, for all his espousal of peaceful coexistence * * * the deeds and words of Khrushchev are devoted to extinction of all but the Communist way of life.

Compare that with the statement of Mr. Robert McCloskey of the State Department, quoted in the Journal of Commerce on September 20 this year. He was quoted as saying:

> The State Department approves of peaceful trade with the Soviet bloc.

But then compare the statement quoted in the New York Times last August 14. A Commerce Department "spokesman" was quoted as saying:

> Russia doesn't want our consumer goods. What the Soviet Union really wants from the United States is technology and industrial equipment, processes, and plants, and this is precisely what the United States does not want to give.

Since then, we have swung the mining equipment deal.

In the New York Times of September 21, Arjay R. Miller, president of the Ford Motor Co., is quoted as telling the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce:

> The partial test ban treaty marks the start of a new battle in the cold war involving market competition for which the United States must be prepared.

And Miller pointed out, the Russians will be "formidable adversaries."

If this is the start of a cold war battle of trade in which the Russians will be formidable adversaries, there can be little room for fuzzy thinking.

Let us know exactly where we stand as the battle begins. Does the Department of State opinion expressed in 1961 that Khrushchev is devoted to extinction of our way of life, still stand? If it does, will McCloskey's idea of "peaceful trade" with them include the technology which the Commerce Department says the Russians want? Does the partial test ban treaty give us sufficient guarantee that the Russians are devoted to peace to relax our vigil on strategic or near-strategic goods? These, gentlemen, are questions which must be asked and which should be answered by a complete and sweeping study of this entire complex question.

We must remember that in this case more than any other, economics are tied to international politics. And in the dealings of politics, one must view not only one's own gains, but the effect on the adversary.

The September 8, 1962, issue of the magazine of Wall Street contends:

> The multimillion dollar stakes of the East-West balance of payments is masterminded on the Eastern side by powerful policymakers who possess minute information not only of their own resources but also of ours. Not only do our statesmen lack comparative decisionmaking power over matters of trade and finance, but by the present pattern of East-West relations are compelled to work without clear information concerning the real flow of funds and goods between the two blocs.

Today, the Russians say they have the money to buy. Let us remember that outside the regular channels of international trade, the Communists are obtaining money from inheritances going across the Iron Curtain, from royalties and patents in the Western World—who got, for instance, the royalties on Boris Pasternak's great book "Dr. Zhivago," which sold so well here in the United States?—from money sent to relatives across the Iron Curtain and from, in the case of Red China at least, immense supplies of illegal narcotics smuggled into this country. From confiscated or illegally obtained supplies of money, the Communists have created themselves a lever for the purchase of legtitimate goods through legitimate channels which could be of vital technological importance to them.

There are other concerns, however, involved with expanded trade with the Russians. We know that some of that Canadian wheat went directly to Cuba. A stronger Cuba means a stronger Communist state in our own hemisphere, one which we know is attempting to spread the Communist idiom to the free States of Latin and South America.

We know that in 1962 Russian trade with Red China dropped to its lowest point since 1950—off 67 percent from 1961. Are we to pump Western production into Russia to keep her strong? If it is valuable in promoting a further rift between these nations it may be worthwhile. But this is not an assumption we can immediately jump at without careful consideration.

The role of our allies who trade with Russia must be considered. While Soviet Russia controls the economies not

only of her own state but also of her satellite states, we can view the entire Communist bloc, except perhaps China, as one unit. There is no competition among them; they function as one economic entity. But that is not the case with our allies. Would our expanded entry into trade with the Soviet Union tend to weaken or strengthen our position with our allies and theirs in relation to the Soviet bloc? This is a question which should be answered.

I found the following excerpt from a fascinating book, of interest:

> But, the Russian note insisted, it (the relaxation of tensions between nations) must be by serious and practical steps—not in one big leap.
>
> What steps?
>
> The first step: Conclusion of a trade and credit agreement.
>
> The second step, to be taken shortly thereafter: Conclusion of a nonaggression pact.
>
> Simultaneously with the second step, the Soviets demanded the conclusion of a special protocol defining the interests of the contracting parties in this or that question of foreign policy. This was more than a hint that in regard to dividing up Eastern Europe, at least, Moscow was receptive.

That excerpt is from William Shirer's "Rise and Fall of the Third Reich." The trade and credit agreement, the nonaggression pact, and the secret protocol, were consummated between Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin in 1939.

Is history repeating itself?

At that time, Stalin used intimidation to get what he wanted. At the same moment he was dealing with Hitler for those concessions, he was discussing with French and English military representatives a plan to contain the Germans. He decided the German offer was more tempting and cut off the French-English talks.

In exchange for trade, for the nonaggression pact, and for dividing up defenseless East Europe, Stalin promised not to attack Germany. It was Germany's later mistakes that brought Russia into the war against her.

Today, Khrushchev talks of expanded trade with us. "We have the money, we want to buy from you," he told Agriculture Secretary Freeman a few weeks ago.

The partial nuclear test ban treaty signed within hours after ratification, two Senate committees were discussing ways of increasing trade with the Russians.

One of the reasons advanced for trading with the Russians is that we will help make them dependent on us, thus encouraging peace. Let me suggest that this is a two-way street and that in expanded trade we would almost surely become equally dependent on them.

Would that create a lever for, let us say, recognition of East Germany? Or a hands-off policy toward Cuba? Or a liberal policy if a South American, Asian, or African country should become Communist dominated?

Would we be able to maintain economic levers for use in international politics, or would our levers bend before the strength of Russian politico-economic crowbars?

We should aim at winning the cold war, the spread of democracy and not communism, successful growth and strength for ourselves and our allies.

I stress this because I believe that it is entirely possible that these objectives can be attained through economic and peaceful means. But they can be obtained only so long as we keep them clearly in mind and realize that trade, like cultural exchanges and all the rest, are cold war weapons.

That is why I think that Congress should undertake a study of trade with the Soviets, so that we can use it as a cold war weapon and aim toward victory. At the moment, I fear that this is not our objective.

I call your attention to a research paper, entitled "Common Action for the Control of Conflict," published by the Institute for Defense Analyses, International Studies Division for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

According to a syndicated column by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, both Secretary Freeman and Secretary of State Rusk carried copies on their recent trips to Russia.

Among the things it expounds are these: to seek joint space projects with the Soviets: Says the publication:

> It (the United States) should further continue to seek to expand cooperation in space with the Soviet Union on both a bilateral and multilateral basis.

It also says:

> The possibility of U.S. assistance in the development of Soviet agriculture should be explored.

It says:

> The United States should be prepared to reduce its restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union.

It would appear that this publication is being taken quite seriously. Consider then that it also advocates that the United States encourage "the development of mutually invulnerable strategic weapons systems," as a contribution to the stability of the military environment. This booklet contends that a balance of military might shows the way to peace, and that the United States should see to it that we do not become too strong.

I will agree that if the Soviet Union were to hold military advantage over us that the peace would be endangered. But if we hold such advantage, the peace would not be endangered, for we have poured billions of dollars into defense not because we wanted to, but because the Soviet Union forced us to do so by its own belligerent posture. Therefore, I see no reason for encouraging her to develop "invulnerable strategic weapons." She seems to do quite well on her own.

In summary, we have seen that:

First. The so-called wheat deal is no different and perhaps much less serious than other trade deals we have recently concluded with the Soviet Union.

Second. We have never ceased to trade with the Russians and so the idea of trade with them in wheat or any other commodity requires no reviewal of policy, except in regard to reappraisal as to what is "strategic material."

Third. That economic factors are political weapons. We have used economic sanctions as weapons in the cold war and the Russians have constantly used economic conditions to gain desired political ends.

Fourth. That any expansion of trade with the Communist nations must be based on a reasonable assumption that it is to our best interests in winning the cold war.

Fifth. That in expanding trade or withholding it, we must evaluate what effect it might have on the Soviet Union which would be favorable to her and unfavorable to us.

Sixth. It must be clearly kept in mind that the avowed intention of the Soviet Union is to bring the world under Communist domination. That one of the weapons it intends to use is economic and is to be used to "bury us."

Seventh. That until such time as world domination is disavowed and that disavowal proved by Communist actions, that we can expect continuing relaxation of tension followed by periods of tension, as the Soviet Union plays the line to land another fish. After World War II, trade with Russia was high until she had grabbed off half of Europe and had gone adventuring in Korea. Then it rose again gradually until we put down our foot in Cuba. Now, it is on its way up again.

Eighth. We must keep in mind that less than 25 years ago the Soviet Union used the same approach in dealing with Nazi Germany, and that the string attached at the end of the line of trade and nonaggression was the spoils of Eastern Europe.

The conclusion to be drawn from these points is this: That since we are already trading with Russia and always have, and since economic conditions carry profound political implications, that at this time we ought to reevaluate our entire trade program with Russia with the end in mind of finding in what ways it benefits us and what ways it does not.

It is not enough to merely expand trade with the Soviet Union in a vague hope unsubstantiated by fact that it will relieve tension. Our trade with Russia has gone up and down, but always in relation to international tension. There is not an iota of evidence that trade with us prevented the Soviets from their avowed intent of dominating the world by any means possible. We must be awake to the possibility that by seeking expanded trade, the Russians are angling for another lever with which to push their way into greater territorial expansion. For today, while Western colonialism is on the decline in Africa and Asia, Communist colonialism is on the march in Ghana and Vietnam, on the borders of India and 90 miles off our southern shore.

There, I suggest that Congress undertake a complete reevaluation of our policy of trade with the Communist bloc, and that we be sure that the sale of every commodity to the Soviets is aimed at strengthening, not weakening, our own national interests.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this

time to clarify, if possible, and to expand on all of the characteristics of the much publicized possibility of the United States making a very substantial wheat sale to the Soviet Union. There are many aspects that should be clarified and taken into consideration as we approach this proposition.

First of all, in arriving at a conclusion as to our national policy on this matter, we should keep in perspective that Russia is the foremost Communist nation in the world, and as such, dedicated to our destruction as a free nation of free people. The question that has recently come before us is the reality of whether or not Russia is becoming less militant in pursuing this avowed Communist objective. Our recent atomic test ban agreement is premised upon the proposition that Russia is sincerely seeking a more peaceful coexistence with non-Communist countries. Russia could have demonstrated her good faith by removing her troops from Cuba, taking down the Berlin wall, or extending more self-determination to the captive nations. So far there has been little indication that such a move to relax tensions will be carried out, although it can be said that Russia is carrying on a vigorous attempt to create an impression of her more friendly attitude.

There is ample argument as to why we should sell some of our abundant supply of wheat for dollars or gold. It would help the market price for wheat farmers. It would reduce our stocks in Commodity Credit hands and thus reduce the cost of our wheat program to the taxpayers. It would demonstrate our ability to produce food for less fortunate countries around the world. It would demonstrate the productive capacity of our American free enterprise system.

On the other side of the coin, is the question as to whether, in helping Russia at this time, when her food supply is inadequate, we are delaying the final recognition by the Russian people of the comparative shortcoming of Russian-planned production. If this was an instance where our wheat would be identified as coming from the people of the United States, we might be achieving desirable results. This will not be the case, however. Russia is apparently not critically short of wheat for her own domestic needs. She needs this wheat being purchased from Canada, Australia, and possibly the United States to fill her commitments to her Communist and non-Communist customers. As this wheat we might sell would reach its destination in Russian ships, there would be a minimum of publicity of the fact that this wheat came from the United States. It is impossible to stamp "Grown in U.S.A." on each kernel of wheat we export. In fact, it has been difficult to identify as American, wheat that we have actually given to some foreign countries.

If we approve this sale—and we must remember this is not a decision that must be made by Congress, but one that can be and will be made by the President—we should be aware that we are taking a step toward relaxing our trade policy with a Communist country. Not to a great degree, since we do trade in certain items with Russia and we have sold, under Public Law 480, large quantities of farm products to Poland and Yugoslavia. We have refused to trade with Russia in certain strategic materials and have refused to carry on any trade with Red China and Castro's Cuba. We have tried, with somewhat limited success, to induce other free nations to restrict, or cut off trade with Communist countries.

Now if we make this sale, we will be weakening our hand in securing cooperation from other countries, but we do not get much cooperation, anyway. Canada has sold wheat the last couple of years to Red China. A part of the wheat she is now selling to Russia will go directly to Cuba.

There is a moral principle involved, but moral principles do not carry weight for long when profitable trade is the consideration. It is a sound argument that we should not do business with a country that is our active enemy. We have apparently crossed this bridge, however, by carrying on some trade with Russia even while she reiterated her intention to "bury us." Now, are we deviating from our moral position by selling Russia something she wants for hard currency, at a time when she is at least refraining from open caustic criticism of the United States?

The questions for the American people to understand are whether or not we can trust Russia any more now than we could in the past? In trading with her, are we helping to strengthen this Communist country, or would we, by refusing to trade, hasten the bringing about of an awakening of the Russian people to the fallacy of communism?

Would an increased volume of trade with Communist countries possibly lead to a more friendly relationship with the free world? Are we burying our head in the sand in refusing to trade with Communists? Do not trade relations tend to lead to friendly political relations?

There are no pat "yes" or "no" answers to these questions. We do know that the Communist ideology is dedicated to the elimination of the free enterprise system. We do know that communism is a godless ideology founded on a base of materialism and complete power in a central government.

Keeping Communist countries in mind for what they are, I believe we must proceed with our eyes wide open in entering into any trade agreement with Russia, just as I hope we understood the new ground we were breaking when we entered into the test ban agreement.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for giving me an opportunity to make these observations.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to take this opportunity to compliment him for his efforts in bringing to the attention of the Members of Congress some of the pertinent points that relate to contemplated trade with Russia and the sale of wheat to them. I think this is an item that is of great significance, particularly to a district such as mine where wheat is one of the major agricultural crops. It is equally important to our foreign policy and trade policy that any informative matter be conveyed to the Congress, as well as to the public, in order to serve the best interests of our Nation and its agriculture.

There are any number of questions that ought to be specifically answered with facts before any Member of Congress is called upon to register an opinion relative to the much-discussed sale of wheat to Russia.

First, we ought to know specifically what the crop shortage is in Russia, and whether this sale merely provides an ample supply for her domestic needs, or whether it offers to Russia the opportunity of supplying wheat to the many Communist satellite countries and even countries which she may at this time be attempting to convert.

We ought further to know the extent to which there may be a subsidy involved in the entire transaction. It would be well for us to remember that if there is a subsidy of 50 cents per bushel or more on a 200-million-bushel sale, that this would literally amount to $100 million of aid to Russia.

I am sure that if anyone suggested that we provide for this amount of direct aid, considerable objections would be raised throughout the country. We ought also to know whether or not any of this wheat would be sent directly to Cuba, inasmuch as it has been indicated that a substantial part of the Canadian sale is being directed to Cuba.

It would seem to be of significance to know whether or not this volume of wheat will be taken from commodity credit stocks or if it is to come from the commercial supply.

The relationships of the entire transaction to the world market and our own domestic market are obviously of significance to the future of wheat producers throughout the Nation, as well as consumers.

These and many more questions ought to have specific reliable statistical answers.

It seems something more than unique that, with the Secretary of Agriculture having very recently visited Russia, he should return without a more detailed knowledge of the needs and the manner in which the sale of wheat is contemplated.

I would also want to raise the question of how come there is such an almost immediate rush to arrive at a decision without knowing all of the facets that may be involved. A decision that is as significant to our foreign policy, trade policy, and the future of U.S. wheat markets throughout the world ought surely to be based on known, reliable facts.

THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege for me since being a Member of this House to serve on the House Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of a great chairman, a distinguished colleague, and an eminent American, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Chairman PATMAN has already, in the short time that he has been chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of this House, accomplished much toward making the banks of this country more effective in their service to the people and in launching programs which will make them even more valued contributors to the progress and prosperity of the Nation. With his long years of experience on the Banking and Currency Committee he has brought to the chairmanship of that committee exceptional knowledge of the financial structure of this country and the functioning of the institutions which make up that structure. He has withal exhibited great vision for America and for the free world and displayed commendable courage in attacking the problems which beset our people and free people everywhere.

It was, therefore, a source of great pride to me, as I know it will be to his colleagues, to see a recent editorial in the American Banker commending Chairman PATMAN's service as chairman in an editorial entitled: "Mr. PATMAN's Good Start."

MR. PATMAN'S GOOD START

When WRIGHT PATMAN, the smalltown Texan who has followed a classic congressional career of standing up for the "little man" against "the interests" became chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee at the beginning of this year, many bankers were honestly concerned about what he would do.

He moved into his new position with a reputation as one of the most active Members of Congress, with particular skill and interest in investigative work and a record which showed him to be vigorously in favor of easier money. On what they knew of him, the bankers' concern about the new chairman of this important congressional committee was understandable.

On his record in the job so far, however, their concern should have abated considerably. For while Mr. PATMAN is still very active, still a skillful investigator, and still in favor of easy money, the bias against banking which many had feared has not been demonstrated.

Rather, Mr. PATMAN has begun to look carefully into phases of banking which may well benefit from the scrutiny. And in doing so, Mr. PATMAN has sought above all to build a solid body of evidence from which reasonable conclusions may be drawn.

Furthermore, in his manner, Mr. PATMAN has prevented differences of opinion from exploding into nasty personality fights. He showed fine restraint last spring at the hearings over the prickly question of possible conflicts between State and Federal banking laws, during which the Independent Bankers Association was demanding the resignation of Comptroller James J. Saxon. Mr. PATMAN ran the hearings smoothly and fairly, refrained from personal involvement in the controversy, and headed off the brawl that many thought was brewing.

Subsequently, with similar good manners, Mr. PATMAN has moved cautiously but firmly to assemble evidence on banking problems.

Two examples have been disclosed in the past few days. In the first, Mr. PATMAN released the information on 3,000 detailed questionnaires to be sent out to a representative cross-section of the Nation's banks, as the first step in a thoughtful examination of the correspondent banking system. Developed in close cooperation with the Federal Reserve Board, the questionnaires also will seek information about the management compensation and succession problem, the market for bank stocks, and financial reporting by the banks. All four questions are of primary importance to banks; the results of the investigation, with the possibility of legislative assistance in coping with some of the problems which may be revealed, could be of value to all banks in the future. Certainly Mr. PATMAN's observation that this is "an entirely friendly survey" is reassuring.

Similarly, the detailed survey of bank merger activity released by the House Banking and Currency Committee in the full report on last spring's hearings sheds light on an area of continuing controversy. The full record, showing that Comptroller Saxon has approved 147 merger applications, and turned down only 7, while the Justice Department was recommending disapproval of 87, the Federal Reserve Board of 79, and the FDIC of 42, cannot help but clear away any possible misunderstanding of what is going on in this area of bank regulation.

It is this kind of contribution of orderly fact-finding, and fair hearings, which many industries would welcome from their appropriate congressional committee. And while it is still early to judge on substantive results—for example, no legislation of any significance has been handled by the committee—on the basis of the way he has gone about the job, and the first preliminary evidence of what is being accomplished, Mr. PATMAN is moving well toward fulfilling his responsibilities to banking, to the Congress, and to the country.

FEDERAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues were as pleased as I was, I am sure, to learn that Subcommittee No. 5 has tentatively approved the inclusion in the civil rights bill of provisions to establish a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to prevent discrimination in employment by employers in interstate commerce on the basis of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin.

A provision to attack discrimination in employment must be included in any truly effective civil rights bill. The elimination of discrimination in employment is the foundation for securing equal opportunity by the American Negro. The other sections of the law are indeed important, but they cannot be fully effective without this provision. What good will be accomplished by ending discrimination in public accommodations if the Negro cannot afford to use the facilities opened to him? What good will it do for the Negro to have equality of opportunity in education if he cannot get the jobs for which he has trained himself? And if a Negro cannot get a job which will enable him to support himself and his family in a decent manner, he will lose faith in democracy and be unable to exercise effectively his newly achieved vote.

It is my sincere hope that this subcommittee action will become final, and that the full Judiciary Committee will wholeheartedly uphold the decision of the subcommittee. A strong equal employment opportunity provision is indispensable to the achievement of full citizenship for all Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LONG of Maryland, for about 2 weeks, on account of Committee on Armed Services business.

Mr. STEED (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. QUIE for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ALGER.

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

Mr. FINO.

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

Mr. SHELLEY in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. EVINS.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6118. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 27, 1963, present to the President, for his

approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5250. An act to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; and

H.R. 8100. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 1, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on interagency problem areas and deficiencies concerning the direct Federal highway construction programs in the Eastern United States, as administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1244. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on our examination of the semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars as of June 30, 1962, prepared by the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1245. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of this Department with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1246. 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.

1247. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report by the Department of the Navy relating to all settlements made under the authority of section 2732 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to title 10 United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1248. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to the requirement of section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343), there are transmitted the receipts and expenditures of the Department of the Interior in connection with the administration of the act for the fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1249. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 29, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Frenchman Creek and Gulfport, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of Representatives on September 25, 1963, the following minority views were filed September 30, 1963:

Mr. HOEVEN: Committee on Agriculture. Part 2, minority views on H.R. 3850. A bill to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8650. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 8651. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for two additional years and providing for certain special projects and studies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 8652. A bill to amend the Passport Act of July 3, 1926, so as to authorize the imposition of certain restrictions on the issuance and use of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 8653. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8654. A bill to terminate a restriction on use with respect to certain land previously conveyed to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and to convey to said city the mineral rights in such land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 8655. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8656. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent the disqualification for pension purposes of certain widows of Spanish-American War veterans who remarry; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8657. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for certain special projects and studies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8658. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8659. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 8660. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 760. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as See America Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J Res. 761. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation of the people of Guam for the passage of the bill H.R. 6225, the Guam rehabilitation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8661. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 8662. A bill for the relief of Eagle & Phenix Manufacturing Division of Reeves Bros., Inc., of Columbus, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8663. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Belmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

320. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John W. Taylor, superintendent of schools of Mendocino County, Ukiah, Calif., relative to the moneys received from lands administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Agriculture.

321. Also, petition of Robert J. O'Keefe, city clerk, Worcester, Mass., relative to endorsing the bill H.R. 5131, relating to the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

322. Also, petition of Edward E. Ruhnke, Sr., city clerk, East Orange, N.J., relative to urging approval of the civil rights legislation as proposed by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

323. Also, petition of Herman Katz, city clerk, clerk of the council, of City Hall, New York, N.Y., relative to strongly recommending the enactment of the civil rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

324. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to

pass legislation requiring interstate commerce and Federal contract businesses not to refuse employment to anyone just because of advanced age because many truly able citizens are denied employment solely on account of advanced age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

325. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting the passage of legislation to give a 4-year college Federal scholarship plus $1,000 per annum while in school to any U.S. citizen of any age who is determined to have an intelligence quotient of 140 or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

326. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to question the legality of the President's proposed Russian-American moonshot effort since no serious consideration has been given such a project by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

327. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to have published as a House document a publication to be known as the "Official U.S. House of Representatives Handbook of Patriotic American Songs" because it is the most patriotic music of all time; to the Committee on House Administration.

328. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Travel Service, the U.S. National Park Service, and other Government agencies to advertise and promote the State of Alaska as "The last of the Old West, the American West—absolutely truly the last of the Old West"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

329. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to use its influence to adopt as a promotional and travel slogan for Hawaii, the following: "Hawaii, the U.S.A.'s most southern State—and least race-conscious State"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

330. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to pass legislation providing for a "veteran's frank" for veterans of foreign wars with battle stripes, also allowing post offices to supply said veteran with paper and pen or pencil; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

331. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to secure all the facts and/or "secret deal" made between the President and Russia before approving a joint Russian-American moon effort; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1963

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

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

O God, our Father, Thou art the shining presence at the altar of our hearts. For this hallowed moment, closing the doors of a noisy world with all its terror and alarm, at the week's beginning we come to this place of quietness and peace to meet with Thee, Thou who hast made us for Thyself.

As before Thee we search our own hearts, we are shamed by what we are, and yet lifted up by what is still within us to become. We confess the fickleness and folly which so often have disappointed us and Thee. Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for cynical contempt of others.

May the mire of our moral failures prove but steppingstones to our better selves. Purge our minds of the prejudices which separate us from others; cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes; make us worthy to take our place at the common table of humanity where the bread of fellowship is broken and the wine of sacrifice is shared.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6118) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Research and General Legislation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF U.S. WAREHOUSE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the U.S. Warehouse Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FOREST LANDS IN COCKE COUNTY, TENN.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF SEMIANNUAL CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1962, Treasury

Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON INTERAGENCY PROBLEM AREAS AND DEFICIENCIES CONCERNING FEDERAL HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS IN THE EASTERN UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on interagency problem areas and deficiencies concerning the direct Federal highway construction programs in the Eastern United States as administered by Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT UNDER OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of compensation for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects hereafter constructed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FACILITATION OF PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present a certified copy of a resolution entitled "Resolution Urging the Congress of the United States To Take Appropriate Action To Extend the Present Territorial Limits," passed by the Massachusetts Senate on September 19, 1963.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION TO EXTEND THE PRESENT TERRITORIAL LIMITS

Whereas the presence of some 200 Russian fishing boats operating as close as 4 miles from our shores poses a serious threat to the commercial fishing industry of Massachusetts and this country; and

Whereas the historic fishing grounds of our fishing fleets are being depleted at an alarming rate by the great invasion of foreign fishing fleets, total food fish landings having dropped 13 million pounds in New England so far this year; and

Whereas the economic welfare of the coastal communities of our Commonwealth and their citizens depends upon the sea to produce sufficient quantities of fish and the loss of our domestic fishing industry would have a crippling effect on the economy of our State; and

Whereas this situation with all its attendant problems is of vital and primary concern not only to Massachusetts, but to the New England States and to the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to extend the territorial limits in regard to fishing rights from the present 3-mile limit to one of 200 miles; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the senate September 19, 1963.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker (Rept. No. 525);

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall (Rept. No. 526);

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse (Rept. No. 527);

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf (Rept. No. 528); and

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett (Rept. No. 529).

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

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business (Rept. No. 547).

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

S. 721. A bill to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas (Rept. No. 530);

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader (Rept. No. 531);

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co., of Phoenix, Ariz. (Rept. No. 532);

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle (Rept. No. 533);

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin (Rept. No. 534);

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown (Rept. No. 535);

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island (Rept. No. 536);

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of Jose Domenech (Rept. No. 537);

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White (Rept. No. 538);

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr. (Rept. No. 539);

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr (Rept. No. 540);

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (Rept. No. 541);

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes (Rept. No. 542);

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins and Son (Rept. No. 543);

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc. (Rept. No. 544);

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan (Rept. No. 545); and

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore (Rept. No. 546).

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

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler (Rept. No. 548); and

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Specialist Five Curtis Melton, Jr. (Rept. No. 549).

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

S. 573. A bill for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr. (Rept. No. 550).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2187. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 so as to extend to employees of State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Committees credit for annual and sick leave purposes for service performed as employees of county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Committees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2188. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2189. A bill for the relief of Juan Miguel Apezteguia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2190. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2191. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes and for purposes of income tax withholding; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2192. A bill for the relief of J. Ashton Gregg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2193. A bill to authorize extension of expiring conservation reserve contracts, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2194. A bill to provide for the employment, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, of certain professional library and recreation employees of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

SAWTOOTH WILDERNESS NATIONAL PARK, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, in the State of Idaho. Bills identical to this have today been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives RALPH HARDING and COMPTON WHITE.

Mr. President, the Boise and Payette Rivers and the beginnings of the great Salmon River run down through the Boise, Sawtooth, and Challis National Forests in the State of Idaho and on to the northwest lowlands, where they help form the vast Snake and Columbia River systems, which in turn wind slowly to the sea. At their origins, these rivers are bounded by high jagged peaks piercing the deep blue Idaho sky. The highest ridges are lined with snow. Beneath them, numerous crystal lakes lie still and undisturbed in the wilderness. The sharp, rocky peaks lend themselves descriptively to the name "Sawtooth," and form the spine of the Sawtooth primitive area, lying isolated and unspoiled by the works of man in the center of the State.

Generations of visitors have been struck by the unusual grandeur of the Sawtooths. Idahoans have long considered this rugged wilderness area to be more than worthy of inclusion in our national park system. A number of representatives from my State, including the distinguished Senator James P. Pope and the late, great Senator William E. Borah, introduced bills proposing the creation of a Sawtooth National Park. Early Idaho Legislatures memorialized the Congress in support of the creation of such a park. Executive interest has been drawn to this great wilderness since the days of Woodrow Wilson.

In early 1960, I conducted a mail poll among the citizens of Idaho, asking whether they favored or opposed a study to indicate the feasibility of the establishment of a national park in the Sawtooths. Of those responding, 77.71 percent, or around four-fifths, favored such a study. Since that time, some of the most enthusiastic support for the creation of a park has come from those few areas which were originally the most cautious about supporting a feasibility study.

I have always looked favorably upon the creation of a national park in the Sawtooths, but my actions toward this end have been guided by the feelings of the citizens of Idaho. A large majority reacted favorably in 1960 to the national park discussion; since that time, locally initiated support has swelled my mail with letters and postcards urging the creation of a national park in the Sawtooths as the best means to insure the permanent preservation of this primitive area, while facilitating the enjoyment of its wonders by vacationers from all parts of the country.

The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, under the concept I am now advancing, would consist of the present primitive area, subject to an absolute congressional mandate that it be preserved as wilderness, plus additional forest land to include the lakes and wooded areas lying along the base of the mountains. The latter would be used for access to the wilderness portion of the park, for administrative purposes, and as the site for expanded public accommodations—lodges, picnic and camp grounds—which would be needed to take care of the added numbers of tourists attracted to the area by its designation as a national park.

No doubt, most of the visitors would simply camp or stay for a few days, along the lake shores or on the stream banks, in the areas set aside for this purpose, enjoying the scenery and the proximity of wilderness, without actually entering, except briefly, the wilderness portion of the park. Those who wished could, however, freely enter the wilderness, on foot or on horseback, complying with the usual regulations to preserve the wilderness character of the environment.

For those ranch owners in the Stanley Basin who fear expansion of Federal holdings or restrictions throughout the surrounding area, park status would be of distinct advantage over the arrangement under which the area is presently administered, in that the boundaries would be fixed by act of Congress and could not expand into areas presently used for grazing or other economic purposes without a further specific act of Congress. At present, the boundaries of the Sawtooth Primitive Area can be altered and extended by the Secretary of Agriculture. With the park as provided by this bill, the present status of the wilderness area would be maintained, and the future interests of users of adjoining lands would be protected, to a much greater extent than they are now.

The economic impact on the State of Idaho would be one of the greatest statewide gain. The proposed park lands are already federally owned, and, as such, their use for park purposes would not result in striking them from any tax roll. Much of the State, in addition, would directly gain from increased tourist trade, and the State as a whole would benefit from the increase in taxable income that would result. As other Western States have prospered from the display of their scenic resources, in national park form, so should Idaho; and as this is done, the greatly increasing need of the American people for scenic recreational facilities will be better met.

At the beginning of this decade, 72,288,000 persons visited our national parks. By 1962 this number had jumped to 88,457,000 and it is conservatively expected that over 92 million persons will tour one or more of our national parks during the current season. This is an increase of approximately 27 percent in 3 years, and as our population continues to multiply and becomes more mobile, and as our residential centers swell and our scenic resources diminish, more and more facilities will be needed to insure maximum enjoyment of those truly beautiful areas that are left.

The area here proposed for inclusion in the National Park System comprises less than 1 percent of the 20 million acres of national forest land within the State of Idaho. The funds available to the Forest Service are necessarily spread thin over this immense area, which includes more than a third of the State. The National Park Service, concentrating its resources on a limited number of defined areas, can more adequately insure full development of this recreational potential for the enjoyment of a greater number of people, and can more effectively draw attention to the Sawtooth country, in national park status, as an area worth visiting. The site is convenient for that great number of summer travelers who attempt to get the most for their time and money by visiting a number of parks during one vacation trip.

Idaho needs this park, Mr. President, as do the people of the country. The Sawtooth uplands presently fall under a primitive area classification, and I think they fully qualify for designation as a wilderness area, which the Forest Service currently proposes. But national park classification would equally preserve the upland wilderness, while more effectively developing the recreational potential of the adjoining baselands. It would boost the economy of the State and region, insure the integrity of the wilderness, and give a designation of magnetic attraction to phenomena already held in awe by people who have seen them.

Mr. President, I hope that this bill will be the vehicle for a thorough feasibility study by both the Forest and National Park Services. Such a study will give us the data necessary for making a sound determination of what the final administrative form should be for this scenic wonderland.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2188) to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an area in the State of Idaho possessing superlative scenic, scientific, and geological features is hereby authorized to be established as the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park for the inspiration, benefit, and use of the public.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act wilderness is defined as an area where earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain, where the land retains its primeval character and influence without permanent improvements or human habitation, and is protected and managed so as to preserve its condition of natural beauty and grandeur. That portion of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, shall be preserved and administered, in perpetuity, as wilderness.

SEC. 3. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park shall, subject to valid existing rights, consist of an area in the State of Idaho described as follows:

(a) Beginning at McGowan Peak, located approximately 1¼ miles southerly from the southeast corner of section 32, township 11 north, range 12 east;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Stanley Lake Creek and the head of Crooked Creek to a point directly north of Upper McGowan Lake;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide approximately one-half mile;

thence southwesterly to Stanley Lake Creek to a point on the main divide between Stanley Lake Creek and Trail Creek approximately three-fourths of a mile east of Observation Peak;

thence southward approximately three-fourths of a mile down Trail Creek to the mouth of the drainage from Trail Creek Lakes;

thence southeastward on the ridge south of Trail Creek Lakes to the main divide between Trail Creek and the North Fork of Baron Creek;

thence following the main divide westerly to a point on the South Fork of the Payette River approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Baron Creek;

thence southwesterly to the main divide between Wapiti Creek and the South Fork of the Payette River;

thence southerly along the main divide to Picket Mountain, located approximately 1⅜ miles easterly from the northeast corner of section 25, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide between the headwaters of Wapiti Creek and the North Fork of the Boise River to a point in the southeast quarter of section 23, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Ten Mile Creek and North Fork of the Boise River to a point near the center of section 36, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southwesterly along the main divide to a point at the head of Lightning Creek in the southeast quarter of section 10, township 8 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to a point on the North Fork of the Boise River one-eighth mile downstream from the mouth of Ballentyne Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to Big Buck Mountain;

thence southeasterly crossing Johnson Creek one-eighth mile upstream from the mouth of Cahhah Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to the north end of Tackobe Mountain which is approximately one-fourth of a mile due west of Alidate Lake;

thence southerly along the main ridge between Black Warrior Creek and Little Queens River to a point on the Little Queens River, located 300 feet upstream from the mouth of Neinmeyer Creek and approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Scenic Creek and 100 feet north of the point where Forest Service Trail Numbered 566 crosses Little Queens River;

thence eastward on the ridge to a point approximately 1¾ miles north of the northeast corner, section 5, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge between Scenic Creek and the Little Queens River to Nahneke Point located approximately one-fourth mile northeastward from northwest corner of section 3, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence easterly approximately one-half mile;

thence southerly along the main ridge on the west side of Queens River to the north quarter corner of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southerly along a ridge one-half mile crossing Queens River near the center of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along a ridge approximately three-fourths mile to a point on the main divide approximately 500 feet south of the northeast corner of section 22, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the main ridge approximately 1¼ miles to a peak in the southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence northeasterly along the ridge to Greylock Mountain;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to the Middle Fork of the Boise River, crossing the river about one-fourth mile below the mouth of Leggit Creek;

thence easterly up the ridge about one-half mile to a point on the ridge between Leggit Creek and the Middle Fork of the Boise River;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Leggit Creek and Grays Creek to Leggit Mountain, located approximately 1⅝ miles easterly from the southeast corner of section 12, township 5 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Leggit Creek and Decker Creek to a peak on the national forest boundary common to the Boise and Sawtooth Forests located approximately three-eighths mile southeasterly from Leggit Lake;

thence northeasterly along the divide between the South Fork of Ross Creek and Leggit Creek to Rossview Peak;

thence northeasterly along the divide being the Camas-Elmore County line between the North Fork of Ross Creek and Mattingly Creek to the point common to Elmore, Camas, and Blaine Counties;

thence northeasterly about 2 miles following the Elmore-Blaine County line to a point on the divide between the heads of Mattingly, Alpine, and Alturas Lake Creeks;

thence northeasterly along the divide between Alpine and Alturas Lake Creeks crossing Alpine Creek approximately three-fourths of a mile above its mouth;

thence northerly along the divide between Pettit Creek on the west and the headwaters of Cabin and Vat Creeks on the east to a point one-fourth mile south of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence following an arc to the northwest, north, and northeast having a ¼-mile radius with the point on high waterline at the westernmost end of Pettit Lake as the center to a point one-fourth mile north of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence due north to a point west of the north end of McDonald Lake;

thence northwestward following the ridge around the head of Mays Creek to a point on the ridge between Mays Creek and Hell Roaring Creek drainages approximately 1 mile southeast of Hell Roaring Lake;

thence north approximately 1⅜ miles to a point 100 feet south of the junction of Forest Service trails numbered 6091 and 6097;

thence northward parallel to and 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 crossing Decker Creek and to a point at the top of the ridge between the Decker Creek drainage and the next unnamed drainage north;

thence southwestward along this ridge approximately 1 mile;

thence northward along the ridge around the head of the first drainage north of Decker Creek and the ridge between this drainage and the drainage into Redfish Lake keeping 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 where it follows this ridge to a point approximately three-fourths of a mile southeast of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due west approximately three-fourths of a mile to a point on an imaginary north-south line passing one-eighth mile west of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due north approximately 1⅝ miles to a point on the ridge between the Redfish Lake and Bench Lake drainages;

thence northeastward along this ridge to a point one-eighth mile southeast of the lower Bench Lake;

thence due north to the top of the first ridge north of this lake;

thence following this ridge northwestward approximately one-half mile to a point one-fourth of a mile north of the second highest of the Bench Lakes;

thence due north approximately 1¾ miles to a point 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 where it crosses the section line common to sections 32 and 33, township 10 north, range 13 east;

thence northwesterly parallel to and 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 approximately 8 miles to a point three-fourths of a mile northeast of McGowan Peak;

thence southwesterly along the ridge approximately three-fourths of a mile to McGowan Peak, the point of beginning.

(b) Not more than 34,000 acres lying adjacent to the area described in subsection (a) of this section, to be reserved for administrative uses and for such recreational facilities, campsites, picnic grounds, and other accommodations as are required to provide for the needs of visitors to the park.

(c) Within one year from the date of approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the component parts of the park identified in the foregoing subsections, and he shall thereupon give notice of the establishment of the park.

SEC. 4. Within the area designated for the park, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. Any lands or interest therein owned by the State of Idaho, or by any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner. The Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the park and, in exchange therefor, he may convey to the grantor of such property and federally owned property under his jurisdiction, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the area designated for the park, or selected in accordance with section 7 of this Act, shall be administered as a part of the park upon its establishment as provided in section 3.

SEC. 5. (a) The grazing of livestock on any Federal lands included within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, where established prior to the effective date of this Act pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any agency, department, or establishment of the United States, shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to protect this area from undue harm or destruction. Nothing contained in this

Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands.

(b) The Secretary may, in cooperation with the appropriate Secretary having jurisdiction over these lands, recommend the use of areas within adjacent or nearby Federal lands for grazing purposes, in place of existing grazing lands included within the boundaries of the park.

SEC. 6. (a) In order to provide suitable access to the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the park, the Secretary may select the location or locations of an entrance road or roads to such park and to points of interest therein, including necessary entrance and related administrative and headquarters sites upon lands located outside the park, and he may select a suitable location or locations outside the park for connections between entrance roads and between roads lying within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, except that no access or connecting roads provided under this section shall be located within that portion of the park identified pursuant to subsection (a) of section 3. When such roads traverse lands within a national forest, the routes or sites selected pursuant to this authority shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands selected pursuant to this section and acquired or transferred in accordance with section 4 hereof as rights-of-way for said entrance roads and connections shall not exceed an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile. Rights-of-way for entrance roads and administrative sites acquired pursuant to this authority shall be administered as a part of the park pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(b) When title is in the United States, the Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands selected pursuant to this section, an entrance road or roads and connections of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary.

SEC. 7. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park established pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, et. seq.), as amended and supplemented, except that the portion of the park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act shall, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, be administered and preserved as wilderness wherein the primeval character and influence is retained and wherein there shall be subject to existing private rights, no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of said portion of the park for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such portion.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EMPLOYMENT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE LAWS OF CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the employment, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, of certain professional library and recreation employees of the Department of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2194) to provide for the employment, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, of certain professional library and recreation employees of the Department of the Army, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army shall employ in accordance with the civil service laws, and fix the compensation of in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, (1) all librarians in all positions in the Department of the Army classified in the library series, which includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to administer, supervise, or perform professional library work such as selecting, cataloging, and classifying publications, and rendering reference and bibliographical services; and (2) all recreation leaders and staff workers in all positions in the Department of the Army classified in the recreation series, which includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to plan, advise on, administer, organize, supervise, conduct, or serve as staff worker or leader in recreation activities.

AMENDMENT OF TITLES X AND XVI OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO IMPROVE PROGRAMS OF AID TO THE BLIND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 25, 1963, the names of Mr. GRUENING and Mr. RIBICOFF were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2181) to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve the programs of aid to the blind so that they will more effectively encourage and assist blind individuals to achieve rehabilitation and restoration to a normal, full, and fruitful life, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators) on September 25, 1963.

NEW YORK TIMES NOT SO SURE ABOUT TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times recently has made a sober reappraisal of the tax cut proposal, explaining that its merits have been seriously exaggerated and its possible adverse effects on the economy—other than inflation—largely ignored.

Even the benefits claimed for the tax cut by the New York Times do not stand up.

The Times argues that the tax cut will primarily help in coping with the persistent balance-of-payments deficit. Classical economists argue exactly the opposite; and in this case it seems that the classical economists are right. The tax cut will not help our adverse balance of payments, because any increased income from the tax cuts would likely be spent for imports—which would directly aggravate our balance of payments—or for articles of domestic production which would tend to increase the price of these products.

Past experience suggests very strongly that this kind of a tax cut—overwhelmingly concentrated in the personal sector, rather than the business sector—will not result in price reduction, but will result in price increases.

The Times would seem to rely on higher interest rates—made possible by the economic stimulation of the tax cuts—to attract foreign capital. But Mr. President, every competent economic study shows convincingly that interest rates are a very minor element in capital flows.

Whatever else can be said for the tax cut, it will certainly not help solve our balance-of-payments difficulties. As the New York Times indicates, other arguments for the cut on the grounds of national interest are very feeble indeed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this editorial published in the New York Times.

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

THE TAX BILL—I

In characterizing House approval of across-the-board tax reductions as a step that will keep the Nation from limping from recession to recession, President Kennedy continues to oversimplify and exaggerate the case for tax cuts.

The current expansion is far from limping. It is now 31 months old, and is showing none of the symptoms of advancing old age that inevitably precede a decline. Business cycles do have a timespan, which cannot be predicted in advance; but the current strength of economic activity indicates that the rising phase of the cycle has a long life ahead of it. While a tax cut may accelerate our growth rate and prolong the expansion, it will not eliminate the business cycle or deal with all the ills of the economy. It will in fact create some new problems.

Relieving the burden of taxation will be most effective in coping with the persistent deficit in the balance of payments. It will enhance the attractiveness of long-term domestic investment for both American and foreign capital. It will give greater freedom and flexibility to the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in dealing with short-term outflows of capital.

Despite Mr. Kennedy's claims, just how greatly the tax bill will reduce the ranks of the unemployed is a matter of debate. Unemployment is concentrated in the young, in the unskilled, among minority groups, and women, which may require special treatment rather than the general stimulus of tax reductions.

The current expansion has been eating into the amount of idle plant. So far, the economy has not been plagued with inflation, largely because of an overabundance of plant and manpower; but specific sectors are already operating close to the limits of capacity. Faster growth, generated by tax cuts, may create price pressures and speculative distortions that could shorten the life of the upturn.

Mr. Kennedy has been unduly modest in describing the growth of the economy and

overenthusiastic about what tax cuts can do. Business activity is moving ahead at a very good clip, and with tax cuts it will do better. The task of prolonging the lifespan of the business expansion will demand much more focus on the special problems that accompany a fast rate of growth.

FOREIGN AID FIASCO IN GUINEA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on repeated occasions I have indicated here on the floor of the Senate the need for tighter criteria in our foreign aid program. We, in the Senate, will shortly be considering the new foreign assistance authorization, when it is reported from the Foreign Relations Committee; and now is a good time to repeat the need for these tighter criteria.

In fact, what we need in the foreign aid program are tests of the possible concrete returns which we can obtain from loans and grants made overseas. A good example of the difficulties which can occur in the absence of adequate criteria has recently been indicated in a newspaper column, by Roland Evans and Robert Novak, which appeared in the Washington Post for Friday, September 27.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea," be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. This article indicates that in Guinea we have "just fumbled a golden opportunity to score a few points." The issue concerned an airline which Guinea wished to have. AID supported this private airline, and, in fact, loaned $700,000 to Guinea, because the airline could not obtain private financing. Then, just a few weeks ago, the airline was discontinued; and the United States is presumably out $700,000. Now Russians are buying the commercial routes.

The result of this loan has been not only the loss of money by the United States, but also loss of prestige.

EXHIBIT 1

FIASCO IN GUINEA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In the steamy West African Republic of Guinea, where the cold war is a daily occurrence, Uncle Sam has just fumbled a golden opportunity to score a few points.

Last spring American diplomats shouted from the housetops—and we reported—how a small American airline called Alaska Airlines, Inc., was replacing Soviet aircraft in Guinea. But until today it has been a well-kept secret that the deal has gone sour.

Alaska Airlines planes were grounded some 3 weeks ago. Although the United States is working discreetly to replace Alaska Airlines with a big American line, the Russians now are flying the commercial routes again. Furthermore, nobody knows whether a $700,000 U.S. loan ever will be repaid.

That is bad enough. But intensive inquiry reveals a breathtaking amount of bureaucratic buckpassing. As usual, the bureaucrats seem less interested in solving the problem than in making sure they don't get the blame for it.

The story dates back to 1958, when Guinea became the first French African colony to win independence. Refused help by both France and the United States, Guinea turned to Moscow for long-term aid.

But Russians are even worse than Americans at administering foreign aid. Guineans are particularly displeased about how much it costs government-owned Air Guinea to operate four-engine turboprop Ilyushins.

So, Guinea negotiated an agreement with Alaska Airlines to sell them less sophisticated aircraft: four-engine DC–4's and single-engine Lockheeds.

When Alaska Airlines could not find private financing, AID—the U.S. foreign aid agency—bought $700,000 worth of Guinean notes. In other words, Uncle Sam lent Guinea $700,000.

Trouble began May 14, 2 weeks after the first DC–4 arrived, when it nosed into the ground during a landing. After that unhappy start, trouble multiplied until Air Guinea grounded the Alaska planes, citing safety reasons.

Alaska Airlines claims that Air Guinea is so infested with Communist bloc personnel that life is impossible for an American line.

The State Department, laughing off these charges as something strictly from Ian Fleming, puts most of the blame on Alaska Airlines—but will not give details.

All that is sure now is that the Government's attempt to escape responsibility by calling this a private affair between Alaska Airlines and the Guinean Government just won't wash.

The Government could have stopped this deal any place along the line. AID could have refused the $700,000 loan, which was approved 3 days after the DC–4 accident.

Buckpassing reached the ridiculous when an AID official privately sought to blame the Federal Aviation Agency for giving the DC–4's preexport approval. Told of this, a furious FAA official raised the roof, denying any prior knowledge of the deal. AID then backed down, admitting there was no special report inspection by the FAA (the planes had passed routine inspections, however).

Whoever is responsible, nobody can deny that the fiasco has hurt United States-Guinean relations and helped the Soviets. An international lawsuit and a congressional investigation are distinct possibilities. Moreover, AID lawyers now are puzzling whether to make Guinea pay up that $700,000.

CANADIAN AND AUSTRALIAN WHEAT AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the public reaction in the United States with reference to large-scale sales of Canadian and Australian wheat to Russia and other Communist-bloc countries.

Most people seem to have come to the conclusion that it does not make sense for the United States alone to withhold the sale of its surplus food commodities to these Communist-bloc countries while our allies are willing to provide them with all they need.

Two persuasive editorials on this subject appeared over the weekend in Washington's two largest daily newspapers. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, published in the Washington Post on Saturday, September 28, entitled "Wheat for Russia"; and one published in the Sunday Star on Sunday, September 29, entitled "Let's Close the Deal."

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1963]

WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

It would be inconsistent with the position which this country historically has taken toward the requirements of other peoples for food if the Government of the United States were to interpose any objection to the shipment of American wheat to the countries of the Soviet bloc.

This country's role as the granary of the world—and as the succor of starving millions in every land—has deeply imbedded in the American conscience an impulse to supply the hungry. It has supplied them for proper pay, when that has been available, but it also has supplied them, in an incredible number of instances, without pay.

The Soviet Union has good occasion to remember this compulsion to feed the world. In 1922, the American Relief Administration, under Herbert Hoover, was feeding 18 million people in the Soviet Union. Maxim Gorky has credited this great effort with saving 9 million lives. George Kennan has recounted how Russia's cultivated acreage dropped 50 percent in 1921. And after making allowance for the dislocation of war, he has declared that "the major cause lay in the reckless and ill-advised policies of the Soviet Government itself." Herbert Hoover glumly conceded that the American people were not "too enthusiastic over saving people who were starving because of their Communist government."

The causes of Soviet bloc shortages now, as then, lie in part in the inability of the Communist system to cope with agricultural production. In the inspired remark of Walt W. Rostow: "Marx was a city boy." Those who revere him as a prophet have been equally unable to solve agricultural problems. It is only fair to say that the present crisis in the Soviet bloc also is greatly due to abnormally adverse weather aggravating the usual handicap of short seasons, light soils, and inadequate rainfall in parts of the Soviet area.

A very strong argument can be made, in economic terms, against meeting the recurrent shortages of the Soviet bloc. It can be contended that bottlenecks and maladjustments of this kind are characteristics of a system of central economic administration. By repeatedly rescuing the system from its inherent defects we make it bearable where it otherwise would be insupportable.

There is an element of truth in this. It also can be argued, however, that we have had little success in working this kind of injury on the Soviet bloc. In order to wage this sort of economic warfare on a broad front, all the free world would have to be united on a firm policy. And it also must be noted that, as far as food exports are concerned, starvation is still to bring down a first Communist regime.

Whatever the economic arguments, it is likely that American wheat sooner or later will flow into the deficit bloc areas, if they want it. The Government can and should exact what negotiating advantages it can from the exchange. In the end, all considerations are likely to be overborne by the American impulse to supply the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Sept. 29, 1963]

LET'S CLOSE THE DEAL

There are formidable and highly emotional domestic political factors involved. But there are also good reasons why the U.S. Government should respond affirmatively to the Soviet Union's reported bid to buy very large quantities of American wheat.

The deal has been under discussion in Ottawa by the Kremlin's representatives and a group of private American traders. If it materializes, as expected, it will be consummated in keeping with our country's complicated system of price supports and export subsidies. In effect, under our law, it will mean that the U.S.S.R. will be dealt with as "a friendly nation" able to buy the wheat at the going price in the world market—a price about 60 cents lower than our domestic millers must pay.

In other words, like such "friendly nations" as France, the Soviet Union will get an American subsidy. However, although some groups in our country are likely to vociferate against this, the fact is that the Russians, if they wanted to, could indirectly buy our wheat at the same subsidized price through third parties regarded as "friendly nations." Another fact worth keeping in mind is that the prospective deal with the U.S.S.R.—a deal comparable to the one recently negotiated by the Kremlin and Ottawa—would not place a heavy extra burden on the taxpayers of the United States. But it would help to ease our costly surplus problem and improve, at least a little bit, our present poor position—one that has put a serious drain on our gold—in the international balance of payments.

The domestic political factors remain, of course, including much bitter opposition among those minority groups who are against doing any kind of business whatever with the Soviet bloc, even such business as importing Poland's excellent hams. In the world's present political climate, however, opposition of this sort is more passionate than reasonable or realistic, and Congress and the administration ought not to be intimidated by it.

Two Senate committees—Foreign Relations and Agriculture—are now jointly engaged in seeking such a judgment. We hope it will be a judgment in favor of the deal. For peaceable business with the Russians can be another step, like the nuclear test ban treaty, toward a detente, a possible new advance that could lead to bigger and better things all around the world.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is evident that the nuclear test ban treaty enjoys wide favor, not only in the Senate, but also among informed people throughout the Nation. Support for the treaty was given by newspapers of widely divergent political viewpoints in my own State. Excellent editorials supporting the test ban treaty recently appeared in the following newspapers which are read in Idaho: the Idaho Statesman, the Idaho State Journal, the Idaho Falls Post-Register, the Salt Lake Tribune, the Rexburg Standard, the Intermountain and the Emmett Messenger-Index. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Idaho Statesman, Aug. 29, 1963]

IT'S WORTH THE RISK

Despite a considerable period of controversial hearings, indications are that the Senate will ratify the nuclear test ban treaty. And the action will have the support of the American people. As Senator CHURCH said, in explaining his plan to vote for the ratification, it is a start in a hopeful program that may settle world conditions and possibly pave the way for greater understanding among nations long in conflict.

Russia's well-identified habit of violating agreements has concerned a number of our national leaders, both within the military and the Congress. Many Americans have the fear that Khrushchev will disregard this nuclear test ban the first time it becomes handy. There is the feeling in some quarters that the risk taken here is too great; that Russia, operating behind her Iron Curtain, will even expedite her nuclear activity at the same time the anti-Communist nations ease this effort.

But this particular treaty doesn't compare with those that have been so readily broken by the Russians. This is a major agreement, one participated in by most of the nations of the world. Should Russia break this agreement, her world position becomes jeopardized to a degree never before so well identified. Failing this time, Russia would prove the identity of international gangster. For such action, she would soon suffer recriminations not previously applied.

Had this nuclear test ban been only an agreement between the United States and Russia, that would be another matter. This pact is almost universally accepted and signed. The signing, of course, is based on hope and faith and not for appeasement of Russia. The reaction to Russian defiance of this particular agreement would realine the world against a belligerent enemy and invite the application of force to wipe out a world threat.

When all is said and done, the burden of this treaty's success rests with Russia, not her so-called opponents. More than any other single nation, Russia faces the challenge. With all who want peace, we have a greater degree of confidence that this time the foundation is too firm for those who have no honor or principle in world dealings. Russia evidenced new willingness for cooperation in this agreement negotiation. In that new attitude there is hope.

[From the Idaho State Journal, Sept. 12, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S ASSURANCE

President Kennedy's letter to Senate leaders yesterday should quiet the fears of some about the limited nuclear test ban treaty. There are some who feel that entering into the treaty will bring about a lowering of our guard and that it will make us more vulnerable to attack. President Kennedy's assurance that the treaty will not limit his authority to use nuclear weapons and that he will continue "a program that will keep us strong in the nuclear field" should remove the objections that seize upon this argument.

There are many in this Nation who would like to see nuclear development cease entirely as a step toward disarmament. This course would be ideal, if we could be assured that our adversaries were following our example, or setting one. At this stage in world affairs, we cannot be so assured and we cannot let down our guard altogether. It is thus the President's responsibility to see that in the absence of disarmament, this country is protected as well as it can be against the devastating weapons we know today.

Although we cannot know it—because precious little discussion of public policy ever filters out of the Soviet Union—there must also be serious reservations there about the treaty and determination there not to let down on nuclear development. Certainly President Kennedy is aware of that determination.

Still we cannot afford to reject this opportunity to take one step toward halting a headlong rush into nuclear war that is too likely to come from unrestricted development of nuclear weapons. We can only hope that overwhelming approval of the treaty by the Senate will indicate our willingness to take the first step.

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register, Sept. 4, 1963]

IT'S STILL WORTH A TRY

No one now expects that the U.S. Senate will give anything but overwhelming approval to the partial nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's nearly unanimous endorsement of the treaty, there is a clear assessment that whatever risk is involved is one this Nation can take without grave danger to its freedom and security.

It is a judgment which says in effect that if we are not willing to take some risk in order to test Russia's purposes at this stage, we are saying that negotiation is now and perhaps forever a futile device of diplomacy in the cold war.

Obviously we are not prepared to take so adamant and seemingly final a stance.

Soviet motives, in the nature of things, can seldom if ever be entirely clear to us. But we are not now measuring motive. We do not have to know all that goes on between the Kremlin and Red China in order to take this test ban chance.

We will be watching Soviet action. There is a strong conviction that if Russia breaks the treaty we will speedily know it and be able to act on our own to prevent Moscow from gaining a critical nuclear military advantage.

It is we who have the great advantage today, and we do not propose to yield it. We will have our guard up, prepared to test in the atmosphere again should the Russians resume.

And beyond doubt, we shall be constantly alert to assure that our massive stockpile of nuclear weapons—called by President Kennedy sufficient to kill 300 million people in 1 hour—remains an effective shield for us and the free world.

This means, of course, keeping the weapons in usable condition—and deliverable over targets.

Military men disagree on ways of assuring this effectiveness. But there would seem to be ample support for the idea that it can be done, notwithstanding the test ban treaty.

Not all our military and nuclear specialists like the treaty. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a sober and responsible body. It listened to the doubts and reservations and yet decided to approve the document. At worst, the committee might in time be proved wrong. At best, this group, the full Senate and all associated with the treaty must recognize that it is not a guarantee of peace, but only a small beginning step down that road.

Up to now there has been almost no traffic on that road. We are simply making ready to try it. We may have to turn back. But, with the stakes so high, the try is one our sanest Senate leaders think we ought to make.

[From the Salt Lake (Idaho) Tribune, Sept. 1, 1963]

AN ACCEPTABLE TREATY WITHIN ITS LIMITS

The 16-to-1 vote by which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the test ban treaty indicates that the big hurdle—Senate ratification—will be cleared with ease. Some supporters predict that fewer than 20 of the 100 Senate Members will vote to reject the pact.

The Foreign Relations Committee wisely decided against tacking on reservations. For reservations might require renegotiation and in the process the treaty could be lost altogether.

Instead, the committee will prepare a report explaining the Senate's interpretation of the agreement. This, according to Committee Chairman FULBRIGHT, will include a statement that the treaty does not prevent the United States from using nuclear weap-

ons in the event of war. The statement will also include assurances that this country will be prepared to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviet Union violates the treaty.

These two points are important since the first answers a question raised by former President Eisenhower and other witnesses while the second provides the "safeguards" demanded by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Debate on the treaty will begin soon after Labor Day, with final action expected by mid-September. And during that time implications of the agreement will be explored at even greater length than was the case in the 12 days of committee hearings.

Certainly no one should be able to say, when the vote on ratification is taken, that the Senators are not fully aware of what they are doing.

Sharply conflicting opinions were presented at the committee hearings. In his message submitting the treaty, President Kennedy emphasized its limited nature and the hope it will prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Underground testing is permitted; testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water is forbidden.

Other proponents—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—made the case that the treaty, on ballance, is to America's advantage. Admitted risks, it was argued, are outweighed by positive gains.

Opponents dealt at length with the risks. Dr. Edward Teller, the nuclear scientist who played a key role in development of the H-bomb, declared Russia was far ahead on antimissile weapons and that the United States could not hope to catch up without testing in the atmosphere. Other eminent scientists did not agree with Dr. Teller.

There was a similar sharp split in the opinions of military men. General LeMay, Air Force chief of staff, had serious misgivings, fearing that "we may get complacent and drop our safeguards program down to a level I consider insufficient." Admiral Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, was totally opposed. The treaty is not in the best interests of the United States, he said.

Such wide differences of opinion are puzzling to the ordinary citizen.

They may be just as puzzling to Senators. If scientists and military men cannot agree, then who is right?

The answer is that the treaty is a diplomatic, not a military or scientific, instrument and that all factors must be considered in reaching a decision. Scientists and military men often are not able to see beyond their specialties.

This is a limited treaty. It has limited objectives. It certainly will not bring "peace in our time." But the consensus, as overwhelmingly expressed by the Foreign Relations Committee vote, is that the treaty is acceptable within its limitations.

The Senate debate, now about to begin, will be enlightening. We do not believe that it should lead to rejection of the treaty.

[From the Rexburg (Idaho) Standard, Sept. 10, 1963]

AN UNWISE PROPOSAL

Political circumstances under which the Senate is considering ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty make it hard to discuss the matter wholly outside of partisan context. An effort must nevertheless be made to do so.

This treaty is not a partisan affair; it touches most crucially upon the security of the United States, an area in which a bipartisan outlook is essential in the national interest. Whether the treaty's effect would be for good or ill should be considered with as little partisan bias as possible.

There will be a temptation to see in a partisan light Senator GOLDWATER'S effort to predicate acceptance of the test ban treaty on Soviet agreement to withdraw from Cuba. Senator HUMPHREY has called this "partisan mischief," and he is right, though having said this he has himself become vulnerable to charges of partisanship.

The Goldwater proposal has no chance of acceptance. It is important, aside from the Arizonian's partisan motives, as an example of a mistaken approach to foreign affairs and in particular a mistaken approach to the question of arms control.

Dealing with a hostile foreign power, in this case the Soviet Union, must always be a step by step affair. No single action can be taken to settle all the big cold war issues at one swoop. Though it is our Government's intention to squeeze the Russians back out of the Western Hemisphere, this cannot be done by saying to Russia: "No Cuban pullout, no treaty."

It should especially not be said in the present instance because that ultimatum is based on the view that the treaty is something that Russia, and Russia alone, wants. This is not true. The test ban treaty will benefit the United States; it is something both Republican and Democratic administrations have sought. To endanger it by attaching impossible conditions would be foolhardy and unrealistic.

[From the Pocatello (Idaho) Intermountain, Aug. 1, 1963]

TREATY WITHOUT A SLOGAN

A sign of new maturity in international relations is the absence of a slogan to go with the proposed American-Soviet-Anglo treaty to control nuclear explosions.

The war to end all wars, the mission of making the world safe for democracy, peace in our time, and even Wendell Willkie's one world, were all sentiments that created unjustified belief that all would shortly be right with the world.

As treaties among nations get rid of the illusions we inherited from kings, some semblance of working international law begins to appear.

A treaty, once broken, is a shambles. A law may be violated and survive, and time may strengthen its good effect through application, amendment and interpretation.

Whether lawmakers writing a code or judges writing case law, the drafters of laws are not inclined to believe that a statute or a decision is a final answer. Often it is rather, a beginning. "This may work." "It may do some good." "Not perfect but it will get us by." That is how lawmakers talk. They imply a practical compromise has been struck between conflicting sides, and they acknowledge the changes to come.

Harriman, Hailsham, and Gromyko have not represented to their governments that their effort will establish mutual faith and trust. Our President and the Soviet Premier have not declared the cold war to be at an end. And the proposed treaty will be read as closely by the powers who do not yet have nuclear weapons as by the signers, as the traffic code might be studied by a man who doesn't yet own a car.

A treaty written from the premise that the world cannot be transformed and cannot be made safe by a single act represents diplomatic realism. It represents more than that. It treats the people of the signatory powers as citizens, not subjects. The absolutes found in treaties of the past were based on the pretense that rulers were omnipotent and that their decrees could be everlasting.

Vigilance is not merely the price of freedom, it has to do with the character of lasting freedom, helping to distinguish it from the euphoria of liberty. Just so, diligence, as a habit, must accompany the attainment of peace in any measure. The security proclaimed by a treaty is, without it, of no more value than a mere proclamation of liberty.

Democracy, within our own land, has kept us working at our freedoms. The art of genuine peacemaking is so embryonic that we do not have the habit—we do not even have a meaningful name for it as yet. The unrelieved ordeal of the cold war and the nonutopian climate of the United Nations—the "one-world" organization, remember?—have taught us that it is work. Hard work. Unending.

The approach to the nuclear control treaty is encouraging evidence that we have learned that progress in international relations requires, as does good government, not the occasional proclamation but the muscle tone of daily effort.

[From the Emmett (Idaho) Messenger-Index, Aug. 22, 1963]

STARK QUESTION

The obvious coolness of many top military leaders toward the test ban treaty is not surprising, and it probably will have more influence on the Senate ratification vote than the outspoken opposition of Dr. Edward Teller, familiarly known as "father of the H-bomb."

As a physicist, Dr. Teller is a genius. As a citizen, his opinion on Emmett's forthcoming decision on a sewage disposal system, for example, would be no more reliable than that of any random resident. As a salesman, a grocery clerk, a millworker, or a football player, he would probably be a flop; and as a political scientist, he is an impotent threat to the survival of man. Dr. Teller's field of competence is physics.

The same cannot be said for Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, who opposes the test ban, nor of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have leaned far over to avoid endorsing the treaty without specifically opposing it. These men must be heard, and their opinions must be weighed carefully.

It is unfortunate, however, that their opinions carry more weight than they merit with some Senators, largely because of political considerations. It is unfortunate because the test treaty involves the heart and the soul and will of mankind far more than strictly military defense. It touches closer to the survival of civilization than to military security.

In the areas, the opinion of the man on the street is more valid than that of General Power. Neither the scientist, sane or mad, nor the military expert are of value to America except as their peculiar and admittedly great talents are directed and controlled by the lay-civilian public—a public which doesn't know even the language of science and understands little of military strategy.

We suggest that the Senator should listen carefully to the opinions of all the "Dr. Tellers" and "General Powers." Analyze them carefully in deciding what the vote on the test treaty shall be.

But we suggest, too, that the Senator should seek the opinion of the Emmett store clerk and the migrant fruitworker, for their opinions, whether coinciding or conflicting with those already heard, are more likely to bear on the question at issue.

And the question at issue is not whether the treaty will last or whether Russia will cheat. It is not whether Russia has lived up to agreements in the past. It is not whether we have more bombs and Russia has bigger ones. It is not, in fact, whether the treaty might give one side or the other some tenuous military advantage.

Neither side can cheat substantially for long. Neither side is constrained by the treaty to reduce its absolute capability of utterly destroying the organized society of the other (and committing national suicide

at the same time). Neither side is prohibited from withdrawing on short notice, or no notice at all. Neither side, in fact, is enjoined to reduce by so much as one firecracker a stockpile of weapons already in being equivalent to 10 tons of exploding dynamite for every man, woman and child on the fact of the earth.

The question at issue in ratifying the treaty—in trying it at least for a while—is stark and simple:

If it is impossible for conflicting nations armed with unlimited atomic power to negotiate, after years of effort, such a minor agreement as a partial ban on nuclear bomb testing, is there any real hope at all that those nations can avoid the ultimate fission-fusion-fission showdown?

We believe that you, gentle reader, are better qualified to answer that question than the physicists or the generals.

In final analysis, only you can answer the question, either by remaining silent or by functioning as a member of the Republic and of the human race.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Vietnamese problem continues to trouble the Government, people, and press of this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two pertinent articles—a column by Drew Pearson, which appeared in many newspapers, including the September 15 issue of the Idaho Falls Post-Register; and an editorial, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Another Method of Dealing with the Diem Clique," which was reprinted in the September 13 issue of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

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

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register, Sept. 15, 1963]

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator FRANK CHURCH, the young Idaho Democrat, put the State Department on the spot at a closed-door hearing regarding its vacillating policy toward South Vietnam, he knew firsthand what he was talking about.

CHURCH made a memorable trip to Saigon 1 year ago with Senators GALE MCGEE, Wyoming, and FRANK MOSS, Utah, also Democrats. They arrived in Saigon 1 day early. If they had arrived on time they would not have seen so much.

But arriving as they did, they were shunted to one side by the police to make way for President Diem.

"The entire population was pushed to one side," CHURCH reported to other Senators, "some of them had to retreat half a block back from the main street.

"Then a motorcyle escort came charging down the street at 60 miles an hour in front of the President. I have seldom seen so many troops lining a street. In 10 minutes Diem got through the heart of the city—a trip which should have taken 30 minutes. That is how he deals with his citizens."

Later, the three Senators found that the President of South Vietnam treated U.S. Senators with almost equal contempt even though these Senators have to vote the millions of foreign aid which pay for Diems troops, his motorcycles and his limousine.

Diem gave the three Senators a 30-minute audience during which he lectured for 30 minutes. It was a monolog. They were not permitted to ask questions. At the conclusion, Ambassador Frederick Nolting was permitted to ask one question. That was all.

During an American Embassy party, Senator CHURCH told guests about the wild ride through the center of the city.

"Oh," remarked one U.S. diplomat, "that's the way of life around here."

CURBING A MANDARIN

The same Senator CHURCH was listening to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman before a closed door meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, Hilsman gave rather a placid explanation of the State Department's predicament in South Vietnam.

When he finished CHURCH asked in acid tones:

"What are you going to do about this Mandarin? There has been nothing like him since the Borgias.

"This self-immolation by Buddist priests has shocked the entire Christian world. No matter how we may look at it here, it puts us on the side of religious repression, a position which I know is not that of the American people."

At this, Assistant Secretary Hilsman lost his complacency. "I agree," he interrupted. He even agreed that it might be a good thing for the Senate to adopt a resolution threatening to cut off aid to President Diem and his high-handed brother and sister-in-law.

Senator CHURCH has now done so. One of the first to join him was Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas Republican, who also was shocked at the high-handed operations of the Diem family and asked some tough questions of Assistant Secretary Hilsman.

A CATHOLIC VIEW

A completely opposite view of South Vietnam and the persecution of Buddhist priests by the Catholic Diem family has been expressed in the Catholic News, organ of the Archdiocese of Cardinal Spellman of New York. It was Cardinal Spellman, who arrived in Saigon on January 5, 1955, to help Catholic refugees from North Vietnam and who has been a strong proponent of U.S. aid to this area. The United States gave $28,571,428 for these refugees on December 21, 1954.

According to Father Patrick O'Connor, Far Eastern correspondent for National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, "Buddhists in South Vietnam have been selling the American people a bill of goods. They sold it first to some of the foreign correspondents in Saigon.

"They have represented themselves as undergoing religious persecution. They have been depicted around the world as suffering from a host of restrictions on their religious worship. They are described as comprising sometimes 70 percent of the population persecuted by a 'Catholic minority government.'"

On the other hand, "Vietnam has impressed me as a country of religious tolerance," Ambassador Nolting is quoted as saying to the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Bishop Peter Carreto of Thailand is also quoted by the Catholic News that "U.S. newspapers give a slanted view" of events in Vietnam. He described charges that President Diem is trying to suppress Buddhism as "absurd."

A sympathetic view of the Buddhists' reported plight has been taken by Pope Paul, who recently avoided seeing President Diem's brother, Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc. When Archbishop Thuc called at the Vatican, issuing degrogatory statements against the Buddhists, he was promptly ordered not to talk about conditions in Vietnam. He left for New York without seeing the Pope.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Sept. 13, 1963]

ANOTHER METHOD OF DEALING WITH THE DIEM CLIQUE

Most Americans, we think, will sympathize with Senators CHURCH of Idaho and CARLSON of Kansas when they express indignation over the highhanded activities of the venal Ngo Dinh Diem clique in South Vietnam. Senator CHURCH says that unless the Diem family undertakes drastic reforms he may offer a resolution to shut off all U.S. aid, now running at a rate of $500 million a year. Seconding this proposal, Senator CARLSON says "we are just wasting money on this dictator government."

It is not likely that Diem, or his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, or whoever is in charge in Saigon, will effect reforms needed to put a popular base under the Government and conclude the war against the Communist guerrillas. It is clear that the Diem family has no interest other than holding power, and the United States will get nowhere until the family is thrown out.

If the United States continues to support Diem in spite of deteriorating relations, it will steadily lose prestige and also lose the chance of friendly relations with the Viet Namese people who blame the Americans for supporting a repressive government. So it is difficult to see what the United States has to gain by this miserable policy.

What would happen if aid were cut off? The Diem regime would collapse, of course. And possibly the Communists in the north would move in and take control of the south, but that is not certain; the North Vietnam Communists have serious factional problems. Suppose aid were withdrawn progressively, in small bits, as a lever to force reform?

That has an attractiveness, but once the process was started Vietnam would be on notice that the United States had lost confidence in the regime, and that would likely bring it down quickly. What needs to be done now is quietly to encourage the regime's growing number of opponents so that the Vietnamese themselves are enabled to throw out the oppressors. That would avoid a possible period of anarchy.

If this procedure proves impossible, it would then be time to consider the course mentioned by Senators CHURCH and CARLSON. On careful analysis it might be found that the consequences would not be as bad as they might seem. In any event, they could hardly be much worse for the United States than pursuit of the present policy.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

AMBASSADOR LODGE'S DIFFICULT JOB IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all Americans respect Henry Cabot Lodge for accepting the difficult job of Ambassador to South Vietnam. We can well understand his indignation at Madame Nhu's charges that American junior officers in Vietnam are "little soldiers of fortune." This kind of calumny is too much for any American to take. As David Halberstam, New York Times correspondent in South Vietnam, pointed out in his dispatch published in the September 27 issue of the Times:

Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, whose husband is the principal adviser to President Ngo Dinh Diem, his brother, has been outspoken about President Kennedy, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the American press, the Bill of Rights, and American culture. However, she had never before attacked the junior officers, many of whom are

in the field with the South Vietnamese forces fighting the Communist guerrillas.

The New York Times has editorially supported Ambassador Lodge in its issue of September 27. I wish to call special attention to the convincing conclusion of this editorial:

President Diem must decide whether he is fighting for his family or for his country, and whether he can afford to permit unbridled license to his sister-in-law, who is developing into the Communists' best ally in his own palace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

MR. LODGE'S STATEMENT

Ambassador Lodge has exploded a political bombshell in Saigon by publicly slapping down Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu for her "shocking, cruel, and insulting" aspersions on American junior officers helping South Vietnam to fight the war against the Communists. In statements never repudiated by President Diem's government, the President's sharp-tongued sister-in-law called the junior officers "little soldiers of fortune" engaging in "irresponsible behavior."

Mme. Nhu, whose equally shocking statements about the protesting Buddhists have compromised the Diem government in the eyes of the world, has often been critical of American policy. That is her privilege, but it is not her privilege to impugn the integrity of American officers and soldiers who are being killed in a strange land, side by side with their Vietnamese comrades. Mr. Lodge said they deserve thanks, not insults.

The Ambassador's statement, long overdue, marks a break with the previous American efforts to get along with the Diem regime at all costs. It deals only with one limited aspect of the war. But it has, of course, wider implications for the future relations of the United States with the Diem government.

President Diem must decide whether he is fighting for his family or for his country, and whether he can afford to permit unbridled license to his sister-in-law, who is developing into the Communists' best ally right in his own palace.

PROXMIRE DAIRY PLAN IS WORTH TRYING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider the dairy bill, S. 1915, which I have sponsored and which was reported from the Senate Agriculture Committee by an 11 to 4 vote.

In the Prairie Farmer for September 7, 1963, appeared an excellent editorial analyzing this bill. I wish to call the editorial to the attention of all members of the Senate who will be voting on this proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "New Dairy Plan Is Worth Trying."

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

[From the Prairie Farmer, Sept. 7, 1963]

NEW DAIRY PLAN IS WORTH TRYING

Dairy leaders who have been working persistently for the last couple of years to reach agreement on sensible, middle-of-the-road legislation have come up with something that we believe is worth trying. Most of the ideas are involved in the Proxmire bill (S. 1915) which has been reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee by an 11 to 4 vote.

This is a voluntary plan which would give producers of Grade A fluid milk price protection on acceptance of a quota and a historical base. It embodies the class I base idea which has been popping up in most of the legislative proposals and has been recommended by the leadership of the Pure Milk Association.

Under the proposed bill class I producers would agree to limit their production in exchange for certain protections. The most attractive thing about the plan is that it promises to get expanding class I producers off the backs of the class III producers who have been left out in the cold by our Federal orders.

The blend system of pricing milk which gives the grade A producer a fluid-milk price for a part of his output and dumps the rest on the manufactured-milk market at whatever it will bring, has about outlived its usefulness. In the Chicago market during the month of June only 46 percent of the grade A milk was sold for fluid use and 54 percent went into production of butter and cheese. This may not be so surprising out here in the Midwest, but the proportion is even worse in New York State where there is very little justification for producing milk to make manufactured items. In New York the proportion of grade A milk going for butter and cheese has risen lately to as high as 58 percent.

It should also be noted that there has been a rather gratifying decrease in the amount of class III milk produced outside the marketing orders, and at the same time a rather alarming increase in the amount of milk produced under class I. Obviously curtailment of production should come in the fluid-milk areas. Under the present system a class I producer dilutes his income, and the class III producer gets clobbered by his larger and more successful competitor.

Prairie Farmer has been opposed, generally speaking, to any two-price system applied to an agricultural product. We have been against such a system in wheat. We have been reluctant to accept it even in the dairy field. However, there is increasing evidence that dairying is a special problem in the agricultural-marketing picture and we need to modify our attitudes to insure a decent living for dairymen and a reliable supply for consumers.

We hope Congress will pass the Proxmire bill and its equivalent in the House (Poage bill) and give this system a try. The demands are moderate. The cost to the taxpayer would seem reasonable. There is no provision for direct subsidy in the bills at the present time. Our experience with milk marketing orders which have dominated the dairy market for many years would indicate that the system might work quite well.

There are problems, of course, but they could be worked out. These include such things as transferability of bases, the entry into dairying of new producers, and safeguards against dairying becoming concentrated in a few hands.

Nevertheless a lot of work has gone into this most recent proposal, and Congress might well go along with the plan to see how it will work out.

SHOOTING DOLLARS TO THE MOON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for some time now I have been indicating what I believe to be weaknesses in the U.S. space program. In particular, I have indicated that I think we should not be spending so much money so rapidly for essentially propaganda advantages, rather than for scientific advantages.

When the President recently spoke at the United Nations he seemed to be removing at least one of the principal arguments given for the space program, namely, that on physiological grounds we had to continue these vast expenditures in order to beat the Russians. He eliminated this justification for the program by saying that we should coordinate with the Russians. Obviously we cannot be first if the Russians are going to be first with us.

In the Washington Post for September 24, 1963, one of the most distinguished voices in American journalism, Mr. Walter Lippmann, has written a column indicating much the same points that I have made repeatedly here in the Senate. Mr. Lippmann supports the idea of coordinating efforts with the Russians in the space program, among other reasons in order to economize and avoid duplication, exactly the reasons that the President used. Mr. Lippmann goes on to point out two major errors in our earlier space program. The first of these was the commitment to put a man, rather than instruments, on the moon. The idea of putting a man on the moon essentially changes, as he says, "an immensely scientific experiment into a morbid and vulgar stunt." He is exactly right that our interests should be entirely scientific, rather than simply showmanship.

The second mistake pointed out by Mr. Lippmann is the setting of 1970 as a target date and hence placing the whole context of the space program into a race with the Russians.

As a result of this: To quote Mr. Lippmann—

We have multiplied the cost many times and what is even more damaging to our society, we are straining beyond the proper limits our relative small supply of scientists and technicians.

I think that strain on our scientific and technical manpower capacity is by far the most important point.

I ask unanimous consent that a column entitled "Purifying the Moon Project" by Walter Lippmann be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PURIFYING THE MOON PROJECT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has made his suggestion of collaboration in going to the moon at a time when there is some improvement in U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. relations. It happens also to be a time when there is a growing doubt among American scientists and among the people generally about the commitment to put an American man on the moon by the year 1970.

The President's proposal at the U.N. is, it seems to me, excellent even if the joint effort proves to be technically and politically impracticable. It is excellent because it may offer an honorable way to correct the mistakes of our original commitments about going to the moon.

There were two big mistakes. One was the commitment to put a man, living person rather than instruments, on the moon.

The other mistake was to set a deadline—1970—when the man was to land on the moon.

These two mistakes have transformed what is an immensely fascinating scientific experiment into a morbid and vulgar stunt. The use of living men rather than instruments has given a gruesome color to the whole enterprise which is akin to that of the circus performer who shoots a flower out of his daughter's mouth. For this is showmanship and not science, and it contaminates the whole affair. We shall be back in the realm of honest science when we proclaim as our objective the landing and orbiting of instruments which can send back exact data.

The setting of 1970 as a target date turned the enterprise into a race in which the objective is not to explore the heavens but to be one up on the Russians. By fixing a date, by making it a race, we are not only prostituting the nature of the scientific effort but are distorting it. We have multiplied the cost many times, and what is even more damaging to our society, we are straining beyond the proper limits our relatively small supply of scientists and technicians. Not since the Pharaohs built the pyramids has a society devoted such gigantic sums to a purpose which has almost nothing to do with its security or its welfare.

And yet the exploration of space will bring a new understanding of the universe and of life, and this is a noble end for which to work. But all this will be done best—all this, it may be, can be done only—if the impulses of the project are purified, if they are cleansed of showmanship, chauvinism, and morbid commercialism. Opening up the heavens is too big an enterprise to be mixed with concern about which nation gets the first headlines and the biggest ones.

As I see it, the best way to purify the moon project is to do what the President has suggested, to work out with the Soviet Union at least a common program with growing exchange of scientific data and increasing consultation. It does not matter much whether the first trip to the moon is made by an American astronaut and a Soviet astronette. What does matter is that we should agree to treat our separate efforts as a scientific and not as a cold war operation.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LEADS NATION IN PH. D.'S

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, In Wisconsin we are very proud of the University of Wisconsin's excellent graduate school and the fine record of its graduate students. A recent study showed that the University of Wisconsin has produced more Ph. D.'s in the last 10 years than any other university in America.

I ask uninimous consent that an article entitled "University of Wisconsin Leads Ph. D. Field," published in the Milwaukee Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LEADS PH. D. FIELD—10-YEAR TOTAL TOPS ALL OTHER SCHOOLS, ENROLLMENT GROWS

MADISON, WIS.—The University of Wisconsin granted the largest number of doctorates of any university in the last 10 years, John Willard, former graduate school dean, said Thursday. The University of Wisconsin total was 3,729 for that period.

Willard said that the research and education programs of the graduate school nearly doubled in the last 5 years, with enrollment growing from 3,860 in 1958–59 to 5,134 in 1962–63.

In addition to expansion of traditional academic fields, the graduate school faculty approved new programs or formalized experimental programs for doctorate degrees in mass communications, meteorology, molecular biology, forestry and forest products, educational psychology, educational administration, music and numerical analysis, according to the report.

New educational programs approved on an experimental basis include men's physical education, Buddhist studies, medical genetics and oceanography and limnology.

Funds for basic research allocated from the graduate school committee grew from $1,674,940 5 years ago to $2,193,484 allocated in 1962–63. Of the latter sum, $1,678,559 was provided by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, $414,935 by the State, and $50,000 from the National Science Foundation.

Funds available for fellowships, also administered through the graduate school, showed a marked rise, increasing from $400,000 in 1958–59 to $1,300,000 in 1962–63.

LOADED DICE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, one of the most important urban renewal proposals in our Nation now under active consideration is the Erieview project in Cleveland, Ohio. This project involves over $10 million of Federal grants and over $33 million of Federal loans. It covers an area of 96 acres of the heart of that great city, which presently is in danger of serious deterioration.

This project was initiated under the leadership of Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze, five-term mayor of Cleveland and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has the strong support of the present outstanding mayor of Cleveland, Ralph S. Locher, and of both of that city's nationally known and very great newspapers, the Cleveland Press and the Plain Dealer. Civic leaders of my home city, Cleveland, have been almost unanimous in their endorsement.

Earlier this year the General Accounting Office issued a scathing report criticizing the Erieview project. As a result, work toward its fulfillment faltered. It has now come to light that the General Accounting Office official who wrote the report, Marion R. Beeman, has admitted that he was "somewhat prejudiced" against Erieview before he even began the investigation which led to the critical report. A finance man all his life, Beeman has no background in city planning or in urban renewal. There is no reason whatever why his views should carry weight. He resigned as head of the Cleveland Regional General Accounting Office last May. His statements since then reveal that he allowed his own personal bias and prejudice and those of his associates to influence his opinion in the report he prepared for the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, I have studied the report thoroughly and some of the suggestions merit further consideration, particularly those regarding the classification of substandard buildings. However, it appears to me to be unconscionable that one Government employee whose mind was closed and biased should jeopardize the future development of a great city just because he happens to feel that a particular project is too big, or because we want to "shake up" another Government agency, in this case the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The General Accounting Office is an agency of the Congress. We should be able to rely on the opinion and judgment of its officials. There may be room for improvement of the Erieview project, and its sponsors are always open to constructive suggestions and at all times willing to listen to knowledgeable citizens. However, the determination of this should be left to unbiased experts in the field of city planning and urban renewal and not on the personal whim of an inexperienced career bureaucrat in a regional Government office. In this instance, the cards were stacked against Erieview before this so-called public official, or recently resigned official, even began his investigation.

Mr. President, in the Cleveland Press of September 29, 1963, there appeared an excellent article by Paul Lilley entitled "Erieview Critic Admits Prejudice." Paul Lilley, who is an outstanding reporter, exceedingly well respected in my home city, is to be congratulated on bringing this intolerable situation to the attention of the public. An editorial in that great newspaper, The Cleveland Press, on September 24, 1963, entitled "The Dice Were Loaded" further commented on this sad case of bureaucratic meddling. I commend these statements to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 23, 1963]

ERIEVIEW CRITIC ADMITS PREJUDICE

(By Paul Lilley)

The General Accounting Office official who wrote the report criticizing Cleveland's Erieview project today said:

He was somewhat prejudiced against the project even before he started the investigation that led to the critical report.

The intent of the investigation and the report was to shake up the Housing and Home Finance Agency which supplies the funds for urban renewal projects throughout the country.

These statements were made by Marion R. Beeman, 67, who resigned as head of the GAO office here in May after he completed the report that has revived opposition in some quarters to Cleveland's $250 million downtown rebuilding program.

Beeman was interviewed in his home in Moreland Hills. He said:

"I was head of the Cleveland office for the GAO 2 years ago when we were checking into slum clearance spending in the St. Vincent Center urban renewal project.

"The boys in the office and myself commented on the Erieview project. We thought the project too big in size. We wondered how the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington could authorize so much demolition.

"We questioned whether the Erieview project would attract the private development and the interest for downtown living as the plan proposed.

"We had talked to real estate men and property owners and there was a lot of violent thinking about the project.

"We questioned the magnitude of the project and the wisdom of tearing down a lot of buildings on the city's hope that developers would rush in overnight and redevelop the area with new apartment and office buildings.

"We thought that if we could get permission to look into Erieview, we might come up with an interesting story—one that would shake up HHFA.

"We got authorization to check into the project 'as we saw fit.' We did.

"I may have been a little prejudiced against Erieview even before we started but we wanted to find out if the HHFA was spending slum clearance money as Congress intended.

"There were some 40 other similar projects pending. Erieview was one of the first downtown renewal projects in the country. We wanted to make HHFA think twice before it again approved a project too big to handle."

DEMOLITION APPROVED

Beeman said his investigation proved that the HHFA and the URA did approve the demolition of standard buildings in Erieview. Then he admitted that standard buildings, in some instances, must be razed to conform to an overall renewal plan.

"We are not shooting at Erieview as such, but we did want to shake up the HHFA into being more critical of similar proposals and to give them more careful attention," said Beeman.

Asked for his personal opinion of the Erieview program, Beeman commented: "If I were a downtown property owner I would consider it a bad thing. Personally, I would have broken the project into smaller projects like the Galbreath proposal and developed the area over a much longer period of time."

Asked if he thought Erieview should be stopped now and the program abandoned, Beeman said:

"The die is cast. I think the first phase of Erieview should go forward.

"There are enough prospective investors now to give the project a good start. The wisdom of the whole thing will depend upon getting new occupancies for the new buildings instead of stripping older buildings of their occupants.

"As for the second stage of Erieview—that calling for residential development—I think it should be given another look."

Beeman retired after 20 years as a Federal auditor. From 1935 to 1943, he was the State director of finance for the WPA in Nebraska.

He lives with his wife, Hughina, at 190 Meadowhill Lane, Moreland Hills.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 24, 1963]

THE DICE WERE LOADED

In the General Accounting Office report which critized Erieview in a report to Congress, the big downtown renewal program never had a chance.

That became evident when Marion R. Beeman, who wrote the report, admitted that he was "somewhat prejudiced" against Erieview before he investigated it.

In fact, said Beeman, "the boys in the office and myself" thought Erieview was too big, doubted it could attract developers, listened to real estate men and questioned its size—all before an investigation was made.

Beeman also admits his office was out to write a report that would "shake up" the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a murky bit of interbureau warfare which just happened to be fought over Erieview.

Small wonder the GAO report was critical.

A finance man all his life, with the WPA and as a Federal auditor, Beeman has no background in city planning or in urban renewal. His competence in those areas is unclear.

At any rate, he now thinks this phase of Erieview should keep going forward. Well, that's just what it's doing, Mr. Beeman.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL TIME DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] be permitted to proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

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

EXTENSION OF THE LIFE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is anticipated that later in the day the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will offer to the bill (H.R. 3369) an amendment which would extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights for another year. Already the Commission has been allowed to exist 4 years more than was intended originally by the Congress and I think it is time to let it die.

When the Senate first considered the establishment of the Commission as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, I predicted that it would be political in nature and disruptive in its effect; that its hearings and reports could be manipulated with an eye to winning minority blocks of votes in pivotal States, and that it would lead only to harassment of the States in their efforts to administer their internal affairs.

I have seen nothing in the past 6 years to cause me to change those views; indeed I am more convinced with each passing year that the Commission does not, and cannot, serve a useful purpose, and that each extension we approve is a waste of money and a disservice to the people of the Nation.

I have not seen the report which I understand the Commission issued today. We were informed that it would not be released until noon. I have had no opportunity to read it. But I understand that the report is in line with other reports which I intend briefly to discuss today. There is nothing in that report which would cause me to change my position that the Commission should not be continued.

The bias of the Commission was called to our attention by one of the original members of the Commission, former Gov. John S. Battle, of Virginia, who said the Commission's 1959 report "is not an impartial factual statement, such as I believe to have been the intent of Congress, but, rather, in large part, an argument in advocacy of preconceived ideas in the field of race relations."

When the Civil Rights Commission was originally established, it was claimed it would be a factfinding body which would do a temporary job, investigating charges of violations of civil rights and assembling impartially weighed evidence which would be useful when proposals for future legislation in this field were considered.

But the Commission has been neither temporary, impartial, nor factual. Its life was extended in 1959 for 2 more years and a former president of the American Bar Association, John C. Satterfield, was appointed as a member. He has charged that the Commission's 1961 report represented a deliberate deception of the people of the United States.

In a speech earlier this year at Rutgers University, Mr. Satterfield said the Commission's report for 1961 "is startling to the casual reader, alarming to the careful student, and frightening to those of us who believe in the maintenance of the system of government created by the Constitution of the United States."

He concluded his analysis of the 1961 report by saying:

Although the 1961 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights contains 37 controversial recommendations, it raises one paramount issue to which the people of the United States must be alerted and which they must face squarely and courageously. The Federal Government expends directly $90 billion per year through its budget; it supervises and controls private and semipublic financial institutions with assets of $890 billion (see p. 65 of the report) through 70 grant-in-aid programs; it dictates the use of approximately one-fourth of the taxes collected and expended by all of the States. As of November 20, 1962, the first major step was taken to pervert this vast financial power to political purposes through Executive Order 11,063.

He also said:

The burning issue in the field of civil rights today, is whether the American people will permit the executive branch of the Federal Government to pervert to political purposes this vast power in the Federal financing of homes, schools, corporations, and individuals' businesses (and eventually the subsidizing of persons by social security, unemployment compensation, veterans' and pension benefits) to bring about the political and sociological ends desired by the political parties then in power. Reasonable business conditions placed upon financing related to the purposes thereof are proper and necessary. Once the people of the United States permit the executive head of the political party then in power to pervert and misuse this financial power for political purposes, all those things which go to make up what we still fondly call our free enterprise system will become subject to despotic action of Federal personnel.

After careful consideration and a full study of all six volumes of the 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report, I charge that this report was prepared and distributed to the people of the United States for the purpose of deliberately deceiving them by using the pretense of an objective study to present only those facts favorable to the desires of the political party and the pressure groups supporting this program. It was planned to conceal from the people of the United States all facts which do not support the political positions thus espoused.

This past spring the Commission continued to advocate the use of financial blackmail by recommending that the President of the United States withhold all Federal funds from the State of Mississippi until that sovereign State complied with the political and racial views of the Commission.

At the time, the President responded, quite properly, that he did not have the legal authority to withhold such funds and doubted whether it would be wise

for the Congress to give him that power. I regret to say that the President now wants the Congress to give him that arbitrary power.

The Commission's recommendations were based on charges which, if true, could have been prosecuted under existing Federal laws, according to the Commission's own admission. But the Commission took the astounding position that the President would be justified in doing an unconstitutional thing to enforce what the Commission claimed to be a constitutional right.

I cannot see any valid reason to continue such an agency any longer than is required for it to file its final report and wind up its affairs. The Commission is scheduled to expire tonight and then it will have 60 days to conclude its business. That should be sufficient.

I respectfully submit that the methods and purposes of the Commission do not justify its continuation. It has done more harm than good, its recommendations have been inflammatory and unsound, and it is certainly one of the temporary Federal agencies we could very well terminate here and now.

Should this Congress vote to continue this unnecessary Federal agency it will be the prelude to an effort to confer upon it the powers covered in title V of the President's omnibus civil rights bill and to increase the quid pro quo of its patriotic and unselfish efforts by $25 per day. Section 104(a) of that title reads as follows:

The Commission shall—

1. Investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

2. Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

3. Appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

4. Serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The section also provides that the Commission may concentrate the performance of its duties on those specified in either of the paragraphs above and provides for interim reports to the President and to the Congress, and a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations.

Section 505(a) of the title provides that section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(d); 71 Stat. 636) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

Section 506 provides that section 105 (g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(g); 71 Stat. 636) is amended to read as follows:

(g) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena any district court of the United States or the U.S. court of any territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

Section 507 adds a new subsection to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 at the end to read as follows:

(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Leaders of the NAACP have boastfully declared that if the conservative Senators block the passage of the President's omnibus civil rights bill, they will organize another march on Washington and it will not stop short of the Senate Chamber and the Senate offices. Senators who yield to such a threat may well remember what happened to the democracy of Rome under similar circumstances.

In his monumental work "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," the British historian, Gibbon, said that the end of democracy in Rome was marked by the action of Caesar when, to pass through the Senate a so-called land bill that would distribute the public lands to the poor, whose vote Caesar was seeking, he told the Senate that he would invite a mob into the Forum to beat up recalcitrant Senators if they did not pass his bill.

That incident is referred to on page 206 of the outstanding biography of Caesar entitled "Life of Caesar" by the Italian historian Guglielmo Ferrero:

Caesar was patient for some time, while Calenus, who was Praetor, and Publius Vatinius, an obscure political adventurer who was Tribune, proposed reforms in the law regulating the courts. At length, seeing that neither Crassus nor himself would be successful in securing that the bill should be discussed by the Senate, Caesar declared that he would simply have it proposed to the electors. This caused a great sensation. With the assistance of Cato and the Conservatives, Bibulus entered into a violent campaign of obstruction on religious grounds to prevent the meeting of the people. Caesar's patience broke down, and he began to work upon the feelings of his supporters. Finally, after doing all he could to win Bibulus to his side, he played his trump card. He appealed openly to Crassus and Pompey for their help. Crassus and Pompey came down to the Forum and declared that the factious obstruction of the Conservatives must be broken down by force if persuasion proved insufficient. On this the Bill was approved amidst a scene of tumultuous excitement. A clause added at the last moment forced the Senators to swear that they would faithfully observe it.

As President Kennedy said on a historic occasion, "Let us never negotiate out of fear."

FREDERICK HALE, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I inform the Senate of the death of one of its former Members, Frederick Hale, of Maine. Senator Hale was one of my best friends. He gave me counsel and support that was invaluable. But more important was his friendship, his understanding, and his words of kindness to me at difficult times.

Only five of the present Members were in the Senate while Senator Hale was a Member. No Republican in today's membership served with Senator Hale. He became a Member of the Senate 10 years prior to the time that the most senior Member of the Senate today first took his oath of office as a Senator.

Senator Hale's service in the Senate included chairmanship of the most important committee of the Senate, the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Naval Affairs Committee. This was of very special interest to me because as a Member of the House of Representatives I served on the Naval Affairs Committee of that body and now serve on the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. I like to think that at least in some small degree I followed in his footsteps and emulated him.

He was one of Maine's most illustrious sons, bringing great honor to the State that he represented in the Senate. As a report in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star states, he said:

The people are not interested in promises. What they want is accomplishment.

I think that I must have had this in mind subconsciously when I first ran for the Senate on the campaign theme of "Don't Trade a Record for a Promise."

At a later date, I shall speak at greater length about Senator Frederick Hale. I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point articles of the Washington Sunday Star of September 29, 1963, and the Washington Sunday Post of the same date with respect to him:

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

FREDERICK HALE DIES; VETERAN MAINE SENATOR

Former Senator Frederick Hale, of Maine, 88, who resigned from the Senate in 1941 because he no longer felt in tune with the politics and legislation of the day, died yesterday at his home at Portland, Maine.

During his four consecutive terms in the Senate, the Republican was an uncompromising personality who fought the New Deal but supported President Roosevelt's foreign policy.

Senator Hale was known for his opposition to vote deals and for his refusal to offer exorbitant promises to his constituents at election time.

"The people are not interested in promises," he said. "What they want is accomplishment."

LIVED IN MANSION

Erect and military in bearing, Senator Hale was one of the city's most eligible bachelors. He lived here in a 16th Street mansion.

Born in Detroit, while his mother was visiting her parents, he was the son of Eugene Hale, who represented Maine in the U.S. Senate from 1881 to 1911, a record for continuous service at the time.

Frederick Hale's paternal grandfather, Zachariah Chandler, was also a Senator. Senator Chandler represented Michigan from 1858 to 1875 and was Secretary of the Interior in President Grant's Cabinet.

Senator Hale developed an extensive and lucrative law practice in Portland, but was drawn into politics and was first elected Senator in 1916.

In February 1919, while the Versailles peace conference was in session, he made a noted speech calling for the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Europe lest the United States become further involved in old world problems.

He had supported the war policy of the Wilson administration but, fearing further entanglements, he voted for the Lodge reservations to American membership in the League of Nations.

Between the wars, he advocated a big Navy and supported President Roosevelt's naval expansion.

He was so opposed to the practices of trading votes that he refused to vote for a project in northern Florida in 1936 and thus lost southern Democratic votes for a tidal power project of vital interest to his own State.

RANKING REPUBLICAN

By virtue of his long tenure, he became ranking Republican in the Senate, as his father also had been.

But, he said, "24 years in the Senate is long enough. It will be better if some younger man takes my place."

An outdoorsman, he continued in excellent health. In his seventies, he played golf almost daily in the summer in Portland, and in the winter turned to Florida courses.

He emerged from retirement in 1943 to lead a successful Portland Red Cross drive in World War II.

A first cousin, Robert Hale of Portland, carried on the family tradition of service on Capitol Hill by representing Maine for eight terms in the House. He lost a reelection bid in 1958, but continues to live here. A niece, Mrs. Howland Chase, also resides here. There are no close survivors.

Funeral services have been planned for 2 p.m. Tuesday at the State Street Chapel in Portland.

EX-SENATOR HALE OF MAINE DEAD AT 88

PORTLAND, MAINE, September 28.—Former Republican Senator from Maine, Frederick Hale, who served four consecutive terms before his retirement in 1941, died today at his home after a long illness. He was 88.

Mr. Hale, who was first elected to the Senate in 1916, was the ranking Republican Member at the time of his retirement. His 24 years of service also closed out a family dynasty in the Senate dating back to 1858.

Mr. Hale's father, Eugene, served 30 years—a record at that time—from 1881 to 1911. His maternal grandfather, Zacharian Chandler, was Senator from Michigan from 1858 to 1875.

During his years at the Capitol, Senator Hale was a "big Navy" advocate and worked during the years of peace to build a U.S. Navy second to none.

He supported much of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's foreign policy, in addition to the administration's naval program, but on domestic issues he differed sharply with the Democratic Chief Executive.

Hale was born in Detroit, October 7, 1874. He was graduated from Harvard and attended Columbia University Law School.

He practiced law in Portland for several years and in 1905 was elected to the Maine Legislature. He returned to the law after one term but kept up interest in party affairs and was Republican national committeeman from Maine from 1912 to 1918.

A first cousin of Mr. Hale's, Robert Hale of Portland continued the family tradition on Capitol Hill by representing Maine for eight consecutive terms in the House before losing a reelection bid in 1958.

Frederick Hale was a bachelor. Surviving relatives, in addition to Robert Hale, who now lives in Washington, D.C., include another cousin, Mrs. Phillip Clifford of Portland, and a niece, Mrs. Howland Chase, of Washington, D.C.

POINT-BY-POINT DEFENSE OF PROXMIRE DAIRY BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Robert J. Williams, of the Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative, has written me a strong, detailed criticism of my dairy bill, S. 1915.

Since the Senate is expected to consider the bill within the next few days, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, together with a point-by-point answer of each of Mr. Williams' criticisms, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN DAIRIES COOPERATIVE,
Union Center, Wis., August 30, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: It has been brought to my attention that the Proxmire class I base bill (S. 1915) will be considered in the Senate September 3 or 4.

Although purported to be desirable from the standpoint of the fluid milk interests operating under Federal marketing orders, it actually is not in the long-term best interests of the dairy industry as a whole; nor the consuming public. This conclusion stems from the following facts.

1. The new subparagraph (H) of the bill says "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section,". This essentially means "in spite of" or "an obstacle to the implementation of paragraph 8C (5)(A) through (G)(H) will overrule in determining how the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937, as amended, will be administered and legally interpreted.

2. In effect (A) through (G) would be non-effective whenever a conflict arose in interpretation or administration of subparagraph (H). This means that 8c(5)(G) which provides: "No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk, and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof in any production area of the United States." will no longer limit the Secretary's powers to prevent him from establishing "trade barriers." (See pp. 16–21 of the Supreme Court decision *"Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers, Inc., et al., Petitioners* v. *United States et al.* dated June 4, 1962. The above section and the subsequent interpretation thereof was largely the basis for eliminating the down allocation and compensatory payment provisions which were interpreted as restrictions to the free flow of milk and milk products.

3. Therefore bill S. 1915 would legalize restrictions via the class I base plan.

4. Such restriction to the movement of milk would have the following results:

(a) It would prevent the free flow of milk between production and consumption areas. It would prevent producers located in the various regions of the United States from competing for higher priced fluid markets on a free and equitable basis.

(b) It would allow class I prices to rise to exorbitant levels in high cost of production areas at the expense of consumers in these areas. In no case should the class I price in Federal orders differ more than the cost of transporting milk from alternative sources.

(c) It would provide a legal basis for allowing inequitable treatment of producers under a Federal order system which is national in scope.

(d) It would insulate fluid producers located in high cost of production areas from the competition of more efficient areas of production. In short it would legalize an economic trade barrier of the most flagrant type.

5. Furthermore in spite of all the wrong it could do, the bill would be relatively ineffective in accomplishing its primary objective; namely, that of cutting milk production in Federal order markets. There are no areas where the variable costs of producing milk are higher than the lowest class price. To put it another way: producers will not cut back production unless the marginal costs of production exceeds the lowest class price. In either of the above cases the producer would continue to produce milk as long as the lowest class price was sufficiently high to help pay for his fixed cost of production such as machinery, equipment, buildings, interest on investment, etc. Any such bill, to cut production in Federal order markets, would have to incorporate an excess price, far below the level of price of the lowest class use.

6. Page 2, lines 6 and 7 includes within the base "reserves of milk as may be found essential thereto." Many markets are on a 3- or 4-day bottling schedule.

This means that as the bottling week shortens the necessary reserves in the market could be interpreted to mean as high as 50 percent above fluid milk requirements. With the technological advancements in transportation the interpretation of necessary reserves should include supplies available from alternative sources. The bill as written would not only protect the producers within each Federal order from outside competition, but would allow for protected increases in production far above the level of production presently in most orders.

7. Page 3, line 11, states that bases are transferable. This particular provision would result in values being attached to bases with their subsequent sale to the highest bidders, or producers under orders which can do the best job of gaging the highest class I prices from their consumers.

In summary the bill entitled S. 1915 would reverse the Supreme Court decision, disadvantage the consumer and in the long run the dairy producers including those producers the bill was designed to help.

Your thoughtful consideration and opposition to this bill would be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. WILLIAMS,
Public Relations and
Procurement Director.

P.S. This letter is in behalf of Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative which is the second largest in Wisconsin and Dairy Maid Products, Eau Claire, which is a federation of

cooperatives with a total farmer membership of 21,000.

MR. ROBERT J. WILLIAMS,
Public Relations and Procurement Director,
Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative,
Union Center, Wis.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: This is with further reference to your mimeographed letter of August 30 in which you commented on the provisions of S. 1915. Your comments are, of course, sincerely appreciated, but lead me to believe that you may not have a complete understanding of the bill or a misconception of the legal effect of the introductory clause of proposed new paragraph (H) reading "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section."

Your letter appears to be concerned that S. 1915 would in some way not explained authorize barriers to the intermarket movement of milk and that the clause above referred to would have the effect of repealing or rendering ineffective for other purposes paragraph 8c(5)(G) of the Agricultural Market Agreement Act of 1937. Paragraph (G) relates to prohibitions or limitations on the intermarket movement of milk and dairy products. This, it is argued, would set aside the Supreme Court decision in the Lehigh case (370 U.S. 76), result in isolation of markets, and produce a list of ills attributable to the imagined isolation of markets.

S. 1957, as you know, relates only to the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of their own milk among the dairy farmers supplying a Federal milk marketing order. It does not preserve for local producers any share of the market nor restrict in any way the intermarket movement of milk or dairy products.

The entry of outside milk into a market would remain as it is under the present law. Thus the percentage of the market supplied by local producer milk would vary with market conditions and other factors just as it does now. S. 1915 would apply only to the distribution of whatever part of the market sales in any particular month came from milk supplied by producers under the order.

These proceeds would be distributed in such a way that the classified pricing system and the blending of returns in effect would be carried to the individual farmer. In general, the farmer would receive a higher return for milk in his allotment of the Class I sales and the lower return for any additional milk marketed. A combination of these price returns would represent his gross return for milk marketed. If the farmer decreased marketing, the decreased volume would come out of the lower priced milk. If he increased marketing, the increase would return only the lower price.

This provides an incentive to decrease marketing and a deterrent to increased marketing which does not exist in the present distribution method. What the bill would do is to enable individual farmers to adjust their marketings more nearly to the market without having their efforts offset by the action of other farmers.

To this extent, the bill is in the interest of manufacturing milk producers, because it would tend to reduce the production of manufacturing milk by fluid milk producers in the Federal order markets.

No claim is, or ever has been made that S. 1915 would greatly reduce milk marketings or solve the problem of surplus milk. But it will provide some incentive to individual farmers to adjust their own marketings, and it is a step in the right direction which can be taken now without adversely affecting any area or group.

That the bill would not restrict the free movement of milk is further indicated by the many safeguards which it provides for new producers who may want to enter a market where provisions under the bill may be in effect. Actually, the bill leans over backward to preserve the free movement of milk and producers between markets. These provisions were written, as you are well aware, because of my concern that manufacturing milk producers be fully protected.

Turning now to the introductory clause of proposed new paragraph (H), this would do just exactly what it says and no more. It would permit the new distribution method described above to be used notwithstanding any other provision of section 8c. This is merely a general exception used to avoid listing specific exceptions as some earlier drafts did. An exception is necessary because the method of distribution authorized by paragraph (H) is somewhat different than the distribution provisions of 8c(5)(B) and there are other minor modifications such as the appeal procedure.

Actually this exception does not affect paragraph 8c(5)(G) at all, because new paragraph (H) does not contain any prohibitions or limitations on the intermarket movement of milk. As the committee report points out, S. 1915 "* * * deals only with apportionment of proceeds among producers" (p. 1) and "The committee wanted to be sure that the allotment provisions would not be a barrier to the movement of milk from any part of the country into the order market" (p. 8).

Furthermore, the bill spells out the way in which producers from other areas can enter a market where the base plan is in effect. This, of course, is not done under the present law and would be, it seems, quite an advanced step for those who believe they are producing milk for manufactured milk purposes but who actually would like to deliver milk to federally regulated markets.

As to the argument that the exception would repeal paragraph 8c(5)(G) or render it ineffective for other purposes such as preventing trade barriers, this is merely a legal misconception which is entirely without foundation. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would justify such an erroneous legal conclusion.

Apparently, you made no effort to check the conclusions in your letter with the Department of Agriculture or with the general counsel's office of the Department. The Department will administer paragraph (H) if it is enacted, and a check there would have revealed that the statements and conclusions in the letter are without foundation.

Paragraph No. 6 of the letter argues that allocation of Class I sales plus a reserve would allow for protected increases in production. There is no protection for local production in S. 1915 either in reserves or otherwise.

Paragraph No. 7 expressed concern over transfer of bases. Adequate safeguards are provided in the bill and transfers would be permitted on in the best interests of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers.

Other paragraphs of the letter are based on the erroneous conclusion that S. 1915 would restrict intermarket movement of milk which, of course, it would not.

To summarize, S. 1915 would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to use this type of a base plan in the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of producer milk.

The committee report states, page 2, "While the committee feels that this (the present law) clearly authorizes apportionment of the proceeds for the milk on the basis of marketings during a representative period, the Department of Agriculture has questioned its authority to apply this adjustment factor except for the limited purpose of eliminating violent seasonal fluctuations. This bill is designed to remove such question and specify one manner in which such authority may be exercised."

One of the things I would like to emphasize in connection with this bill is the great effort that has been made by me, the National Milk Producers Federation, and the Department of Agriculture to be sure that the Dairymen's Class I Base Plan would not operate unfairly as to any group of dairymen or any production area.

If I can be of further help in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL CITES THE WARREN COURT'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal yesterday carried a remarkable editorial praising the anniversary of 10 years of the so-called Warren court, the court presided over by Earl Warren as Chief Justice, who has had a most notable and impressive record.

Too few Americans realize the great contribution the Warren court has made, as the Milwaukee Journal points out, to the real business of this country—the achievement of greater freedom for all our citizens.

This is such a remarkable editorial that I hope other Members of the Senate will have occasion to peruse it. Chief Justice Warren has been the butt of a great deal of grossly unfair and uninformed criticism. He has become controversial. But this decent, unusually wise man deserves praise. I am glad the Milwaukee Journal has given his court and Chief Justice Warren personal recognition. The Chief Justice is a remarkably wholesome American.

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

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

DECADE OF THE WARREN COURT

Ten years ago tomorrow, in perhaps the happiest inspiration of his Presidency, Dwight Eisenhower appointed Earl Warren Chief Justice of the United States. As "the Warren court" now enters its second decade, Court historians are already according him future rank as "one of the great Chief Justices."

Certain it is, at any rate, that the Court with his vote and his leadership has more profoundly influenced and shaped the course of individual human affairs than in any equal period of time before. It has been the great liberal Court not in any political sense but in the word root sense that "liber" means free.

Much or most of the record might have been written under another than Earl Warren, to be sure. The Court in this period just happened to be hit by an accumulation of problems of human liberty—which is the great business of America—that other branches of Government had been creating or sweeping under the rug. But Warren is the man it happened to, and the record came out shining.

Warren's accession came just as the Court was being forced out of its historic role as a brake on the other branches and having to take the lead, not by its choice but by their default, in the renewal of freedom. The times impelled it to become "the most important force for social change in the United States today."

The first and greatest theme of the Warren court has been, of course, that racial

segregation in public schools, and wherever else cases have come up, is not constitutional equality. The right to equal protection of the laws is at least attaining its fullest meaning.

Under the equal protection clause also, the Warren court has made the right to fair representation in State legislatures enforceable. This writes completely new constitutional history. Uniquely, it comes to the aid not of minority or individual rights but of majority rights.

The Court has earnestly tried twice, with great difficulty, to teach that the first amendment has to mean at least that Government shall not prescribe religious practices, and that this meaning is in the interest not only of persons with conflicting faiths or no faiths, but of religion itself.

The Court has done much to restore the neglected right of accused persons to have counsel. It has put new strength in the guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures. It has enlarged the access to Federal habeas corpus against State and local injustice. It has upheld the right to travel.

It has bulwarked the heart of due process. A convicted person, for instance, may not lose the right of appeal for lack of funds. A suspect may not be protractedly grilled by police before arraignment. A conviction will not stand if Government documents pertinent to the defense are withheld. Prosecution for Communist activity is no less bound by strict requirements of proof than any other criminal action.

The Court has disciplined Congress in the excesses and abuses of its investigative function. There must be, for instance, a legislative purpose, not mere exposure of persons for exposure's sake. A contempt penalty will not stand for refusal to answer a committee that was violating its own rules. A civil servant is no less entitled to correct firing procedure because a rampaging Senator wants his scalp.

In all this, and more, the Court has been focusing its concern not on abstractions and generalities but on people. As the Constitution basically was meant to stand between the people and their Government, so this Court has stood, "against the assaults of opportunism, the expediency of the passing hour, the erosion of small encroachments."

Even if it was coincidence, it was under Chief Justice Warren that the Court did enter a distince new era. His name and mark are upon its noble work of making America practice what it preaches, making freedom mean what it says.

WE SELL RUSSIA THE ROPE TO HANG US

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a cartoon in this morning's Washington Post was most appropriate. It is a drawing of an executive at a telephone. Behind him is a sign, "Wheat Producers, Inc." The executive is making a telephone call, and the words in the cartoon show that he is saying, "Wait a minute—did you say those atheistic warmongers are willing to pay cash?"

It seems to me this is a most eloquent commentary on our weakness and blindness in preparing to provide assistance to the Soviet Union in its serious economic need, a sale of wheat to the Soviet Union when they constitute the greatest threat to our freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short article by the Associated Press showing that Cargill, Inc., probably the Nation's largest grain processors and shippers, will have nothing to do with shipping wheat to the Soviet Union. I think they should be commended for it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CARGILL WON'T SHARE IN SOVIET GRAIN DEAL

MINNEAPOLIS, September 29.—Cargill, Inc., grain processors and shippers, said today it has notified American grain interests conducting talks with the Russians in Ottawa that Cargill does not wish to be involved in the proposed arrangements.

E. E. Kelm, president of Cargill, was referring to talks reported earlier this week between American traders and the Russians as a followup to Canada's $500 million wheat deal with the Soviets.

CAPITAL TIMES HIGHLIGHTS HANDOUT IN TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, section 202 of the tax cut bill, H.R. 8363, would make a number of liberalizing changes in the investment credit.

First, the bill provides that in the case of utilities companies eligible for the 7-percent credit—usually transportation companies—regulatory agencies of the Federal Government, especially the ICC, could not force the companies to reflect the reductions in taxes over the investment credit as a reduction in cost for ratemaking purposes.

The second feature of this provision is that the same restriction would also apply to regulatory agencies, especially the FPC and FCC, in the case of utility companies eligible for a 3-percent investment credit; that is, communications and electric power companies.

This is one of the most extreme proposals in the bill. Taxes have always been viewed as an element of cost in computing utility rates. Thus, any reduction in taxes should be viewed as a reduction in cost.

One alleged advantage of the investment credit is that the reduction in taxes can be passed on to consumers generally and therefore increase aggregate demand for products. This is being precluded by section 202 of the bill.

Another alleged change of the investment credit is that it provides additional funds for investment. However, since utilities by definition are operating at optimum levels of capacity, additional retained earnings are least likely to result in increased investment in the case of utilities.

Senators should also note that section 202 of the bill also liberalizes the investment credit in two other ways.

First, the investment credit was somewhat crippled last year by the so-called Long amendment, which required the depreciation base to be reduced by the amount of the investment credit. This Long amendment would be repealed by section 202, and it is my understanding that Senator RUSSELL LONG is going along with this.

The investment credit is also expanded by the bill to apply to escalators and elevators. This is just one more example of how a new loophole gradually gets broadened in the tax law.

Mr. President, the Capital Times of Madison is perhaps the only paper in the Nation that has called attention to this giveaway. I ask unanimous consent that the article reporting the "tax bill sleeper" and the editorial commenting on it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Capital Times, Sept. 23, 1963]

UTILITIES TO GET BIG WINDFALL—TAX BILL "SLEEPER" COSTLY TO CONSUMERS

The tax bill coming up in the House this week contains a sleeper provision that will cost gas, electricity, and phone users about $287 million next year.

This information comes from the Electric Consumers Information Committee, a consumer-protection group that has stubbornly fought the Nation's big private utility interests.

The provision, originally introduced as an independent bill, but now buried within the entire tax package, pretends to be a simple modification of last year's investment credit law, the ECIC points out.

It would prevent regulatory agencies from recognizing the tax savings obtained by the investment credits when the agencies calculate utility profits and subsequent consumer rates.

Boiled down, this means that consumers will pay rates based on "phantom taxes" that exaggerate the actual cost of providing the service.

The investment credit law enacted in 1962 kicks back tax savings of from 3 to 7 percent of new capital investments made by privately owned utilities and other industries.

Since private power utilities will invest an estimated $3.5 billion in new plants and equipment this year, their tax loads will be reduced by $105 million—which won't be passed on to consumers.

Since local gas utilities will invest an estimated $880 million, they'll save about $26.4 million, which won't be passed on to consumers.

Gas pipeline utilities will invest $940 million, and will save $68.5 million, which won't be passed on to the local utilities they serve, or to the eventual customers.

Telephone utilities will invest $3 billion, and save $90 million, which won't be passed on to consumers.

The total $287 million in savings that the public will be paying for. The utilities can use the money for other purposes. Dividends, for instance.

In justifying the bill, the House Ways and Means Committee argued that the purpose of the investment credit law was to encourage investments.

The ECIC refutes this by challenging the need for incentive by utilities dedicated to serve the public. If more facilities are needed, the companies are dutybound to expand to meet the need, the ECIC says.

As Representative AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, said last year, "In view of the fact that utilities are regulated monopolies with guaranteed rates of return and with a utility responsibility to provide all the investment needed to meet demand, I can see absolutely no reason for offering them a tax incentive to do what they are required to do anyway."

The provisions enabling the privately owned utilities to avoid sharing their tax windfalls with consumers are contained in section 202(e) of the new tax bill.

Originally, the proposed legislation came as a separate bill, H.R. 7111. At that time, numerous requests were made to House Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on the bill, but none were ever held.

According to the ECIC, the Federal Power Commission gave its views on the bill to the

Ways and Means Committee, but the report was never made public.

Another regulatory agency, the Federal Communications Commission, voted 3 to 2 in favor of a "flow through" policy—the passing on of the tax savings to the consumer public.

But, apparently bowing to pressure, the FCC later announced it was suspending that decision.

The ECIC has urged the public to contact its representatives, urging them to vote for deletion of section 202(e).

[From the Capital Times, Sept. 23, 1963]

CONSUMERS TO PAY FOR HUGE TAX WINDFALL FOR UTILITIES

On page 31 in today's issue of the Capital Times will be found a story giving the details of one of the most brazen pieces of special interest legislation that has been introduced in Congress in recent years.

According to the Electric Consumers Information Committee, the tax bill that is coming up in Congress this week contains a "sleeper" provision that would cost customers of private utilities about $287 million next year.

The method by which this would be done is a complicated one. So far as we have been able to determine there has been no discussion whatever of this provision of the tax bill in the reams of copy which the wire services have been sending out from Washington.

Were it not for the Electric Consumers Information Committee, a watchdog of the public interest in Washington, the whole thing would have been kept quiet and the bill passed without any opposition.

Briefly, what the provision would do would be to make consumers of gas, electricity, and telephone pay rates based on "phantom taxes" that exaggerate the actual cost to the utilities of providing the service.

Under a bill passed in 1962, the private utilities are receiving kickbacks in tax savings of from 3 to 5 percent of their new capital investments. The tax bill now in Congress would prohibit governmental regulatory agencies from recognizing this tax savings in calculating permissible utility profits and rates to the consumers.

As a result, the utilities will save $287 million in taxes that the public will be paying for. The utilities will be able to use the money for any purpose they desire, including the payment of dividends.

The ECIC says that the Federal Power Commission gave its views on this provision of the tax bill to a committee of Congress, but that this testimony was never made public.

Why has this testimony been kept secret? The public has a right to know what the top regulatory agency thinks of a bill affecting tens of millions of consumers of utility service.

Congress should knock this special interest feature out of the tax bill.

Mr. GRUENING obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Alaska be authorized to proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

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

MUST THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS BE LOST?—A PROGRAM OF DECISIVE ACTION TO SAVE IT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on August 2, 1962—almost 13 months ago—I stated on the floor of the Senate that a reexamination of the U.S. program of military assistance to Latin America was long overdue.

I demonstrated clearly at that time that:

None of the goals of the program has been achieved—not hemisphere defense; not standardization (of weapons); not modernization; not a reduction in forces; not even that much to be desired byproduct, indoctrination of the military in their role in a modern democracy.

The recent tragic and disgraceful events in the Dominican Republic underscore the words I uttered over a year ago.

We must recall that it had been our hope to help the Dominican Republic become the showplace of the Alliance for Progress. With our help, in accordance with the principles of the charter of the Alliance, the Dominican Republic would be enabled to achieve economic and social development in the framework of freedom and democracy.

That was our hope. That was our goal. And a great goal it was.

Our dream and the dreams of the Dominican peoples were rudely shattered when the military machine—largely holdovers from the bloody and corrupt Trujillo dictatorship—aided by the police, trained with U.S. AID funds, ousted the administration of Dr. Juan Bosch, President of the Dominican Republic.

In the eyes of the free world, Dr. Bosch was more than the President of the Dominican Republic. After 31 years of corruption and dictatorship at its worst, Dr. Bosch took office a short time ago as the first President of the Dominican Republic. He was elected with full freedom of election in accordance with the new constitution of the Dominican Republic, and after an election campaign that was a model of democratic performance.

This was the administration that just had to succeed.

And, under the direction of President Bosch, the country was on the move—economically, politically, and socially. It may be true that the country was not moving ahead as fast as some would have liked. But at least President Bosch turned out to be an honest, dedicated person devoted to his country's best interests and determined to bring about economic and social progress in his country.

Some say of him that he is a poor administrator; that he has not learned the administrator's art of delegating authority. Fortunately, Mr. President, that is not a fatal defect in any head of state in any country. Some of the great Presidents of our own country have had an inability to delegate authority. And in the Dominican Republic, after 31 years of corruption and atrophying dictatorship, there can be understanding of the reluctance of the first constitutionally elected President to keep matters within his own ken during the political days of his administration. Besides this is wholly irrelevant: The principle of not condoning the military overthrowing of a legally constituted government is at stake.

Others say of him that he is penurious; that he balanced his country's budget; that he paid off his indebtedness to the World Bank ahead of time; that he reduced his private indebtednesses.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is exactly the type of administrator which this country would hope to have in a nation destined to be a showcase of the Alliance for Progress.

But Dr. Bosch's efforts have been interrupted. He has been ousted by a military coup.

The charge is made by the gangsters who overthrew him that Dr. Bosch was "soft on communism." This is invariably the pretense of every would-be dictator, crook, or scoundrel who seeks U.S. support, recognition, and U.S. financial aid. Unfortunately, we have in the past been seduced by such allegations.

The fact remains, Mr. President, that Dr. Bosch was the constitutionally elected President of the Dominican Republic. The military opportunists who ousted him acted entirely outside the constitution of the Dominican Republic. They acted to further their own political ambitions.

They must not be permitted to reap the advantages of their ill-considered actions. This is the point at which the United States must draw the line. Here we must stand firm if there is to be any hope at all for the future of the Alliance for Progress. The U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, has called the overthrow of Dr. Bosch "a setback for democracy." It is that, and more.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, it is a direct result of the past policies of the Government of the United States.

We have talked strongly, but carried a little stick.

We have not matched our deeds to our words.

Need I remind you, Mr. President, of our vacillations in Peru, in Ecuador, in Argentina, in Brazil?

In Peru, after the military had set aside the election, the returns of which had not been counted, and installed its junta, the United States withdrew recognition and withheld financial aid under the Alliance for Progress program, a few days later reversed its correct stand, thus exhibiting its lack of consistency and firm purpose and giving encouragement to such military coups in the future.

Each time we have said: "Your actions are at variance with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. Change; reform; mend your ways; or there will be no more foreign aid."

Yet each time we have settled for the porridge of empty promises.

Each time we have retreated and ultimately endorsed the new, illegal status quo.

Each time we have ultimately agreed to condone behavior at variance with the attainment of the objectives of the principles of the Alliance for Progress.

I hope that in the case of the Dominican Republic this time we will not weaken.

I commend the President of the United States for the forthright stand he has taken with respect to the usurpers of power in the Dominican Republic. The pseudomilitary junta in the Dominican Republic which has ruthlessly sought to deal a body blow to democratic principles should not be permitted to reap the

slightest advantage from its perfidious conduct. It has acted against the best interests of the Dominican Republic and its peoples.

By withdrawing diplomatic recognition and halting foreign economic assistance, this administration has acted fairly, intelligently, and justly. What it has done is for the best interests of all the Dominican people.

I urge my administration to hold firm.

I urge my administration to withhold diplomatic recognition of the new, illegitimate regime in the Dominican Republic, and to withhold all further foreign economic aid until Dr. Bosch has been brought back and duly installed as the legitimate head of state.

We can insist upon nothing less, because if we do not insist upon the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, then we will be endangering other civilian governments not only in Latin America but in the rest of the world as well. We will be in effect inciting similar military revolts in Venezuela, Colombia, and other Latin American nations which are trying to establish democratic regimes. We will be playing into the hands of the Communists who will rejoice at the installation of totalitarianism.

We must insist upon adherence to the principle that the military is subject to civilian control. We can settle for nothing less than the reinstallation of President Bosch. Otherwise, we will be in a position of encouraging military leaders in other countries to overthrow duly constituted governments because, regardless of what transpires, they will reap the immediate fruits of their revolt against civilian authorities.

An excellent editorial in the Washington Post for Thursday, September 26, 1963, summed up the situation in the Dominican Republic when it stated:

> In the circumstances, there was absolutely no warrant for a military uprising. There is nothing wrong with the Dominican Republic that bayonets can be expected to cure.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial and the editorial from the Washington Post which appeared yesterday be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I likewise ask unanimous consent that editorials on this subject from the New York Times of September 29, 1963; from the Detroit Free Press for September 27, 1963; from the Washington Post of September 29, 1963; from the New York Herald Tribune of September 26, 1963; and from the Milwaukee Journal of September 26, 1963; and news articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the excellent Post editorial, from which I quoted and will be inserted in full following my remarks, was headed "Death of a Democracy." But, Mr. President, there need be no death. There must be no death of democracy in the Dominican Republic. The proposal that I make will restore it to life. If we do not take the necessary and obvious steps to restore it to life we will share in the guilt for its death. Has this great Republic of ours lost all its power? Is it prepared to sacrifice its repute and its prestige at the behest of a little group of sordid gangsters—the survivors of the dastardly Trujillo regime? I hope and pray not.

Over the weekend I was interviewed on this situation by the able reporter for the Washington Post, Dan Kurzman. I outlined my proposal to him. I ask unanimous consent that the story he wrote concerning that interview be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 26, 1963]

DEATH OF A DEMOCRACY

The light of liberty has been snuffed out in the Dominican Republic by military conspirators who, like the Bourbons, seem to have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. After three decades of tryranny, Juan Bosch was overwhelmingly elected president last year. There have been criticisms of Mr. Bosch, but let it be noted that few complained that the president was dictatorial. Quite the contrary; the prevailing lament was that Mr. Bosch was too democratic, that he allowed his opponents, particularly at the extreme left, too much liberty.

His government was plagued by lack of experience and the country's economic conditions have recently worsened. All this posed a problem for Dominican democracy; it did not pose a crisis. In the circumstances, there was absolutely no warrant for a military uprising. There is nothing wrong with the Dominican Republic that bayonets can be expected to cure.

The United States is wholly justified in suspending both diplomatic relations and foreign aid. The purpose of Alliance for Progress aid is to nurture a fragile experiment in democracy, not to encourage a leap backwards into the dark. The harm done by the coup is incalculable since it comes after months of painful yet peaceful transition from the Trujillo era. The aim of U.S. policy, in concert with other Latin American countries, will surely be to bring about a swift return to constitutional government.

The coup highlights again the strange alliance between Castro and the rightwing military. Both wish democracy to fail, and both flourish when either can point to the other as the sole alternative. Opinion in this country is not prepared to accept this false logic. There can be only unreserved condemnation of a coup that heartens Havana and creates an ominous precedent.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 26, 1963]

THE COUP IN SANTO DOMINGO

The overthrow of President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic in still another Latin American rightwing military coup is an utterly deplorable event. Whatever Mr. Bosch's faults and weaknesses, he had been freely and fairly elected. His inauguration in February was a dawn of hope and freedom after more than three decades of bestial tyranny. Freedom has now been thrown away, as if it were a paltry gift.

The ostensible reasons for the coup have a stale sound—the usual accusations of procommunism, socialism, and mismanagement. Juan Bosch was a left-of-center intellectual in line with the democratic left represented by such leaders as President Betancourt of Venezuela and Gov. Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico. He made bad mistakes. Some of his chosen aids were very leftist. He tried to move too fast in transforming a rigidly autocratic social and economic structure, based on a business, landowning, and military elite, into a popular and democratic regime.

President Bosch was an amateur fighting professionals. He was capricious and unstable in some of his acts and tried to do too much himself. He failed to create a power structure first, and to build up popular support so that he could take strong measures of social and economic reform. He made powerful enemies and he seemed to be losing, in recent months, the once enthusiastic support of the United States. These were the mistakes of inexperience, compounded by misfortunes.

The coup d'etat is a severe blow to democracy in Latin America and a frightening development for the democratic Caribbean powers. Naturally, Castroite Cuba will rejoice, because a military dictatorship is a much easier target than a democracy. Guatemala (which also recently had a military coup that overthrew an elected President) and Nicaragua will likewise be happy to find a new recruit for military rule. Inside the Dominican Republic there will be a polarization of political forces.

The Alliance for Progress will be the No. 1 victim outside of the Dominican Republic. The Alliance is based on democratic principles and had set out to make the Dominican Republic a shining example of how to help a one-time dictatorship turn into a thriving democracy. Washington, having accepted the military coups in Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru (after initial protests) and Argentina, is in a weak situation.

A meeting for Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States should be called swiftly so that all the democratic forces in the hemisphere can be rallied to condemn this new threat to freedom in Latin America.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Sept. 27, 1963]

JOLTING DEFEAT FOR U.S. HOPES

This country's Latin American diplomacy suffered a disappointing setback in the coup which ousted Juan Bosch from the Dominican Republic's Presidency.

Bosch headed the first legally elected government which the Dominican Republic had lived under in 33 years. It was the third government to reign there since the tyrannical Generalissimo Trujillo's 30-year regime was overthrown with his assassination 28 months ago.

The deposed Bosch was described as an anti-Communist leftist. However, he was a leftist chiefly by the standards of a little land long accustomed to oligarch rule, one in which a few rich (including Trujillo) kept getting richer and the mass of poor got clubbed or shot if they resented abuse.

To provide a decent government and an economy bearing some hope for the ordinary man, it was inescapable that Bosch would have to make life much less comfortable for beneficiaries of the bad old order.

Though a man of rich intellect, Bosch apparently was lacking as a builder of the political strength necessary to give security to his administration. The so-called rightists—which in Latin American terminology means antidemocratic, entrenched reactionaries—removed him with brisk efficiency.

So for the moment, at least, the Dominican Republic has one of those regimes under which economic and social advance is considered insufferable radicalism—and which works for the defeat of everything the United States seeks to accomplish with the Alliance for Progress.

The immediate reaction in Washington was to suspend diplomatic relations. Meanwhile our hopes have taken a licking (they have received similar lickings in Guatemala, Ecuador, and Peru) and the people of the Dominican Republic may very well be back

where they started the day Trujillo was done in.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1963]

CRISIS IN THE CARIBBEAN

In the harsh afterlight of the military coup in the Dominican Republic, the United States is faced with a double problem. The first is a problem of principle, and it can be easily resolved. The overthrow of President Juan Bosch was a monstrous wrong, lacking even the tatter of justification that existed in Guatemala, Ecuador, and Argentina, other countries where the military ejected elected governments.

As a matter of principle, this country should refuse diplomatic recognition of the self-styled "rightest" junta that has seized power by force of arms. In terms of principle, the decision as to continuing economic aid is also clear. Aid should be denied, since the basic premise of the Alliance for Progress is to combine economic development, social reform, and constitutional methods.

As a practical matter, the junta may survive and the problem of a realistic accommodation to events would then arise. Some will say—indeed, the argument is already being advanced—that unpleasant as it may be, the Dominican people are somehow not ready for democracy and that as a lesser evil the United States should accept the military rulers on the grounds that this will assure stable government and an anti-Communist ally in the fight against Castroism.

The purported realism of this course deserves examination. Acceptance of the lesser-evil philosophy would be taken as a green light for military conspiracies in neighboring countries. Venezuela, already precarious, is a leading candidate for a coup—and if Venezuela should fall Colombia would be subjected to intense internal pressure and might well follow suit.

In Central America, three democratic republics—Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador—are already in jitters about possible conspiracies. In Nicaragua, the Somoza oligarchy is sponsoring the training of rightist Cuban exiles, allegedly an anti-Castro force. But Nicaragua's neighbors fear that the Cubans will really be used against the Central American democracies with the aim of creating a holy alliance of military dictatorships in the region. This is their sober apprehension, whether justified or not.

It would be hard to conceive a worse situation for the United States in the Caribbean than a polarization between ultraconservative military tyrannies and the ultrarevolutionary Cuban regime. A sort of Vietnamese nightmare of guerrilla warfare waged in our own backyard would be realized with a vengeance if the United States seemed to be backing an alliance of Trujillo as an alternative to Fidel Castro.

When rumors of an impending coup were spreading in Santo Domingo, the United States lost an opportunity to demonstrate forceful solidarity with the elected regime. A hope-for-the-best attitude has permeated U.S. policy in Santo Domingo. But one failure of imagination would be heaped on another if Washington should timidly acquiesce to the murder of Dominican democracy by seeming to say that the coup was a case of justifiable homicide.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 26, 1963]

TRUJILLO'S GHOST RETURNS

The military coup in the Dominican Republic has plunged that unhappy little Republic back into the throes of dictatorship from which it was struggling to emerge after more than 30 years of Trujillo tyranny. It makes the chaotic Caribbean even more explosive than before, even more inviting for the lighters of Communist fires.

Now both parts of the island of Hispaniola, shared by the Dominican Republic and Haiti, are under dictatorial rule. On the nearby island of Cuba sits Fidel Castro, whose offer of Communist dictatorship has been enhanced as an alternative to military dictatorship in these two republics.

A short jump away, on the northeastern tip of the South American Continent, is British Guiana, where Cheddi Jagan and his American-born wife, Janet, await the full independence of that territory so that they might carry it into the Soviet, or Cuban or at least neutralist camp.

Things are looking up for the Communists in the Caribbean. And they are looking down for us.

We cannot escape responsibility for our role in acquiescing in, if not actually cultivating, the Trujillo regime which turned the Dominican Republic into a feudal fief and left it a political and social wasteland. From that heritage, it was too much to expect a rapid transition to representative, democratic government.

President Bosch tried. He should be praised for the attempt. The officers who overthrew him together with the nation's democratic institutions are to be repudiated, as our State Department rightly has done by suspending diplomatic relations and economic aid.

We and the other American Republics cannot surrender to chaos and hopelessness—the allies of communism in the Caribbean. We have succeeded in persuading the military regimes of Argentina and Peru to withdraw. We must do the same in the case of the Dominican Republic if we are to avoid another Cuba.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Sept. 26, 1963]

SETBACK FOR DEMOCRACY

In severing diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, the State Department put the case succinctly: "Any overthrow of a democratically elected government is a loss to the policies of the countries of this hemisphere, including our own."

The military claims that it ousted President Juan Bosch to save the country from communism. That is balderdash. Bosch has been a fighting anti-Communist for years. His election 8 months ago was a signal triumph for the republic, for he became the first legally elected President since the early 1930's and was the people's choice after years of dictatorship imposed by the Trujillos.

The military coup leaders are acting in the tradition of foes of democracy. They declared a state of siege. They seized legally elected officials. They arrested everyone they considered a radical—by which they mean opponents of their course of action. Thus democracy in the Dominican Republic, so hopefully installed early this year, is again set aside. The new dictators promise new and free elections, of course—except that Bosch's Democratic Revolutionary Party and its allies, which form a political majority, are barred from participating in a provisional government or plans for naming a new one.

The history of military coups everywhere is not such as to lead anyone to expect that those who have seized power are likely to give it up easily or soon. Again democracy has received a setback in Latin America. Once more the citizens of the Dominican Republic are not the determiners of their own fate.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1963]

UNITED STATES SEEKS FIRM POLICY TOWARD LATIN COUPS

(By Dan Kurzman)

Administration officials appear to be divided over the question of U.S. policy toward the new military-run government of the Dominican Republic and toward Latin American military coups in general. They hope to resolve differences this weekend.

State Department officials are oriented, it seems, toward a "soft" policy, while other high administration leaders maintain flatly that they favor a "tough" line.

This hard approach was reflected in the disclosure yesterday that the United States had planned to dispatch a warship, probably the aircraft carrier *Okinawa*, to Dominican waters before the coup that overthrew President Juan Bosch took place.

This plan, which was decided on after Bosch made a desperate last-minute plea to U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin for help on learning of the imminence of a coup, was cancelled, however, because of hurricane conditions in the area.

But American warships, it is understood, are now positioned in the vicinity of the Dominican Republic.

U.S. officials maintain that the decision to send warships to the area—before and after the coup—was motivated only by the need to assure the protection of American citizens in the Dominican Republic in the event of violence. But the U.S. actions appear also to have been, and to be, intended as a show of force.

As the coup is already a fait accompli, the presence of the U.S. warships near Dominican shores could help to discourage the present leaders from taking any drastic measures against Bosch followers.

A further indication of the U.S. hard line was the recall yesterday of Ambassador Martin ostensibly for consultations.

Top State Department officials are taking the view that the United States should "wait and see" before deciding to take a strong stand against the new regime. They apparently feel that pledges of anticommunism and free elections in the foreseeable future should constitute the main requisites for the reestablishment of currently suspended U.S. diplomatic recognition and economic aid.

These conditions would be similar to those applied to military governments that have overthrown constitutional regimes in Peru, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador.

TOUGHER STAND SEEN

But other high administration officials feel that the Dominican coup was far more brutal and unjustifiable than in the other cases and indicate that the United States will take a much harder stand toward the new regime in that country.

They would like to see aid suspended indefinitely regardless of the behavior of this regime. Diplomatic relations would, if their view should prevail, be suspended for a long period. And when reestablished, ties would possibly be on a chargé d'affairs level as in Haiti.

Administration leaders are meeting this weekend in an attempt to hammer out differences and agree on a common approach. The all-important result could determine the general direction of American policy toward coups in the future.

Several Latin nations are anxiously awaiting the outcome as a key to their own fates. Venezuela, Honduras and Columbia are all threatened by military coups and strongly favor a tough U.S. policy as a deterrent. Costa Rica and El Salvador also favor such a policy.

OAS MEETING SOUGHT

Venezuela is expected to request a meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States possibly on Thursday to decide on whether to hold an OAS foreign ministers conference to determine measures for preventing new coups.

Only the five above-mentioned countries are expected to vote for a meeting of foreign ministers, but Venezuela, in particular, feels that the effort should be made. Mexico and Bolivia have broken ties with the Dominican

Republic, but stand on the principle of nonintervention.

Council President Gonzalo Facio, speaking in his capacity as Costa Rica's Ambassador to the United States, appealed to this county yesterday to aid militarily any Latin government that in the future may be threatened by a coup.

"If a constitutional government is in danger of being overthrown, it has a perfect right to ask for military aid," he said. "And the United States and other countries should give that aid. In the past, U.S. forces intervened against the interests of democracy to preserve nondemocratic regimes. Why should they not intervene now to save democracy?"

He added that since the United States has promised to help any country threatened by Castroism, even of the internal variety, this principle of preserving democracy by all necessary means could easily be extended to all kinds of dictatorship.

The junta reportedly sent Bosch into exile in Trinidad by slow boat yesterday. Departure plans were kept secret to minimize the chances of disorders.

TO TAKE 10 DAYS

The voyage was expected to take about 10 days, with the destination reported as either Europe or Trinidad. In the interval, the military obviously hope, passions will have cooled down sufficiently to blunt the effectiveness of the anti-junta speeches Bosch is likely to make when he is free. Junta leaders said that Hurricane Edith was responsible for his delayed departure.

In Washington, Dominican Ambassador Enriquillo A. del Rosario, who has resigned his post, and visiting Dominican Senator Thelma Frias appealed to the United States to send marines to rescue Bosch while at sea. They expressed fear for his safety while aboard the craft.

Senator Frias who as vice president of the Senate is the highest official in the Bosch administration not under arrest, said she would try to see President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Senators, Congressmen and other U.S. leaders. She would ask them, she said, to have U.S. warships blockade the Dominican Republic until and unless the junta permits the return of Bosch to power.

She will also urge the AFL–CIO to call on dockworkers to refuse to discharge cargo going to or coming from her country.

"If the United States and other countries in the hemisphere abandon us at this moment," the senator said, "democracy will soon disappear throughout Latin America."

In Santo Domingo, Angel Miolan, president of Bosch's Revolutionary Dominican Party, was detained by police after the alleged discovery of arms in his home and in that of an aunt.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

BOSCH AND WIFE ON WAY TO EXILE ABOARD A NAVY BOAT TO TRINIDAD

SANTO DOMINGO, September 28.—Deposed President Juan Bosch and his wife were dispatched by naval warship into exile to Trinidad tonight.

Bosch was escorted from the palace by Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera, chief of internal security. Imbert was in charge of Bosch's personal security.

With his wife he boarded the frigate Mella, flagship of the Dominican Navy. It sailed for Port of Spain on a voyage that should take about 10 days at slow cruise speed.

Because of reports that Bosch had been mistreated the ruling junta permitted a delegation from the diplomatic corps to visit him this afternoon. The Colombian Ambassador and the Argentine Chargé d'Affaires conferred with Bosch.

He assured them that he had not been mistreated but that he had declared himself on a hunger strike as long as he was a prisoner in the palace.

[From the Miami Herald]

WESSIN TAKES CREDIT FOR INITIATING COUP

SANTO DOMINGO, September 28.—Gen. Elias Wessin, 39-year-old son of an Arabian merchant who migrated here 40 years ago, admitted today that he started the coup that deposed President Juan Bosch.

"I initiated the plan and the other officers went with me," the general said.

It had been known that Wessin played a key role, but this was the first public admission that he put the whole thing together.

The general said the plan to oust the president was drafted July 13. All officers from major on up backed a showdown with Bosch at the San Isidoro base on that day.

"We told Bosch sincerely that the Dominican people and the armed forces were worried about the advance of communism," Wessin said. "I told him that if I took some measures to stop this advance the armed forces were going to back me up.

"From then on the situation went from bad to worse. We put the plan together in one day last July but waited a long time until we decided we could not wait any longer.

"The plan clicked off last Tuesday night with a final showdown about 11 in the palace. By morning Bosch was a prisoner and the country firmly under military control and a day later a civilian triumvirate was given the government reins."

Wessin called Bosch a Communist. "The way he worked here in the 7 months he was President all seems to indicate that he was a Communist," he said.

The general said the Communists had been trying to infiltrate the armed forces but it would never happen now.

He said steps had been taken to wipe out this infiltration and none would be permitted in the future.

"We have installed courses in religion in the armed forces," he said.

"The armed forces decided not to permit any dictatorship of the right or left. That is why all the army cooperated."

RED HALT CALLED IN AMERICAS

President Kennedy said yesterday that the United States and its Latin American neighbors "are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere."

And the way to be sure this does not happen, Mr. Kennedy said in a message to the Catholic Association for International Peace "is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism."

The association, now in annual conference here, gave its annual peace award yesterday to Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the U.S. Alliance for Progress program for economic and social development of Latin America.

From the Vatican came a message saying Pope Paul VI sent his blessings to the conference, and an expression of gratification for its theme: "The Christian Challenge in Latin America."

Mr. Kennedy, who is now traveling in the West, congratulated Moscoso on receiving the association's award, referred to him as "this most valued public servant." The association is connected with the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is an organization of U.S. bishops of the Roman Catholic Church.

The President's message to the conference did not mention Cuba by name in his reference to existence of a Communist state in this hemisphere.

He called Latin America "the most critical area in the world today," and recalled that he had previously used the same words.

"The critical situation in Latin America can best be met by the Alliance for Progress, a joint effort of the United States and the Republics of Latin America to stimulate economic growth and to provide better health and educational facilities and more adequate job opportunities for all of our neighbors south of the border," he said.

"Together, we are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere, and we know that the only really effective means to this end is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism.

"More than that, we realize that the United States has a responsibility in justice and charity to do what we can to make it possible for our neighbors in Latin America to enjoy a better life."

[From the New York Times]

DOMINICAN COUP STIRS NEW TENSION IN CARIBBEAN—OVERTHROW OF DEMOCRATIC REGIME OFFERS NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR CASTRO AND DEALS STRONG BLOW TO U.S. ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—In the stillness of the tropical dawn Wednesday, an experiment in democratic social revolution of crucial importance to the Western Hemisphere quietly died in the ancient Caribbean city of Santo Domingo.

Its death came when a group of Dominican generals and colonels, acting as the battering ram for a motley collection of ambitious rightist politicians and disgruntled businessmen, ousted President Juan D. Bosch after 7 months in his elective office.

THREE EFFECTS

The bloodless revolution, described by its leaders as the road to the creation of a "rightest state" in the Dominican Republic, produced three simultaneous and highly negative effects on three different but intimately related levels.

These can be defined in this way:

1. On the national level, it set back the Dominican Republic politically to where it stood in May 1961, when the old dictator, Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, was assassinated after 31 years in power. Socially and economically, it nipped in the bud the once bright promise of democratic reform.

2. On the regional level, it removed from the Caribbean what may have emerged as the pivot of stability in that desperately troubled area.

3. On the hemispheric level, it dealt the Alliance for Progress the most destructive body blow it had suffered in its short and uncertain life.

SHOCKED REACTION

The shock and the sense of gloom that the anti-Bosch coup set off in Washington and in many Latin American capitals stemmed from the realization that the action of the Dominican military had gone far to compromise the cardinal principle of the Alliance. That principle is that economic and social development is possible within the framework of democratic freedoms.

In the hemispheric sense, the Bosch upset was particularly painful because, at least to the Kennedy administration, the Dominican Republic had loomed as the golden opportunity to prove—in contrast to neighboring Communist Cuba—that a progressive democracy could be built on the ruins of an oppressive dictatorship.

But if the reaction in this broad, hemispheric context was thus basically philosophical and ideological, in the more immediate Caribbean terms it presaged an even greater unrest and, quite probably a hefty assist to the cause of Cuba's Premier Fidel Castro.

BREEDING GROUND

More than any other area in Latin America—and in a sense resembling the prewar condition of the Balkans in Europe—the Caribbean region has been a breeding ground for revolutions, war and general agitation since even before its Republics gained their independence in the 19th century.

In the recent past, these political storms have been born over the Caribbean to lash out at the rest of the hemisphere. Premier Castro's initial Cuban-Caribbean revolution has deeply affected the United States and Latin America—nearly leading, in fact, to a nuclear world war less than a year ago. In another way, the Dominican democratic experiment was intended to serve as an inspiring example to the whole continent; and its sudden collapse has cast a pall over the future of the Alliance for Progress.

Under the circumstances, everything that happens in the Caribbean—and in its political components—has an immediate and drastic impact on the rest of the hemisphere. It is in this light, then, that the present tension in the Caribbean must be seen.

WIDENING EFFECTS

At the time President Bosch was being ousted, the Caribbean was going through one of its most agitated periods in history. But no single, all-embracing diagnosis could be offered in explanation of this state of affairs. It was, rather, the combination of all the old pressures of political immaturity, economic inadequacy, social protest, and the peculiarly volatile Caribbean temperament born from the crisscrossing of cultures and races and the stimulus of the revolutionary age.

For all the practical purposes, the Caribbean—as a geopolitical concept—could no longer be restricted to its angry islands in the sun. Nowadays, the Central American isthmus and the countries of South America's northern shore, bathed by the Caribbean, had to be included in it.

Cuba, of course, remained the central fact of Caribbean life, but her own character was changing sharply as the fifth anniversary of her revolution approached.

Politically, she lives in a growing isolation, not only from the hemisphere and the Western World, but also from the mainstream of the Communist movement. The Soviet-Chinese split and the detente between the United States and the Soviet Union abruptly forced Premier Castro into a neutral position in the Communist controversy.

Refusing to sign the partial nuclear test ban treaty, to go along with the Soviet concept of coexistence, and to reconsider his advocacy of violent revolution, which Moscow now opposes, Dr. Castro busied himself encouraging the so-called Chinese revolutionary position in Latin America. As his power among the Soviet-oriented Communist Parties in the hemisphere began to wane, he concentrated on Venezuela, where leftist terrorists were attempting to force a military coup d'etat, hoping that it would rally that country behind an extremist, "patriotic" revolution.

POSSIBLE REACTIONS

The failure, thus far, of this operation has tarnished further Premier Castro's image at home and abroad at a time when his revolutionary economy is limping badly and required a drastic return to dependence on sugar. But this week's Dominican military coup seemed to offer Cuba new opportunities in a country much closer to her shores than Venezuela. Dominican generals may well have done Dr. Castro's work for him, and chances are he will capitalize on the new dictatorship next door.

The theory that military coups tend to benefit communism—or Castroism—applies elsewhere in the Caribbean as it did in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic. Guatemala has been under military rule since last April. And the Dominican coup immediately raised the fear that it might be imitated in Venezuela, Honduras, and El Salvador. Democratic societies in these Republics were sufficiently weak, the military sufficiently shortsighted and the politicians sufficiently ambitious to make such a falling-dominoes effect plausible.

RISING PRESSURES

Costa Rica, for 15 years a working democracy, suspected that her neighbor Nicaragua's arming of anti-Castro exiles was more a menace to Costa Rica than to Cuba. Panama was approaching a difficult presidential election and the pressures there, too, were rising.

Back in the center of the Caribbean, the straight dictatorship of President Francois Duvalier in Haiti succeeded in surviving all the internal and external attempts to oust it. Ironically, President Bosch, who tried hard to overthrow the Duvalier regime in the name of perhaps excessively aggressive democracy, was the first to fall at the hands of his own military. But the potential for explosion goes on rising in Haiti.

TENSIONS IN GUIANA

On the South American coast, tiny British Guiana, ruled by a Marxist premier although still unable to win independence from the Crown, increasingly worries Washington, which fears repetition of the Cuban experience there. Political and racial tensions, often erupting into violence, are again running high.

This, then, is the troubled Caribbean picture as the Dominican reverts to a makeshift military dictatorship and thereby adds fuel to the fires of the area's unrest.

But with the failure of the Dominican democratic experiment there seems little that the United States or the rest of Latin America will or can do in the foreseeable future to stabilize the Caribbean situation.

Although a half-dozen governments are pressing for action through the Organization of American States to control the spread of military coups, the majority opposes it. As an inspirational political source, the Alliance for Progress offers no visible leverage, busy as it is licking its Dominican wounds.

DISTURBING CHOICE

As for the United States, it faces the disturbing choice of withholding indefinitely economic aid and diplomatic recognition to military regimes—a policy that backfired in Haiti and Peru—or of rationalizing the emergence of the army governments and readmitting them to the fold, as it did earlier this year with Guatemala and Ecuador.

But nothing promises more effectively to bury the democratic aims of the Alliance for Progress than this course of action. And except for the United States and a few Latin American governments, nobody seems to care.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1963]

DOMINICAN JUNTA SWORN IN AS POLICE BATTLE STUDENTS

(By Henry Raymont)

SANTO DOMINGO, September 26.—A three-man civilian junta was sworn in today to govern the Dominican Republic while riot squads battled students demanding the return of the deposed president, Dr. Juan D. Bosch.

In a hurriedly improvised ceremony at the presidential palace, the junta ostensibly received executive powers from the military leaders who seized control of the country before dawn yesterday. Dr. Bosch and members of his cabinet were arrested.

(In Washington U.S. officials viewed the naming of the junta as a temporary expedient in the face of a power struggle.)

The swearing-in ceremony touched off rioting and arrests of scores of teenaged students who are known to sympathize with the leftwing 14th of June movement.

Many moderates here feared that the coup would attract a new following to the movement, which is now becoming the standard bearer for restoration of the constitutional regime it frequently attacked while Dr. Bosch was in power.

COMMUNISM CHARGED

The military described the Bosch regime yesterday as "corrupt and pro-Communist" and said that it had acted to crush "Castro communism."

The junta is headed by Dr. Emilio de Los Santos, the former president of the electoral college. Seven months ago the college pronounced Dr. Bosch to be the first constitutionally elected president in 38 years.

The other members are Manuel Enrique Tavares Espaillat, a wealthy, 40-year-old industrialist and a graduate of Yale University, and Ramon Tapia Espinal, 37, a lawyer and a former member of the ruling council of state that preceded the Bosch regime.

Shortly after the junta took its oath of office, hundreds of students assembled at the university to protest the coup. Mounted policemen broke up the meeting.

At the same time groups of students began to barricade the streets of Ciudad Nueva, a section of workers' homes in the center of the city.

Squads of policemen wearing gas masks arrived in riot trucks and occupied much of the district. There were several clashes. One woman was hurt by a bullet.

Crowds gathered at the scene of the clashes. They booed the policemen and when trucks from the Government sugar refinery drove past, bystanders called on the workers to strike.

Some of the tear gas from the Ciudad Nueva encounters was carried into the heart of Santo Domingo by strong winds that battered the ocean front in advance of Hurricane Edith.

There were no disturbances evident around the palace where the inaugural ceremony took place at 1 p.m. (2 p.m. eastern daylight time). The ceremony lasted 5 minutes.

A televison commentator in an open-collared sports shirt acted as master of ceremonies. No diplomatic representatives were present.

Representatives of the three major opposition parties that supported the coup, military leaders and newsmen, a total of about 60 persons, witnessed the ceremony in the diplomatic reception room of the presidential palace.

It was the same room, where, on February 27, President Bosch received thousands of well-wishers, including Vice President JOHNSON.

It was hoped then that the Bosch regime would mark the beginning of a long period of democracy after the assassination in 1962 of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina. His death ended a 30-year dictatorship.

Today, one floor away from the swearing-in ceremony, the ousted president was a political prisoner. He was reported to be stubbornly resisting efforts to persuade him to sign a resignation statement that would make the junta legal.

BOSCH'S WIFE RETURNS

The President's wife flew here from San Juan this morning to see her husband and to demand guarantees that he would suffer no harm. She was promised that he would be safe, but there was no information on what the junta planned to do with Dr. Bosch and the members of his ousted Cabinet. The men are being held in separate rooms on the third floor of the palace under heavy guard.

The only speaker at the swearing-in ceremony, other than the television announcer, was Maj. Gen. Victor Elby Viñas Román, the

armed forces minister in the Bosch government. He and the chiefs of staff of the army, air force, and navy led the coup d'etat yesterday.

General Viñas Román spoke briefly of the "sacred commitment" the armed forces had undertaken to save the Dominican Republic from what he charged was administrative disorganization and a "soft" policy toward communism.

The United States fears that the ouster of Dr. Bosch will strengthen, not weaken Communist activities in the Dominican Republic.

General Viñas Román said it was up to the three civilian leaders to assume the responsibility of "defining our true democratic ideals and returning the country on the road toward its high destiny."

As he spoke, the military leaders stood in uniform in a solid line behind the three civilians, who were seated at a table covered with a green felt cloth.

The radio announcer, Thomas Reyes Cerda, read a detailed account of yesterday's coup and the biographies of the members of the junta. Mr. Cerda is a well-known anti-Communist.

The junta program calls for it to govern for 2 years, after which it would hold elections.

After the swearing-in ceremony, Col. Elia Wessing y Wessing was promoted to brigadier general. A diehard opponent of left-wing elements who took issue with the political orientation of the Bosch government, General Wessing y Wessing is regarded as one of the most powerful men in the new regime.

The other top military leaders are Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera and Gen. Luis Amiama Tio, survivors of the plot against General Trujillo.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1963]

UNITED STATES SEES POWER STRUGGLE

WASHINGTON, September 26.—U.S. officials believe a struggle for power has developed in the Dominican Republic.

Today's appointment of a three-man civilian junta was considered to be a temporary expedient. Officials here doubted that the junta could actually govern the country.

The impression among U.S. officials and Latin American diplomats was that the junta was primarily a front for Gen. Imbert Barrera, who is regarded as the chief power behind the coup and as the virtual dictator of the Dominican Republic.

Because of the uncertain situation, the administration is refraining from formulating any long-range policies toward the new regime.

Yesterday the United States suspended diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and announced that it had halted economic aid to the country.

Although he never enjoyed support among most of the military, Gen. Imbert Barrera was able in the last 2 years to gain almost complete control over the heavily armed, 12,000-man police force.

He was said to have enjoyed the full allegiance of Col. Belisario Peguero, the police commander.

The United States has helped to develop the police force into a modern, anti-riot contingent. U.S. police specialists trained the force through the Administration for International Development at a cost of $429,000.

The support of air force tank units was reported to have come to Gen. Imbert Barrera through Col. Wessin y Wessin. Colonel Wessin plotted against President Bosch earlier this year and is believed to have given his allegiance to Gen. Imbert Barrera.

Diplomatic reports assert that the coup—for which most of the military chiefs were not ready—occurred as a result of a confrontation between the generals and President Bosch over Colonel Wessin's fate.

It was understood that President Bosch had summoned the military chiefs to the palace late Tuesday night to demand that Colonel Wessin be removed. Otherwise, Dr. Bosch said, he would resign.

The military chiefs, fearing that their acceptance of the Bosch ultimatum might have created a dangerous precedent, were reported to have told him to resign.

Gen. Imbert Barrera was then reported to have seized control and ordered the coup.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 29, 1963]

DOMINICAN RULERS WILL RELAX CURBS

(By Henry Raymont)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 28.—The Dominican Republic's civilian junta prepared today to lift the siege imposed last Wednesday after the armed forces overturned the government of President Juan D. Bosch.

An order ending the 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew was reported to have been signed at the presidential palace at noon as part of a general relaxation of security measures by the three-man provisional government.

The national police, under the orders of Gen. Belisario Peguero Guerrero, continued to round up Dominicans they suspected of Communist connections. At least 30 persons, including members of the former Bosch Government, were taken to the airport to be deported.

The junta was preparing the outline of a political program it intends to submit to the United States and to the other Latin American countries in the hope of overcoming their reluctance to extend diplomatic recognition to the de facto regime.

The program was known to emphasize dedication to democracy, national reconciliation and the early restoration of constitutional rule. Some commentators forecast difficulty for the junta in convincing the hemispheric nations that it was necessary to depose an elected government.

The United States and most Latin American missions here have strong reservations about the new government, even though to some diplomats the composition of the coalition cabinet offered hope that the new leaders would attempt to return the country to constitutional rule in less than the 2 years forecast by Dr. Emilio de Los Santos, head of the junta.

The reservations about recognition are based on the belief that it could encourage further military coups in Latin America.

UNITED STATES RECALLS AMBASSADOR

The U.S. Ambassador, John Bartlow Martin, was called home by the State Department, at noon today, and his departure was said to be imminent.

Mexico, usually swift to accept de facto regimes, took the unusual step of ordering home its entire diplomatic mission.

Dr. Bosch made a state visit to Mexico last week in defiance of threats that a military conspiracy was in the making. He even jested about the danger at the airport before leaving to attend Mexico's independence celebrations.

Mexico's Ambassador, Ernesto Soto Reyes, has been instructed to leave the Dominican Republic as soon as he can turn over a group of political refugees in his Embassy to another mission.

Similar instructions have been received by the envoys of Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Venezuela.

REFUGEES QUIT EMBASSIES

Several members of the Dominican revolutionary party and the 14th of June movement, who took refuge in Latin American embassies immediately after the coup, returned to their homes last night and this morning, after the junta announced that the two parties could continue to participate in the country's political life.

The outflow stopped abruptly this afternoon when it was learned that Angel Miolan, president of the Dominican revolutionary party, had been arrested shortly after he left the Colombian Embassy.

Those taken to the airport for deportation included a former Cabinet member, Diego Bordas, and Alfredo Manzano, a member of the 14th of July movement.

YACHT TO DEPORT PRESIDENT

The government plans to place Dr. Bosch on the frigate *Mella*, a converted luxury yacht, which is to take him to Trinidad. Departure was tentatively set for 1 a.m. tomorrow. Dr. Bosch's wife, Mrs. Carmen Quidiello de Bosch, who is living at the Chilean Embassy, was expected to join him aboard ship.

A government source said the warship would cruise the Caribbean 4 or 5 days before touching land to delay giving Dr. Bosch an opportunity to make statements critical of the new regime. He is expected to seek political asylum in Venezuela.

Santo Domingo enjoyed a calm and sunny day after yesterday's squalls and gales from Hurricane Edith, which flooded parts of the country.

Reactions to the new political situation were mixed. Despite threats of violence by student groups and sporadic strikes by some government workers, the overwhelming feeling seems to be one of stoic resignation.

Many Dominicans who were dissatisfied with Dr. Bosch's government would have preferred to fight him within the democratic process of the established institutions.

One major preoccupation of moderates here was that the national police force, which was reluctant to accept orders even under the Bosch government, would move indiscriminately against political opponents of the new regime on the pretext of fighting communism.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post & Times Herald Sept. 30, 1963]

U.S. URGED TO RESTORE BOSCH RULE—GRUENING, ENVOY HERE, SUGGESTING USE OF FORCE

(By Dan Kurzman)

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, said yesterday that the United States "should take whatever steps are necessary" to remove deposed President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic from the vessel carrying him into exile and return him to power.

This statement, which the Senator expects to elaborate upon today on the Senate floor, would presumably mean that the United States should use marines as a last resort to achieve this end. Such a policy, GRUENING feels, is the only way to save the Alliance for Progress.

At the same time, Enriquillo A. del Rosario, Dominican Ambassador in Washington, wired President Kennedy yesterday requesting similar U.S. measures. Although he refuses to represent the military junta that ousted Bosch last week, del Rosario still considers himself Ambassador of the legal Dominican Government, headed by Bosch, and telegraphed President Kennedy in that capacity.

U.S. ENVOY RETURNS

These efforts to toughen U.S. policy toward the military junta came as U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin returned yesterday from Santo Domingo for consultations. His return apparently also reflects U.S. displeasure with the coup.

Martin is meeting with top officials here to help them decide on U.S. policy toward the Dominican Republic. Top State Department officials are believed to be taking a soft stand toward the military regime, while

other high administration leaders favor a hard approach.

GRUENING, whose interest in Latin America dates back to 1933 when he helped inaugurate President Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy at Montevideo, Uruguay, said the United States must "intercept the vessel on which President Bosch is a prisoner and bring him back so that he may complete his term."

NO ALTERNATIVE POSSIBLE

The Senator said that "no alternative is possible without disaster, not only to the Dominican Republic, but to the entire Alliance program and to the prestige of the United States in this hemisphere."

In the event that the junta, as is probable, should oppose U.S. action, GRUENING added, "the United States should take whatever steps are necessary to secure compliance."

GRUENING strongly condemned the State Department's role in the present crisis. "Unless the policymakers in the State Department show the courage and guts which they have not shown hitherto," he said, "thereby implementing the declared policy of President Kennedy, not only will the Alliance for Progress be finished, but Latin America will go down the drain.

"We have here the most flagrant case on record of an honestly and freely elected government overthrown by a sordid, power-seeking military junta operating in the worst traditions of Latin American dictatorships."

The Senator expressed the fear that after the preliminary gesture of cutting diplomatic relations and economic aid, the State Department will shortly resort to a face-saving formula geared to the usual promise that at some future date an election will be held.

Such an election, he charged, would be a farce, and represent abject surrender to the Latin American militarists.

GRUENING made it clear that any action the United States might take should come only in response to the request of the constitutional Bosch government. He said that Ambassador del Rosario, the legal representative of the Bosch government here, can properly speak for him.

The Senator said that fears that such action might presage a return to the discredited U.S. gunboat diplomacy of the past are unjustified. U.S. interventions early this century in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Mexico and Nicaragua, he said, were "*authorized against* the will of the governments and people of the countries invaded." In the present situation, however, a legal, democratic government would request such intervention.

Del Rosario, in his wire to President Kennedy, said: "As the Ambassador of the legal Government of the Dominican Republic to the United States, I feel it is my duty to request that the U.S. Government, with the help of other friendly governments, take whatever measures are necessary to remove President Juan Bosch from the vessel taking him into exile, return him to the Dominican Republic, and restore to him the Presidential powers granted him in a free election by the Dominican people.

"Such action, in righting a monstrous wrong, would be in keeping with the principles of the Alliance for Progress, which, as you have so often stated, cannot succeed unless democracy is nurtured and safeguarded in Latin America."

Bosch on Saturday night was put aboard a navy frigate believed headed for some Caribbean destination. Venezuela has reportedly sent a warship and planes to follow the vessel to deter Dominican soldiers from possibly assassinating Bosch at sea.

Meanwhile, in Washington, Arturo Calventi, the Dominican Republic's Ambassador to the Organization of American States, resigned yesterday in protest against the coup.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in effect I urged that the United States send a destroyer to intercept the vessel carrying President Bosch into exile and order it to return him to the Dominican Republic. I would advise, also, Mr. President, that if the vessel does not heed such an order that it be boarded, President Bosch be taken from it and returned, under U.S. protection, to the Dominican Republic.

This is not, I must point out, a return to the days of gunboat diplomacy. At the time, I deplored and spoke and wrote against that. In those cases—when we intervened in the early days of the century in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Mexico—we intervened without any request from, and against the wishes of, their duly constituted governments and their peoples. That is not the case in this instance. Moreover, this would not be a violation of any treaty commitment against intervention. We would not be intervening. We would be fulfilling a request for help from the authorized representative of a duly constituted government. We would be doing no more—indeed far less—than we did when we sent the 6th Fleet and landed Marines in Lebanon at that country's duly constituted Government's request.

The duly accredited Ambassador of the Dominican Republic has made directly to the President the request for assistance from the United States. We should heed that request. The time has come to act with speed and determination to save the Alliance for Progress.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I highly commend the Senator from Alaska. He is performing another outstanding service for the country. His logic is devastating. If we permit the military coup in the Dominican Republic to succeed, the chances for the success of the Alliance for Progress will be very dim indeed. The Senator has delivered a most impressive speech. I should like to ask the Senator if he will yield for a few questions.

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the first place, the Senator from Alaska suggests a most unusual step on our part, namely, that we intercept the Dominican warship and that we return President Bosch to the Dominican Republic. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any precedent for this kind of action.

Mr. GRUENING. There is no precedent exactly for this particular kind of intervention, where the legitimate head of a country has been taken prisoner. However, there is a close analogy with what happened in Lebanon.

There we were asked by its Government for help. We were asked for military help by the President of Lebanon. We sent the 6th Fleet and we landed marines. We performed a service that the constituted Government had asked us to perform. It was fearful that it might be overthrown. This episode and U.S. performance in it a few short years ago is as close an analogy in recent times as one can find. I believe it is a good analogy. In this case of the Dominican Republic it is even more applicable because we have a particular and vital interest to support the Dominican Republic in connection with the Alliance for Progress, and indeed because we assisted in the rebirth of what we hoped to be a free, democratically governed state.

We could very easily have disregarded the request from Lebanon, but we did not do so. In the case of Lebanon as a result of our intervention there was no overthrow of the constituted government. So in this case the analogy with which I urge we do in the Caribbean is extremely applicable, because this is a much more flagrant case and at our doorstep.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's answer is convincing. He speaks about a request to this Government. That request comes from the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic. I take it that there has been no word at all from President Bosch himself. Is that correct? Has he been held incommunicado?

Mr. GRUENING. No word could come from him. He has been cut off from outside communication. He has indeed been held incommunicado. He is a prisoner on the vessel on which he is being held. However, we know he refused to resign voluntarily. He went on a hunger strike in protest against his arrest. He was completely opposed and resistant to the effort to put him out of office. He is being held a prisoner against his will by military gangsters. He cannot speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator if to his knowledge President Bosch has had any opportunity to make such a request. The reason I labor the point is that it is extremely important in the case of an intervention that the request to intervene should be made by the constituted government. We have to be absolutely safeguarded against any possibility that through our intervention we could be charged with imposing a puppet against the will of the people of a country.

It is for this reason that I press the Senator with the question as to whether there has been any indication that President Bosch himself has expressed a desire to return and a willingness to have the United States help him return.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that we must be overcautious in not appearing unasked, on our own initiative to intervene and imposing someone against the wishes of the Dominican people. Mr. Bosch has not been free to speak. I have conversed with our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Mr. John Barlow Martin. He told me that President Bosch had been fearful of such an occurrence—the military coup—and that

the United States tried to prevent it. It remains to be demonstrated what effort was made to prevent the occurrence, whether we had been fully apprised of what was about to take place, and whether we could have stopped it. I feel we could have and should have.

In answer to the Senator's question, when the vessel on which Bosch, a prisoner, is being carried into exile, is intercepted, President Bosch can be asked that question. If—free from duress, with no pistol at his back—he says, "No; I do not want to go back; I want to go to exile," we should have performed our duty as a government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to have that clarification. The Senator has performed a great service. It is important for us to realize that if the Alliance for Progress is to work, it must be based on genuine reforms and democracy, and on the kind of government that will have the interest of all the people of the country at heart, not a military dictatorship which is set up for the power and enrichment of a few.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I associate myself with the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin. At the same time I compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alaska for the needed public service he has rendered by making his fine statement today. In answer to the interrogation by the Senator from Wisconsin, I feel that he indicated that President Bosch is a firm, determined man and that he did not yield to force and did not voluntarily resign. I join the Senator in the feeling that since we tried to prevent this usurpation through our appropriate officials, and that, having failed, it is high time that we exert the efforts of this great Nation to try to prevent this wrong from being continued.

We Americans had a feeling of pride when in the Dominican Republic there was a fair election by the citizens of that unfortunate little country, which was created by the Almighty to be a garden spot of the world, but due to the depravity and tyranny of man had become the cesspool and slum of the Western Hemisphere.

As Senators know, the election of Senor Bosch as President was hailed as an indication that the Dominican Republic was proceeding to a future of democracy and freedom. There was hope that bloodshed and terror were things of the past.

Recently, all this was toppled into dust by a military takeover. Three militarists usurped the power granted President Bosch by popular will. It is now reported that he has been bundled off as a prisoner on a Dominican naval vessel, en route to exile in a foreign land. The best that can be said for the military junta, which immediately suspended all civil liberties in that unhappy island, is that they did not murder President Bosch, the civilian head of state in that neighboring nation.

What are the duties of our State Department relative to this island, so close to our shores, inhabited by descendants of those patriots who fought bravely for freedom against French tyranny more than 150 years ago, as the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who is an outstanding historian, knows probably better than does any other Member of this body. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Alaska that our duty is clear. We should associate ourselves with the freedom-loving people of all the Latin American Republics to take action and see to it that President Bosch is restored to office until such time as the citizens of the Dominican Republic in a free election decree otherwise. A Fascist dictatorship is now emerging where we had considered that the people had spoken and had elected a President who took the oath of office in a republic modeled after our own United States.

As the distinguished Senator from Alaska has hindered in his excellent address, had the Communists usurped power instead of this Fascist outfit, there would probably have been an uproar in the United States and a demand that we send in our military and air power to restore the duly elected President.

Is our Government doing enough by merely refusing recognition to the Fascist regime? We have sponsored the Alliance for Progress for the welfare of freedom-loving people of the Western Hemisphere and to accelerate the progress of our sister Latin American Republics of Central and South America. Are we responding to the demands of the times if we fail to remove these Fascist usurpers by persuasion, or by force, if necessary?

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his forthright statement.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his helpful contribution to this discussion.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska be yielded an additional 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I have listened with much interest to the audacious and provocative proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Alaska. It is characteristic of him to seize the initiative and to take a position that is refreshingly bold. It is a position, I feel certain, that is not likely to be found in any of the cautious position papers of the State Department. For this, I wish to commend him.

However, I should like to know if he does not agree with me that the action he proposes is peculiarly within the power of the President alone to take, and whether, in view of this, the Senator has undertaken to communicate his proposal to the President, prior to the time of making his address on the Senate floor.

Mr. GRUENING. The President was not in the city last night, but I communicated with one very close to him and requested that this proposal be transmitted to the President. I was assured that it would be transmitted promptly.

Mr. CHURCH. I was certain that the Senator from Alaska would have taken that precaution. However, as a matter of record, it ought to be clearly understood that if he did so, inasmuch as it is Executive action for which he is calling today.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot, out of hand, endorse all that the Senator from Alaska has proposed. At the very least, I would have to reserve judgment upon the question of attempting to reestablish the Bosch regime in the Dominican Republic, through an external American intervention, because such action would be fraught with peril, and the prospect of adverse repercussions needs to be carefully considered.

However, the Senator's proposal that we intercept the gunboat that is now taking the duly-elected constitutional President of the Dominican Republic into exile, and free him from his abductors has great appeal to me. I should think it could be done with a view to providing President Bosch with asylum in the United States. I believe such a gesture would make it dramatically plain to the people of Latin America that the United States holds a duly-elected President in high regard and looks with stern rebuke upon the forcible overthrow of constitutional government by military juntas.

As the Senator from Alaska has so well said, we have seen constitutional governments deposed in Argentina, in Peru, in Ecuador, and now in the Dominican Republic, within the past 2 years. We have grave reason to suspect a similar overthrow may be attempted against President Betancourt, in Venezuela.

The American position respecting these seizures has not been sufficiently firm. It would be in the best traditions of this Republic for the President to direct a rescue of the kind suggested by the Senator from Alaska, making it emphatically clear to the people of South America that the U.S. Government upholds constitutional authority, and looks with grave misgivings upon the forcible overthrow of constitutional government by military means.

The proposed rescue of President Bosch, who is now a prisoner on the high seas, is something due him, and something that would have a dramatic and constructive effect throughout Latin America. In this part of his proposal, the Senator from Alaska has made an imaginative and tenable suggestion, and I commend him for it.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I welcome his contribution. His suggestion, which is comparable, in part, with what I propose, really might be considered a step in the direction of fulfillment, because if we were to rescue President Bosch, we would offer him asylum in the United States. Of course,

he would have to be given freedom of choice with respect to the country to which he might wish to go, provided he was forcibly expelled, against his will. This would give us an opportunity to talk with him and to determine whether his view coincides with that of the only legally remaining representative of the Dominican Republic in the United States, the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic, who has specifically requested that President Bosch be rescued from the vessel and restored to his office.

Clearly, the situation requires something better than the supine and spineless compromises of the past. Moreover, there is a very pertinent precedent in what we did in Lebanon. There we intervened militarily, with a fleet and with Marines, which we landed, although under circumstances not nearly so compelling as these in the Dominican Republic; the President of Lebanon feared a disturbance which might drive him from office and wanted some reinforcements. We acceded to his request.

This situation in the Caribbean is much more atrocious. If we do not do this, I believe the alternatives are very grave.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] referred to my proposal as "audacious and provocative." But the Declaration of Independence was also an audacious and provocative proposal. Nearly every important move for progress or to rectify grave wrongs has, at the time, been deemed an audacious and provocative proposal.

If we do not do this, we might as well forget the Alliance for Progress and our hopes of seeing it gradually develop under free and democratic regimes in Latin America.

As the Senator from Idaho has well pointed out, the present situation is really an inducement, almost a provocation, to similar uprisings in Venezuela, against Betancourt; or in Colombia; or in any other Latin American country where a serious and honest attempt is being made to establish a successful combination of the democratic system and economic resuscitation under the Alliance for Progress.

I very much hope the administration will not—as it has done in the past—first say, "We will not recognize this power-hungry group of usurpers; we will deny them economic aid," but then, in 3 or 4 weeks, devise a face-saving formula by which it will say, "Well, they promise to be good boys, and they will hold another election in a few months." The election in Santo Domingo has been held—the freest election which possibly could be held. But if the present group remains in power no such election can be held in the future. In that event, we might as well kiss the Alliance for Progress goodby, and invite the criticism and opposition of almost every Member of Congress who feels that we are simply wasting our money and enthroning dictatorships, and thus using American taxpayers' dollars for purposes wholly alien to the purposes and aims of the administration.

So I believe that the alternatives to our not taking this action are of far graver import.

An analogous situation confronted us in connection with the test ban treaty. It does involve some risks, but those of us who voted for it felt that, on balance, the risks were negligible, when compared with the benefits. I believe that is also the case in connection with the situation in the Dominican Republic. Inaction or inadequate action will be disastrous.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DUAL RAIL RAPID TRANSIT FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a problem that has been concerning many urban areas of the United States is that of mass transportation. The Congress has passed legislation to try to help solve some of these problems.

Considerable research and work has been done by various private companies toward improving urban mass transportation.

The Duorail Aerospace Rapid Transit Corp. is one company that has been active in this field. It has developed a system of dual rail rapid transit which the company feels will meet the need for fast, economical transportation.

Recently this company presented a study which it had made. I believe it will be interesting to those who are concerned with this problem. Accordingly, I ask that this study be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

Duorail Aerospace Rapid Transit Corp., otherwise known as the DART Corp., respectfully submits for your consideration a brief study of urban mass transportation, the inherent problems and costs, together with a plan to improve every adverse condition of this unprecedented situation. Considerable material has already been contributed on the subject, that detailed elaboration on its symptoms and wastes will not be necessary here except for clarity or to bring certain aspects into sharper focus.

DART is honored for the privilege of offering a solution to a matter that portends to worsen if proper measures are not taken now. The subject is of major concern to us all.

The movement of people and material constitutes the very lifeblood of today's society.

A look at yesterday still fills us with a splendid wonder at the hardships that have been overcome and the progress that has been attained by evolving the principles of the wheel. Those who will come after us will look back in like manner to judge our progress from here onward. They will probably agree that what confronts us was even more complex and unwieldy than the hardships that confronted our forefathers. Its disposition is ours now even more than those who will succeed us. Proper planning today gives us direction for tomorrow. In our opinion, any other kind is costly and must be scrapped because of the staggering time loss and wasted funds. We must be credited with conscientious, deliberate, leadership—exercising preventative measures as well as corrective ones based on keen insight and study.

The automobile, the very root of our problem, will never be considered a mistake or that should now be abandoned, or that it should never have been invented. None of us will revert back to travel by the saddle or the buggy. Each preceding system of travel was the forerunner of the next, all still existing side by side, controlled by the laws of expediency and demand. It is expedient today that a new medium of transportation be introduced to relieve and supplement those that have gone before it. DART feels that this medium is embodied within its own concept.

The stark fact is that after many years of production of all kinds of vehicles, road and highway development and repairs hardly keeps pace. Another 7 million vehicles will be added to the over 87 million that now tour our roads and highways. Multiply 7 million by 15-foot length of the average automobile of today, then divide by 5,280 feet (1 mile) and that totals 20,000 miles of autobiles, bumper to bumper. The logistics can be projected much further.

Add the above condition to an already predicted skyrocketing population buildup that multiply metropolitan and urban complexities and you have in the making more of the same arterial traffic strife that now concerns us.

Congestion is a symptom of the growing inadequacy of ground travel. This steady growth sabotages progress and drains billions of dollars every year.

Freeways built at tremendous cost take up considerable space and suffer shameful inadequacy as soon as they become familiar routes. By themselves they cannot solve transportation problems. Everyone is aware that they sometimes become superparking lots capturing thousands of automobiles and drivers and robbing them of hours of time and subjecting them to anxiety and frustration.

Public transportation is largely implemented by rubber-tired vehicles challenging other vehicles, suffering the same kind of losses that cannot be absorbed, therefore must be charged to the consumer, who abandons the service after a trial realizing that there are no timesaving schedules.

Today travel must be accepted in its true economic context, as a necessary, time-loss expense; a means to an end. The loss of public transportation systems, in spite of their growing need, is the strongest proof of their inadequacy. This has in itself been adding to the strife it once overcame.

The harassment of ground travel media points up vividly that public transportation must not be subjected to the normal or other travel problems if it must necessarily survive and perform public service to all.

Public transportation has slowly destroyed itself and complicated an already serious problem because of its inability to earn a profit. It is not enough for public transportation to exist, it should thrive profitably like other responsible businesses. It should fulfill its function to the public it serves. Because of the inadequacy of its equipment, it is giving poor service and no profits and are grinding to a halt at a time when there is a greater need for the movement of the people.

In the last several years, we have seen the disappearance of many elevated structures for the obvious reason that they were not adequate. At the same time proponents of above surface systems have come forward with plans that have little more to offer and in many cases lack the service capabilities of even the old elevated systems. Each of the proposed systems, including the monorail concept, over a period of years of trial have been found to be totally inadequate for our present demands and certainly are not the answer to our future problems. The inherent shortcomings of presently proposed systems become apparent after a study is made of the DART system. Because of its many applications you will find that DART is total transportation service conceived in an era when travel at sonic speeds has been accepted as a symbol of the space age. DART's purpose is to facilitate travel above ground level and introduce timesaving speed—a speed never conceived before in surface travel

with a safety factor next to none. It will revolutionize local and distance travel conditions.

DART incorporates many favorable economic and efficiency measures that will serve the community and the Nation generally. DART will integrate all travel media, establishing an environment of balance, order, safety, and progress.

DART's contributions to the local and national economy will facilitate its advent and help private, civil, municipal, State, and Federal governing bodies to arrive at an equitable, far-reaching program for the development of a truly rapid transit system.

With a plan based on sound economic principles, governing bodies will be able to implement the many functions and principles of government, allowing them to reach a decision of mutual accord where once only respected differences of opinion prevailed.

The senseless drain on our economy of the wasted billions and billions of dollars can be partially eliminated by diverting moneys to a master plan of standardized DART systems, integrating it into the total operation, by:

(a) Providing swift, comfortable, economical transportation above the ground for the masses now thrown into hazardous, time-consuming struggle of daily, simultaneous migrations to and from business.

(b) Reducing the need for motor-driven vehicles, especially in areas of greater population concentration for the citizen now reluctant to give up his independent mode of travel, which will further reduce local congestion.

(c) Reducing the need of many cross-city transport vehicles now employed to cart consumer items from warehouses to points of display, from merchandising locations to the consumer, from raw material source to manufacturer, from manufacturer to jobber and warehouses, and so forth, keeping through traffic to a minimum.

(d) Supplying swift transportation services for trucking firms, manufacturers, suppliers of all kinds of wares and produce; loading their wares into unitized truck bodies supplied by Dart, then transporting these wares to all outlying parts of the city in minutes. (This will reduce local congestion further and supply these burdened companies with a minimum expense transportation service, which saves gas, maintenance and time. It cuts street traffic and speeds up local conditions. These deliveries will be made after peak hours of passenger service with unitized transport bodies hoisted into position at local DART terminals for scheduled deliveries. Local public transportation then is not competing for the same travel routes but allows the staggering truck traffic movements until after peak public transportation moves are made.

(e) Reducing road and highway building and repairs.

(f) Reducing accidents and deaths.

(g) Reducing overburdening insurance rates (a general public saving).

(h) Reducing staggering man hours in work losses, especially in inclement weather.

(i) Reducing commuting time losses; statistics show this to average 9 years of a man's life, sufficient time for everyone to earn a university degree.

(j) Reducing the health hazard of smog; a monster of our own making.

(k) Freeing valuable building sites now used for parking facilities in areas of greater business concentration.

(l) Assisting local transportation firms to operate profitably, restoring it to a self supporting basis as a private or municipal service. This will put these services into revenue source classification rather than a necessary but unprofitable operation, thus freeing funds for more pressing needs.

(m) Making police monitoring services less necessary, reducing municipal and State costs.

(n) Providing an economic safety valve, when defense spending is curbed, permitting labor to be diverted into building a real rapid transit system as is herein suggested.

(o) By providing work generally by reviving what is now a dying public service.

(p) Providing national and civil defense a bulwark for mass evacuation of the populace in time of crisis or movement of armed services, a dramatic and effective adjunct.

(q) Providing, in place of the covering canopy, a superstructure for additional freeway surfaces for general movement of people and material where needed.

(r) Providing pneumatic tubes for mail or small items especially in emergencies for medications or vital implements of war.

(s) Providing with long range planning utility service conduits allowing easy access for repair and the efficient placement of telephone wires from its present unsightly position along the route.

(t) Providing logical shelter locations under the structure taking advantage of the superstructure above.

(u) Restoring metropolitan areas to their once coveted sphere of activity.

(v) Providing a safe ground link in jetage travel; an adjunct to air transportation, bringing their passengers to their true destination in record time. It is an exasperating paradox to be able to fly thousands of miles so magically, then spend the same amount of time struggling the last few miles to home or destination.

(w) Being built for permanency, it will be of rugged, lasting construction, but smart for even the most sophisticated residential areas.

(x) Restoring freeways to their original concept of unimpeded, steady movement of vehicles.

By freeing the arteries of progress, we also thwart inflationary tendencies. Providing the key for solving the vast complex of travel and transportation, DART will help to unify the Nation and expand its commercial areas to new heights of prosperity.

EXPLANATION OF DART AND ITS FUNCTION

DART is as new a concept in rapid transit as a "souped up 500" would be to the "tin lizzie". The simple addition of another rail to a "monorail" does not by itself constitute "duorail." The added rail naturally offers additional strength and rigidity and removes the undesirable element of sway, but the underslung center of gravity position of the car allows for greater stability as well as speed on curves or on straightaways.

The patented suspension system allows for the same type of aerodynamic fuselage design as required by aircraft with engineering principles pertaining thereto. Unlike all other surface travel media and elevated systems where the cars are constructed to weigh more than their load capacity to insure stability in motion, DART, because of its safe position, below the rails, can be made on lightweight construction as incorporated in aircraft. There is no possibility of "falling off" as may happen with above rail runner cars.

Each car is operated by an overhead electromagnetic bogie with a short wheelbase, readily receptive to short arch switching systems, comparable to those used by the railroad today. Most of the monorail systems projected have an inadequate switching system, requiring a separate structure for each line, which is prohibitive as well as being an added obstruction for surface traffic in multiple construction.

Repairs can be handled without disassembling the car itself and can readily and safely be worked on from above. Monorail does not have this advantage.

DART cars, capable of intercity speeds of 125 miles per hour or more, will be moved by magnetic pull rather than electric or other motors or engines, at uniform speeds regardless of grades.

Rail jumping is not possible, regardless of the speeds. Collisions are avoided by automatic functioning controls that space the trains in transit independent of human factors.

Silent operation is accomplished in two ways, namely, by a resilient absorbing cushion below the rails to absorb vibration, noise and "sing" and acoustic sound traps insulation within the canopy itself. Wheel design and construction techniques will add further soundproofing.

Brakes will be electrodynamically controlled and function only against the rails.

The overhead structure, which can support a freeway or a canopy, is as much a part of the entire system as the car is itself. Within it rides the bogie above the rail, soundproofing for noiseless travel, pneumatic tubes for mail service, utility conduits, including telephone wires, an eyesore in so many areas. (Microwave in the future may replace the present system of wires).

The canopy or overhead freeway serves a very important function in the DART design as an all-weather enclosure to insure against schedule defeating ice, snow, rain, and sleet. It also shields against excessive light or heat and adds materially to the climate control within the car.

Four sets of rails are canopied in this structure allowing for local as well as express schedules.

In times of emergency, all four rails can be used for evacuation of civilians, military personnel and could serve as a dramatic adjunct to civil strategic defense.

DART installations once begun will develop rapidly using modern prefabrication methods.

Suspended rail sections can be precast in 90-foot sections and installed at a rate of 150 or more miles per year.

Designed along aerodynamic principles, DART will create the same esthetic acceptance as aircraft design has done with the public everywhere. The single central support structure offers maximum stability with the least amount of surface obstruction.

Existing freeways can serve as DART arteries in either of two ways. The DART suspension system can be centered on the freeway or can be made to ride alongside with a partial canopy improvised.

Present rights-of-way should be used to avoid time and cost involved in surveys, condemnation proceedings injunctions to restrain and land purchasing needs. The DART system can be planned along existing freeway routes and coordinated with any and all other systems, taking the primary arterial service for itself.

Once envisioned in its total concept DART will be recognized as absolutely indispensable in the present and future planning of this Nation's growth, a safe ground link in jet age travel.

Its introduction here or abroad will provide an outstanding monument to American technological ingenuity and skill; again another treasure from her vast storehouse of contributions to mankind.

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA—ECONOMY OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, two articles which appeared in today's newspaper, one written by Roscoe Drummond, the other by Joseph Alsop. Mr. Drummond discusses the importance of our Government's assistance to Yugoslavia and the values of continuing that aid. Mr. Alsop writes about the remarkable ingenuity which refugees from Red China have displayed in Hong Kong and suggests that under different leadership the economy

of Communist China would be much stronger than it is at present, with important implications for other industrial nations.

Both of these articles are thought-provoking and I believe they are worthy of our careful consideration.

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

AID TO TITO—WHAT UNITED STATES GOT FOR $2.5 BILLION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—When President Josip Broz Tito arrives in Washington October 17 to confer with President Kennedy on trade and foreign policy, one question which most Americans would like him to answer is this: What has the United States got for its $2.5 billion of aid to Yugoslavia during the past 15 years?

This question greatly concerned the 6 Senators and 12 Congressmen who made up the American delegation to the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union here in Belgrade. They raised it pointedly on several occasions.

It is a good question, a fair question, particularly since Congress is being asked by the administration to reverse the decision it made a year ago denying Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment in trade. The most-favored-nation provision means that when the United States makes tariff arrangements with one country, it grants the same arrangement with other nations.

First, it should be understood that all United States aid to Yugoslavia is ended. Aid is neither being sought nor given.

But the United States has put a lot of resources into Yugoslavia. It is reasonable to want to know what benefit they have produced for us, because there is no justification for such aid unless it serves our national interests.

The facts, I think, show that we have received large dividends.

Until Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, Soviet-controlled military forces lined the Adriatic and stood menacingly along the borders of Greece, Austria, Italy, and Albania.

Tito's declaration of independence from Russia wiped out this menace at one stroke. American aid has greatly helped to nourish and sustain that independence until Yugoslavia could get on its feet economically. It has done so by virtue of its own hard work, through U.S. aid, and through the economic resurgence of all of Western Europe. Yugoslavian trade is now 77 percent with the West, only 23 percent with the Soviet bloc and other countries.

Here are some of the other dividends which have come from Yugoslavia's independence of the Soviet Union which our aid has helped to maintain:

Yugoslavia withdrew all of its military help to the Communist civil war in Greece and the war soon collapsed.

The long-festering dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy over Trieste was amicably settled.

Albania was geographically isolated from the Soviet bloc.

Though Tito is a dedicated Communist, he withdrew his country from the Cominform, an instrument of Communist world subversion, and has refused to join the Warsaw Pact.

Only a Yugoslavia independent of the Soviet Union could pursue policies which have produced the foregoing results. Its independence is possible only because of its economic association with the United States and Western Europe.

Clearly it is in the interests of the United States to do everything practicable to keep it that way.

It seems to me shortsighted for Congress to direct the administration to discriminate against Yugoslavia in withdrawing the normal most-favored-nation provision. We were of course, piqued by Tito's refusal to criticize the Soviet Union for breaking the test moratorium in 1961. This was one of Belgrade's political mistakes.

But Yugoslavia has often sided with the United States at the U.N. and has more frequently voted with the unalined nations than with the Soviets.

If Congress does not soon reverse its action cutting off Yugoslavia and Poland from normal trade relations, the effect of this policy will be exactly the opposite of what its sponsors said they want. It will not help isolate Eastern Europe from the Soviet Union; it will isolate us from Eastern Europe and abandon the field to the Soviets. Surely this is a policy of retreat, not advance, and a detriment to the national interests and security of the United States.

The choice before us in Eastern Europe today is not between supporting communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. The choice is between governments dominated by Moscow and governments, like Yugoslavia's, which, while Communist, are independent, which are not abetting the Communist conspiracy, and which are pursuing their own national interests—not Russia's national interests.

MATTER OF FACT—GRATITUDE TO CHAIRMAN MAO

(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—The free world's free enterprisers would soon move to a vote of thanks to Mao Tse-tung if they halfway understood the real meaning of this strange and wonderful city.

The point is that Hong Kong shows, in the most startling manner, what Chinese can do if you only give them a chance. Close to 3 million of them have poured into this confined space since the Japanese surrender.

Any economist on earth, is asked to predict the results of such an influx, would confidently forecast death by starvation for more than three-quarters of the immigrants. There is nothing here except a fine harbor and an honest and permissive British Government. There is not even enough water to wash in.

But here are millions of ingenious, intelligent, and industrious Chinese. Almost literally with their naked hands (for the flight capital taking refuge in Hong Kong has mostly gone into real estate speculation) these Chinese have made Hong Kong the great manufacturing city which now troubles the world trade pattern of almost every light industry.

The West German "economic miracle" is a poor, piddling, petty thing compared to this phenomenon of Hong Kong. If you reflect upon its significance, Hong Kong is a cause for melancholy as well as a warning to other peoples. It is both at once, in fact, because it suggests what the Chinese people might have accomplished and may yet accomplish without Chairman Mao.

Very few parochial Westerners know it; but in truth, for close on 2,000 years, China was always the strongest and richest power on earth whenever China had a reasonably efficient central government. The old Chinese society was really too successful. For this very reason, it took too long for the rich cake of ancient custom to be broken and the preparations for a new start to be made, after the old China felt the resistless impact of Western industrial strength.

But the cake of custom had at length broken, and all was in readiness for a new start by the end of the Second World War. If the Chinese people had then had half a chance, scores of Hong Kongs would have been created by now, in the commercial coastal cities and in the industrial centers of the interior.

These numerous Hong Kongs would in turn have generated, by the sheer suction of their own needs, a strong Chinese heavy industry based upon the plentiful resources of coal and iron which the Communists have never managed to exploit efficiently. And the Chinese farmers, who are the best in the world, would now be meeting the food needs of this transformed China by the same intensive use of fertilizer that has produced such astonishing results in Japan.

The same economists who would have predicted death by starvation for three-quarters of the immigrants into Hong Kong will no doubt smile in a superior way at this picture of the China that might have been. But these economists, like the vast majority of other Westerners, do not understand the foundations of China's greatness.

There are four, as follows: the family system; an incomparable talent for capital-creation; a proper respect for fertilizer; and the habit of working together, in labor corvees or otherwise. Mao's Stalinist-communism has attacked the family system, forbidden individual capital-creation, removed the farmers' incentives for keeping the fields in good heart, and grossly misused the labor corvees.

In truth, Mao's Stalinist-communism might well have been specially designed to frustrate the genius of the Chinese people. If you consider the probable impact on other industrial nations of the China that might have been, you will see why a kind of wry gratitude to Chairman Mao is certainly in order. If Chinese can make Japanese come to them to buy cheap toys, which just happened here, God knows what they would do to the rest of us if they were given their heads.

But Mao has not only frustrated the extraordinary genius of the people he leads, he has also brought China to a worse pass than China has ever experienced from floods and droughts and wicked rulers and foreign invasions and all the other harsh changes of Chinese history. This is now the central political fact in Asia, and it demands further analysis.

URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, FLORENCE, ALA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Kiplinger letter featured an urban renewal project in Florence, Ala. The article has generated many inquiries to the Florence Housing Authority. The executive director of the authority has responded to the inquiries with an informative letter concerning the value of this project to the city of Florence. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FLORENCE HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Florence, Ala., August 9, 1963.

GENTLEMEN: In response to your request, I am happy to give you some details on our Handy Heights project. The Kiplinger letter of August 2 refers to an urban renewal project which was carried out between 1955 and 1958 by the city of Florence through the Florence housing authority in cooperation with the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It was known as Urban Renewal Project UR 5–1.

This was one of the very first residential reuse projects in the Nation. We cleared 25 acres on the west side of the city which was 100 percent slum with no inside toilets, very little running water and all poorly constructed houses. There were 113 parcels of land and 72 houses on same. After clear-

ance, streets with paving, curb and gutter, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, electricity, gas and water were all installed. The city of Florence owns its utility departments and this would have been done as far as utilities for any subdivision.

A few of the buildings in the project area were sound and capable of being moved. We used this as a relocation resource and 14 were moved from the project area and brought up to minimum standards of the city. These were sold only to former occupants of the project area; two houses in the project area were left where they were and rehabilitated to meet city standards.

After all of the families were relocated and the site improvements in place, a portion of the land was sold to the city for a swimming pool, and additional school site, and the balance of the property was sold at public auction to qualified redevelopers. The high bidder was Garber, Cook & Hulsey of Birmingham, Ala., who erected and sold 78 three-bedroom homes on the property. The prices ranged from $9,750 to $10,500. All of the occupants of the area were Negro and the city is very proud to have a FHA-approved subdivision that is now fully occupied by Negro homeowners.

Before the city's activity, every family in this area was living in a substandard house; at the conclusion of the project we not only had the above subdivision but 85 percent of the former occupants of the area were relocated elsewhere into decent, safe, and sanitary housing meeting minimum requirements. Other than utilities, the city's total cost was $55,000. The balance of the cost was paid from the proceeds of the land and a Federal capital grant of $280,000.

Before redevelopment, the entire area brought in $325 per year to the city in taxes. It demanded a tremendous amount of municipal services and had been a long existing health hazard. Today these are not only cleared, but the city receives more than $2,500 per year from taxes on the area and this increase will pay the entire project cost to the city in less than 25 years.

Since the successful conclusion of this project, the city has also completed a public reuse project to clear 45 slum dwellings providing additional land for our jointly owned city-county hospital and a Negro high school. This has been successfully closed and we have filed the application for another project in connection with Florence State College which has a 50-acre campus in our city. This project will provide an additional much needed 30 acres to the college campus. The city is also preparing to apply for an urban renewal project to establish an industrial park and we are very interested in a downtown urban renewal effort in the central business district.

Florence, Ala., is sold on this program and we hope this letter will be of assistance to your city. We are honored that the Kiplinger letter has taken notice of our effort and if we may be of further assistance with other details, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

KARL T. TYREE, Jr.,
Executive Director.

THE THREE GREAT ISSUES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on September 20, I addressed the Western States Democratic Conference, in Salt Lake City, Utah.

This was an important meeting. Leading Democratic officials from all of the Western States attended. The conference was a new indication of the increased political and economic importance of the Western States.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of my remarks at the Western States Democratic Conference be inserted in the RECORD, at this point.

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

TRINITY OF ISSUES

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Western States Democratic Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 20, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, I have come out here not to talk to you about the "right wing," but about the "right way."

I understand my friend and colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH, took good care of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and his assorted followers the other day.

Little more need be said.

I would like to make just this one comment to Senator GOLDWATER: BARRY, we have just one thing in common. I was not elected President in 1960. You are not going to be elected President in 1964.

Now let's get down to business.

And our business is the business of the Nation, and the business of the world is in the 20th century.

There are three great issues facing America today. They stand together as a trinity—conditioning, effecting, and ultimately determining the freedom, the strength, and the security of our Nation. These three great issues are:

(1) The expansion and growth of our economy.

(2) The guaranteeing of equal opportunity and civil rights for all our people.

(3) The designing of a national security policy in a framework of peace.

It is to the solution of these three challenges that the Democratic Party and the Kennedy administration is dedicated.

We know that if America is to have the strength and vitality for the long-term requirements of world leadership we must have a healthy, prosperous, growing economy.

We must be able to provide jobs for the unemployed, and utilize all plant equipment to maximum capacity.

We must be able to modernize our factories and shops in order to compete at home and in the world markets.

We must be able to automate and at the same time absorb into the employment market those who are displaced by machines and technology.

We must have an ever-increasing number of skilled, trained workers as a supporting team for our scientists and technicians. These, and other matters are the challenges of the 1960's.

It is because of these heavy demands and unusual requirements of the modern age that President Kennedy has recommended a broad program of action.

First and foremost is his program of tax reduction to stimulate the economy. This will free approximately $11 billion of new capital, which will increase purchasing power and provide new investment for new plant and production facilities.

Jobs require capital. And in this age of automation, each new job requires an ever-increasing amount of investment capital.

The Democratic Party refuses to be shackled and tied down by old dogma and obsolete economic doctrine. It requires more than public works and Government subsidies to keep this economy moving. This is a private enterprise economy. Over 80 percent of our total national gross product is in the private sector. The Democratic Party is determined to unleash the tremendous energy of the private enterprise forces of America and let those forces go to work—to build, to create, and to produce (yes, and we believe in investment—public and private) and, in those areas of severe unemployment our dedication to social justice and decency requires that we extend the helping hand of Government through public works, area redevelopment, Small Business Administration, emergency relief, unemployment compensation, and other services of Government. But here, too, new enterprise is needed, new jobs, new factories, new work. And, therefore, with the combination of public and private resources this administration seeks to revitalize these pockets of depression. We know that investment in America anywhere is good business.

We will not rest until all America enjoys the fruits of modern science and technology, until all America is at work, until every American who wants a job and is willing to work has that job.

Nor shall we contend ourselves with merely providing job opportunities. We will also see to it that workers are given the opportunity to be trained for their jobs through expanded technical and vocational education, through manpower retraining programs and, above all, through improved programs of elementary, secondary, vocational, and higher education that meet the needs of the 20th century. We know that brain power is the new source of strength. Yes, what we are doing is a comprehensive program of financing, training, planning, and mobilization of resources. It requires cooperation of the public and private areas of our economy.

Yes, we have been able to get America moving once again, and we are moving forward under the inspiring, intelligent, and competent leadership of President Kennedy. The facts speak for themselves. Unemployment is down. The gross national product is at an all-time high. Investment is increasing. And the Nation enjoys a prosperity unequaled at any time in our history.

The campaign promise of 1960 to get America moving once again—to bring about economic growth and expansion—that promise is being fulfilled.

America grows stronger each day. And with American economic strengths growing, freedom everywhere is more secure.

The second great issue is that of civil rights—what I call human rights. America is in the midst of a social revolution. The American Negro is demanding full citizenship 100 years after the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation. He demands its fulfillment.

Just as Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in 1863, President Kennedy and his administration will guarantee the fruits of freedom to every American in 1963. The President's civil rights program is morally right, politically right, and economically sound. It is designed to eliminate second-class citizenship and to guarantee first-class citizenship to all Americans. It is the life—the spirit—and the heart of the constitutional guarantees of equal rights, equal privileges and immunities.

We cannot afford illiteracy, poverty, ignorance, hopelessness, frustration among millions of our people.

We need every American trained, equipped, and motivated to do his best. Every section, area, and region of this Nation must make its full contribution to American democracy.

We must insist upon the best in education, in housing, in health, in industry, in agriculture, in every endeavor of life. And if we insist on the best and know that we need the best in order to survive as a free people, then we must provide the means, the facilities, and the legal protections that permit and, indeed, inspire men to do their best.

This is what we mean by a civil rights program. And the passage of the civil rights legislation is not radical.

All we seek to do is that which the Constitution of the United States provides that we should do. All that we ask the States to do is that which the Constitution requires our respective States to do.

Surely, if this world of ours has become smaller, more interdependent, more integrated, more of a one-world because of science, technology, and communication, then who can deny that this American Republic has become one nation, indivisible and committed to liberty and justice for all?

How can we ask the American Negro to pay taxes, to defend our Nation on the field of battle, to win our medals in the Olympics, to entertain us on the stage, to work in our factories and mines, and yet deny him the right to vote or the right to eat at a lunch counter with his fellow citizens? Taxation without representation is un-American. Segregation is un-American. Discrimination is un-American. It is evil. It is wrong. And it must be destroyed. Thank God we have a President who has the courage and strength to win this battle.

The responsibilities of world leadership compel us to come to this world with clean hands. Bombings of churches in Birmingham that take the lives of little children do more damage to American leadership in Asia, Africa, and Latin America than all the Communist propaganda put together.

The hate and the passion that has been generated by the "reactionary radical right-wing" forces in American life has done more to divide America, to weaken America than any Communist conspiracy.

If we are destroyed, it will not be by a foreign power or ideology. It will be because we have destroyed ourselves through the bitterness and hatred that come from racial discrimination and the wild men of reaction—the fanatics with their irresponsible attack upon our Constitution, our courts, and our institutions of democratic society.

Yes, beware of that leadership that has nothing to offer but reaction at home and jingoism abroad.

Just as America needs a strong economy that provides opportunity for all, so this Nation must set the example for the world of respect for human dignity, of equal rights for all of its citizens, of first-class citizenship for every man who bears the high honor of being an American.

Finally, the third great challenge before us is to provide security for ourselves and others who seek to live in freedom—and to do this within the framework of peace. Indeed, it is to this challenge that our President has given such great leadership.

America is stronger today militarily than ever before. Our allies are stronger and more prosperous than at any time in their history. The so-called Communist monolithic bloc is shattered by the struggle between Russia and China. The satellite states of Eastern Europe are demanding more freedom and independence. There is a restlessness throughout the entire world and a longing and hunger for peace.

President Kennedy in a memorable address at American University on June 10 this year reminded us that peace is a process. We must work for peace. We must build for peace. We must do it step by step, program by program, year by year.

The United Nations is a mighty force for peace. It grows stronger each year. The nuclear test ban treaty, which will be ratified in the Senate next week, is a significant step in easing world tensions. It brings to bear upon the problems that beset mankind the rule of reason. This treaty carries the American trademark—the American eagle. It was designed and drafted in America. It was first advanced by President Eisenhower, and offered again by President Kennedy. It was he who took the initiative. We asked the Russians to negotiate. We offered the draft treaty. Yes, it was signed in Moscow, but it was made in Washington.

Now let me say a personal word about our President.

I have the privilege of working closely with President Kennedy. I see him at close range, and I see him under the enormous stresses of the American Presidency.

As he faces the swirling, baffling problems of foreign policy, as he comes to grip with the emotion-laden, violent, and difficult developments in the crisis in race relations, he is standing up well.

He has met the problem of racial violence with a cool head and a warm heart. He has presented to Congress a program of strong civil rights.

And Congress is going to support the President. We are going to pass the Kennedy civil rights program before adjourning this year—even if we stay until Christmas.

It is now clear that the President's initiative in the nuclear test ban treaty will be ratified by the Senate next week overwhelmingly. And in so doing, the President and the Senate are giving mankind the means to take a historic step—toward sanity, toward reasonableness, in relationships among the great powers.

Yes, massive, historical changes are taking place in the world, and much of the changed situation this year stems out of the leadership of our President in convincing the Soviet leadership—by actions, not just words—that it is hopeless to contemplate military victory over the United States.

President Kennedy's handling of the October crisis over the Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba won him the awed respect of the Soviet leaders.

And it has won for him the confidence and trust of the American people. They realize that we have a leader who measures up, who has the qualities of balance, intelligence, and courage that the Nation requires in time of crisis.

What a contrast. With reckless talk flying back and forth, with Communist Chinese and Republican rightists vying to see which can denounce the test ban treaty the loudest, how refreshing to see our President in action. Most Americans, I believe, would agree that patience, perseverance, staying power and cool heads are infinitely preferable in our national leaders to the emotional rash and reckless abandon of hot temper of the wild men of the Republican far right.

Yes, we have many unsolved problems; but what is important is not that we have deep problems still unsolved, but that President Kennedy and a Congress which is dominated by men of the caliber of Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, FRANK MOSS, and GALE MCGEE, of HOWARD CANNON, HENRY "SCOOP" JACKSON, and CLAIR ENGLE, are dedicated to the task of finding solutions for those problems.

These are all men of moderation and sense—hardworking, dedicated and reasonable men. The West can be proud of them. I am confident not only that each of them is going to be returned to the Senate next year, but that we can increase the weight of Democratic strength from the West in the next Congress.

The more radical and outrageous the position of the Republican Party becomes, the more it is captured by the extremists of the right, the more sharply will the moderation, good sense and judgment of President Kennedy and his supporters in the Congress stand in contrast in the minds of the American electorate.

We must push ahead with our program. We Democrats simply do not have the time—and should not take the time—to waste trying to placate the implacable, trying to reason with the unreasonable. That is the unique problem of the Republican leadership.

Let them wrestle with that one. I wish them good luck.

In the meantime, we Democrats have no intention of trimming our sails or dipping our flag in any kind of recognition or tribute to the noisy and flamboyant minority that refuses to come along with us into the 20th century.

We have better work to do. We have a peace to be won—week by week, and year by year.

We have the great unfinished tasks of providing universal justice and opportunity for every American.

We have the possibility—if we are wise, if we are resolute—of destroying in this century the age-old conditions of want and hunger that have plagued men from the dawn of the human era.

We have everything before us—an exciting age, an age in which the scientists are providing everyday a new tool to help destroy poverty, to help in the war against pain and disease, to provide wider opportunities for richer living.

Technology has brought us to the threshold of an age of such abundance that I do not think we have yet grasped its full impact. We must think boldly, create, build, move forward.

I feel at this time, as Brigham Young must have felt as he rounded the western flank of that great mountain to the east of Salt Lake Valley for the first time.

He had fought through mountain passes and ridges that must have taxed the powers of endurance of every man and woman and child in his party. Perhaps they seemed endless—those obstacles so grim and bleak.

But as his wagon train wound slowly out of the last mountain pass, and the magnificent sweep of the valley of the Salt Lake lay spread before them, a dream in his heart swelled into reality.

"This is the place," he said.

Here, at last, was the new chance, the place in which a new life could be built in peace and abundance.

I do not know if we have wound out of that last mountain pass of history. But I see in the distance a valley of peace. We are nearing it. We may make it.

We are going to try to make it to that valley. This is the place.

"WHERE I STAND"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the citizens of several Western States were thrilled and inspired recently by the Western tour of this Nation which was completed only yesterday by the President of the United States.

I was particularly proud that nowhere in the President's itinerary did he receive a warmer or more enthusiastic reception that the one accorded him in Las Vegas, Nev.

In my opinion, the enthusiasm which the President encountered can be ascribed to many reasons. One of these reasons is the President's leadership in the nuclear test ban treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that a column authored by Hank Greenspun, publisher of the Las Vegas Sun, entitled "Where I Stand," be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE I STAND

(By Hank Greenspun)

"Hail to the Chief."

This is the musical greeting that protocol decrees be played at the arrival of the President of the United States.

All Presidents are supposed to be chiefs, for chiefs are leaders of their people.

In the history of our Nation, the few real chiefs who occupied the White House have been immortalized in history. Any child can

quickly recall the names of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Madison, the Roosevelts, Teddy, and Franklin, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, and possibly a few others. The others were not exactly leaders but were either reluctantly pushed into decisions or proved to be colossal failures.

President John F. Kennedy arrives in Las Vegas this noon for a speech at the convention hall. I think the route he travels from the airport along Paradise Valley Road should be strewn with olive branches for these are a symbol of peace, and he brings us hope for peace.

I imagine it's a little late to compose a new song but I believe our President qualifies for a "Hail to the superchief."

I think history will be able to assess his true value to the Nation and the world after the partisan politicians and petty detractors are gone.

Criticism of the President is that he talks and does not act. It is valid in only one regard. He does talk and there isn't a greater talker in the country today but he has also proved he can act when there is need for action.

There's a lot of difference between him and Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain of England coming back from Munich waving an umbrella and saying: "Peace in our times." Chamberlain believed Hitler and was lulled by him. England was not prepared and did not prepare, for Chamberlain was a man of words and not deeds.

The test ban treaty with Soviet Russia is only one of many significant acts of the Kennedy administration. The President doesn't say it is "peace in our time." He says it is a step toward peace. He is not yet ready to believe the Russians but he is ready to hope and hope is the future of nations and mankind.

Our guard is up. We are ready for any eventuality like this Nation has never been ready. We have the weapons which can annihilate our enemies but they cannot assure our survival for this is the nature of offensive weapons in a hydrogen age.

The President is aware of the problem and that's why he insists on talks between all nations. Talk is not the negation of action. Words have sent more barriers tumbling down than the mightiest of cannon.

It is wholly unfair to say that talks with the Russians are a waste of time. It is true that many conferences and international meetings have frequently been disappointing. There have even been colossal failures in our talking attempts for peace. But none of them has been as bloody a failure as war. And not one of them can be as disastrous as another war.

So what's wrong with talk? And what's wrong with the action of the President who caused the Soviet Union to back down when action was decreed in the Cuban crisis?

There are times to talk and times to act. The present situation calls for talks because the risk of not talking is too great for any leader to have on his conscience.

The test ban treaty may prove to be a failure, but at least the effort will not leave millions of burned bodies strewn across the earth and cause possibly even more young bodies present and yet unborn, to die of leukemia and cancer, the result of testing in the atmosphere.

The right to criticize cooperation with the Soviets does not belong to BARRY GOLDWATER or the unfeeling and unthinking diehards who have stabbed in the back every effort for international cooperation and then exclaimed. "I told you it won't work."

There isn't much time for the civilized human beings to arrive at a decision. Some chief and some nation must take the lead. The United States has taken this lead. The effort may not be a certainty for peace. We may still doubt the Russian sincerity but never must we cease to hope.

This is the hope our Chief has given us. This is the future of America and the world. A hope for a free people all over the earth. A hope for a world free from the devastation of war.

We in Las Vegas who have felt the force of atomic weapons at the testing grounds a few miles from here—the megatons of force that will result in megadeaths—millions of deaths. We must greet our Chief with olive branches for he has given us hope.

To us, he is truly a superchief.

BELMONT FARIES WRITES OF GREAT WORK BY GREAT TEXAS ARTIST, TOM LEA, OF SAM HOUSTON, GREATEST TEXAN OF THEM ALL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today I deeply regret that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot reproduce works of art, for I am sure the readers of the RECORD would like to see the magnificent drawing of Sam Houston executed by Tom Lea, the outstanding Texas artist, and unveiled here last week as the design for a new stamp commemorating Houston.

Last week it was my pleasure to be with Postmaster General Gronouski and others as this dramatic sketch was displayed for the first time. Those of us who viewed it then realized the wisdom of selecting the great artist Tom Lea to capture the spirit of Texas' great rugged hero, Sam Houston, Governor, general, Senator, and president of the Republic of Texas.

Those who cannot see this picture now will be given that opportunity in December, when this striking stamp will go on sale. Then it will be seen generally how our great Texas artist has added another laurel to his distinguished career by portraying the greatest Texan of them all, Sam Houston. First day sales will be at Houston, Tex., December 13, 1963, on the anniversary of Houston's inauguration as president of the Republic of Texas on December 13, 1841.

A highly interesting article on the stamp and Tom Lea has been written by Mr. Belmont Faries and published in the Washington Star for September 29. Mr. Faries is a reader of Tom Lea's works; he knows his Texas subjects as well as his stamps. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this place in the RECORD.

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

TEXAS ART FOR SAM HOUSTON

(By Belmont Faries)

Texas Artist Tom Lea's design for the 5-cent Sam Houston stamp is a powerful line sketch showing the great Texan in the prime of life.

It was made public Friday when Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, who had suggested that Lea be given the assignment, went to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to see the art work for the stamp, which will be issued on December 13 at Houston, Tex.

Sam Houston, commander of the army which won the independence of Texas by defeating Santa Anna at San Jacinto, twice President of the Republic, first Senator from the new State, and Governor at the outbreak of the Civil War, is an almost legendary figure.

He was a big man (he stood 6 feet 6), at ease in the turbulence of Tennessee politics or on the frontier as an Indian trader and an adopted member of the Cherokee tribe. Lea has drawn him in full figure, with Texas hat, boots, and rifle.

The portrait is based on an 1848 lithograph by F. Davignon, but Lea has drawn Houston a few years younger, as he looked when he was the first President of Texas.

Tom Lea, outstanding both as an artist and a writer, was born July 11, 1903, in El Paso, where his father was mayor and a typical frontier lawyer. He learned to ride at three and saw his first bullfight at eight. At 17 he went to Chicago to study at the Art Institute, and later lived in Sante Fe before returning to El Paso, where he now makes his home.

He has done a number of murals for public buildings, such as the El Paso Courthouse and public library, and for a number of post offices. During World War II he was a correspondent for Life magazine on assignments which included a landing with the first Marine assault wave at Peleliu.

As a book illustrator he is well known for his work on such western nonfiction as Frank Dobie's "The Longhorns," and he has written and illustrated two novels, "The Brave Bulls," a story of the Mexican bullring, and "The Wonderful Country," an authentic western set in the Rio Grande region of some 70 or 80 years ago.

Although Lea has done much painting in oils, his most characteristic works are line drawings using black ink on white board. His design for the Houston stamp was prepared in this way. It will be printed in deep black on white paper. The Houston figure has been engraved by Arthur W. Dintaman, the lettering and numeral by George A. Payne.

Addressed envelopes for first-day cancellation, with remittance for the cost of the stamps, may be sent to the Postmaster, Houston, Tex., 77002. The outer envelope should be marked "First Day Covers Houston Stamp" and must be postmarked not later than December 13.

AVIATION IN SUPERSONIC AGE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Anchorage, Alaska, was privileged last Wednesday night to have as its speaker Samuel F. Pryor, long-time vice president of Pan American World Airways, and an even longer-time friend of Alaska. When single-engine aircraft were the order of the day in territorial times, Sam Pryor visited with us, toured the rugged and beautiful terrain with us, hunted with us, fished with us.

He was speaking last Wednesday, to a considerable extent, from memory. Yet his talk was late 20th century in content and appeal. It was good to have him back in Alaska once again.

Pan American and Alaska are as closely knit a unit as is imaginable. Since 1931 Pan American has been providing service between Seattle and Alaska, from the early days of the 8-passenger aircraft to the mighty 160-passenger jets which now operate over Pan Am's routes, twice daily, between the States of Washington and Alaska.

It was not my good fortune to have been in Anchorage last week, Mr. President, to hear Sam Pryor's talk. But friends have called it to my attention and I have read it. I believe everyone in this body who has a sweet tooth for adventure and who looks toward the future

with excitement will enjoy Sam Pryor's remarks.

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

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

ADDRESS OF SAMUEL F. PRYOR

Because of my business, Mrs. Pryor and I have had the privilege of seeing practically every nook and corner of this world. We truly know it to be a beautiful world—but the last 4 days, having flown with Lowell and landed on skis on one of your glaciers 5,000 feet up in the mountains—and then spending a night at Kulic—a night at Brooks Camp with a trip to the Valley of 10,000 Smokes with my friend Ray Petersen—Mrs. Pryor and I both agree that we have seen the most beautiful part of this beautiful world.

Ten years ago the idea of traveling 3,000 miles to accept a speaking engagement would have made anyone pause for thought. Today Mrs. Pryor and I could have had supper at our home in Greenwich, Conn., and attended your dinner here tonight.

I was glad to get Mr. Bank's invitation to visit with the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce tonight—it seemed natural for a representative of the world's flyingest airline to visit the flyingest city in the flyingest State.

But I accepted his invitation with considerable humility because as a visitor to Alaska, I have seen first hand just how much air travel has been incorporated into your daily lives. It continues to amaze me that 1 of every 30 Anchoragites is a licensed pilot. May I ask by a show of hands how many pilots are here tonight?

There is also a very personal reason why I was so pleased to be invited to Anchorage. My oldest daughter and her husband and family had the courage and the pioneering spirit to forsake a settled existence in New Jersey for the vitality of a growing Alaska. Mrs. Pryor and I relish every opportunity to visit them here and are constantly infused with their own sense of dynamic activity and contribution to a dynamic community. It has also been a source of great satisfaction to the Pryor family that others of our children have chosen to settle permanently in the 50th State. Today we find ourselves flying back and forth between the two new additions to the other 48 States with little thought for the 3,000 miles that separate us.

There is an even more compelling reason, however, why I should be here in Anchorage speaking with you tonight. Pan American and Alaska have been partners for 31 years—partners in one of the most soul satisfying chronicles of initiative, imagination and courage. And may I say that partnership began 6 years before the creation of the CAB. These very elements of initiative, imagination and courage liberally salted with a measure of adventure, attracted a World War I pilot named Carl Ben Eielson to the same challenge offered to my children today. Together with Sir Hubert Wilkins and Joe Crosson, Eielson is acknowledged to be the pioneer of arctic flying. And, I'm proud to say, Pan Am's chief pilot today on our Alaskan operations is Capt. Ralph Savory, one of your old time able bush pilots in the early thirties. Eielson's surveys, begun back in 1922, convinced him that aviation was the best answer to transportation in this rugged area of 600 million square miles. Particularly where there were no roads and coastal ports were inaccessible, intercommunity travel was almost impossible.

Eielson's early probing of the feasibility of bringing scheduled air transport to Alaska was avidly supported by his friend, Juan Trippe, who flew with him in the early 1920's. Trippe returned to the States to found Pan American Airways, and expand the air network south through Latin America, while his friend Eielson opened Alaskan Airways to pioneer air routes to the north.

The hazards of piloting a single-engine aircraft in the exploratory days of Alaska's air age are legion: Icy winds, snow and ice storms, uncharted terrain, glacial peaks, no radio or radar, no airports. The realities of weather and topography required that a pilot be equally adept at landings with wheels, pontoons, and skis and nature was often unkind to those who were downed en route. The textbooks on operations and maintenance of aircraft in subzero temperatures with which all of you are familiar came out of those early days, much of it a result of the efforts of Ben Eielson and your other great pioneers—the Wiens, Bob Reeve, Ray Petersen and others you know so well. Among other achievements in 1924 he flew the first airborne mail in Alaska—164 pounds—from Fairbanks to McGrath in under 3 hours. The same delivery by the dog team required 17 days. Interestingly, Pan Am's first airmail bid was in competition with dog sled teams.

Not surprisingly, in the course of the twenties, a host of small aviation companies sprang up to handle passengers and mail. However, there was still no regularly scheduled air operation in existence—Ben's great dream—at the time he died in a crash in 1929.

Prior to his death, Ben Eielson left yet another mark on the growing importance of Alaska in the air age; he completed a historic flight from America to Asia across the Bering Straits—a route now vital to Alaska as a gateway to the East. The significance of this last achievement and of the subsequent monumental survey flight for Pan American by Charles and Anne Lindbergh north to the Orient in 1931 is really just coming into focus today. The concept of Alaska as the geopolitical center of the world, serving as the hub of a vast wheel of great circle air routes to four continents, has become believable in today's jet age of air travel. This concept should become the dominant reality of the supersonic age that lies just ahead. And that reality will be of unparalleled significance in the development of both your city and your State, and in the operation of every major carrier flying worldwide routes today.

I know that everyone of you here tonight has spent many hours looking at the future, weighing it, discussing it; and your economic development committee reports show you are planning for it. Your enormous commitment to the future is written all over the face of Anchorage, and indeed the entire State of Alaska—in Fairbanks, in Juneau, and Ketchikan. In fact, were it not for the promises of the future, many—if not most of you—would not be here today.

Let me say that we at Pan American are constantly making the same sort of commitment. Our own studies have already led us to believe that Alaska holds one of the keys, if not the single most important key, to future success in the era of supersonic transport.

Pan American has already placed an order with the Franco-British group that is developing a prototype 1,450 m.p.h. mach 2 ship. We expect delivery of our first Concorde supersonic jet some time in 1969. Once this aircraft is available to us, Pan American stands ready to embark on a program of great circle routes that would change the entire complexion of air transport. Alaska would thus find itself so close, in air time, to the principal United States and world population centers that the impact will be like placing it in the geographical center of the country.

There is also, as you know, a great deal of soul searching taking place today both in Washington and at the headquarters of the major U.S. airframe and aircraft engine companies regarding the possibility of designing and producing a mach 3 supersonic jet. At mach 3, this ship would have a cruising airspeed of 2,000 miles an hour, carrying 200 passengers and range minimum of 4,000 miles with stretch capability of 5,500 miles—built of steel and titanium.

To give you some idea of what mach 3 supersonic great circle routes would look like with Anchorage as the hub, let me suggest a few figures:

Anchorage to Seattle 1 hour 24 minutes; 1 hour 42 minutes to San Francisco; 2 hours 9 minutes to Chicago; New York's Idlewild Airport would be only 2 hours and 27 minutes away; Anchorage to Baltimore-Washington—2 hours 30 minutes; Anchorage to Paris 3 hours 6 minutes (present time 10 hours 55 minutes); Anchorage to Rio de Janeiro (via New York) 5 hours 24 minutes; Anchorage to Hamburg 3 hours 6 minutes (present time 8 hours 40 minutes); Anchorage to Hong Kong 3 hours 18 minutes; Anchorage to Lisbon 3 hours 24 minutes; Anchorage to Miami 2 hours 48 minutes; Anchorage to Kansas City 2 hours 6 minutes (present time 5 hours 35 minutes); Anchorage to Manila (via Tokyo) 4 hours 6 minutes (present time 11 hours 9 minutes); Anchorage to Copenhagen 3 hours 6 minutes (present time 8 hours 35 minutes).

Tokyo would be just 3 minutes further away than New York, and you will be able to make a visit to Moscow in 3 hours flat.

Consider this impact on business trips—one-day trips to major world trade centers. Second, the impact on tourist and personal travel—development of scenic and sports potential of Alaska. And, third, the economic impact of intransit stopover passengers resulting from mass transportation between major world population centers through Alaska.

What are all these implications for Alaska's future? In effect, the 49th State will become the Northwest Passage for which European navigators searched so fruitlessly over the centuries.

The opportunities for joint cooperation between you and your 50th State neighbor to the south offer another attractive prospect to us at Pan Am, and to other global carriers. What a magnificent package it would make to offer a week's skiing in Alaska, followed by a week's surfing and sunning in Hawaii. As the standard of living continues to rise in Europe, this type of dual-purpose holiday will be increasingly within the means of large segments of the population. Supersonic aircraft will make the great circle route over the pole to Alaska from Europe a perfect path to the Pacific, and indeed open up the South Pacific of James Michener to the European traveler, and today the Pacific is the fastest growing air traffic area in the world.

A dream, this talk of the supersonic age? Not by our standards at Pan American, and not by your standards, either, unless I miss my guess.

Our airline is still guided by the very man who had the courage and the foresight to make a major commitment to Alaskan air transportation in its embryonic stage—Juan Trippe. He made his first important investment here back in 1932, by purchasing the fledging Alaskan Airways—his late friend Ben Eielson's pioneer venture—and Pacific International Airways.

There were those who questioned Trippe's judgment at the time. As I have said, flying was still a great physical and financial hazard in Alaska, and the unsubsidized costs ran high. Was Juan Trippe dreaming in his early projection of the prospects of Alaskan air transportation? Trippe's belief in Alaska was no more fanciful than Secretary of State William Seward who bought the Alaskan Territory from the Russians for $7.2 million—about half the estimated cost of one supersonic plane—at what proved to be the rate of 2 cents an acre.

As early as 1934 Pan Am prepared a detailed study, with maps, proving that the shortest route to China from the United States was through Alaska. By 1940 commercial service between Seattle and Juneau was established, and the advent of the workhorse, DC–3, enabled Pan Am to open service through Whitehorse to Fairbanks. Lockheed Lodestars were operating twice a week on the Seattle-Fairbanks run in 1941 when Juan Trippe phased Pacific-Alaska Airways into the Alaska Division of Pan American.

At the time of the bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese, Pan Am had achieved all but the goal of establishing a great circle route to Asia. Yet few Americans realized the significance of Alaska as a strategic base for air operations in the North Pacific, although Gen. Billy Mitchell had declared before a congressional committee in 1935 that "Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft * * * whoever holds Alaska holds the world." The Japanese were not so blind, and made a stab at gaining a foothold on the North American Continent through the Aleutians.

At the close of the war, Pan American continued on its pioneering path. First came the DC–4's in 1947; then the first DC–6B's with pressurized cabin in 1954; the first B–377 luxury stratoclippers in 1956, and then the first jets. Beginning in 1945, the airline also made the first efforts to reduce cargo rates to make it feasible for Alaskans to utilize air freight for shipment of more goods. Both of your very able U.S. Senators have carried the fight for more transportation at lower rates since Alaska gained statehood.

It is no overstatement that Pan American and Alaska grew up together. Yet now, far from maturity in this year of 1963, we will fly 2,428,000 people across the Atlantic—720,000 across the Pacific. Pan American will have provided transportation for 1,730,000 people between the two American Continents and for 73,000 people between Alaska and Seattle. Since we have had the 31-year partnership with Alaska we have flown 113,154 trips across the Atlantic and 7,224 flights around the world.

We are operating Cape Canaveral for the Air Force, manning not only the cape but all the observation posts on islands between Florida and Cape Good Hope.

On a shoot we dispatch 10 ships to sea to observe the missile flights. We have a 600-man team working for the Army in the heart of Arizona—and we shoot stratospheric rockets for the Air Force over Hudson Bay.

Pan Am, through its fully owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp., operates 22 hotels around the world, and it inaugurates an average of about 8 new hotels annually. Its target 5 years hence is to operate 90 hotels around the world.

Through the new Pan Am Building in New York—the largest office building in the world—we are heavily involved in real estate. The small airline that began in Alaska and Key West has become a diversified American corporation engaged in many activities providing employment for close to 35,000 people with 38,000 stockholders—and with an unbroken dividend record since 1941. We like to feel that we are an example of the free enterprise system.

We of Pan American expect a good deal more of competition from our many formidable rivals on the world airways in bidding for landing rights here in Alaska. All will want to fly in and out of supersonic airports in the State with mail, passengers, and cargo, not merely stop for refueling or maintenance.

As in any business we must be alert to new developments and the improvement of service. As Jackie Gleason once said, "It's like being at the North Pole, the minute you sit down and relax, you're dead." In the airline business you just have to keep going.

May I say in closing, having described to you Pan Am's 30-year partnership with Alaska and Pan Am's 30-year commitment to the improvement of Alaskan air service, I am sure you experienced somewhat the same sense of shock we did in Pan Am when the CAB recommended that all of our Alaskan operations be terminated. This matter is now being litigated in Washington and it would be improper for me to comment further on the merits. But this I will say—and as forcefully and vigorously as I know now—we have no intention of terminating our 30-year partnership with Alaska. We hope to persuade the CAB that their present proposal is wrong and if we are unsuccessful we will use every legal means at our disposal and, if necessary, through every available court. Guided by the spirit of Ben Eielson, Joe Crosson, and many others who are no longer with us today but to whose pioneering efforts we have a continuing obligation, Pan American intends to stay in Alaska. We like it here.

A LIFE OF VIGOR ON THE LAST FRONTIER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, life may be peaches and cream in the big city East, but in the more remote areas of Alaska it can still be wild and woolly.

A recent letter published in the Lyman County Herald of Presho, S. Dak., tells of Alaska life at its woolliest.

Mrs. Art Porterfield, the author of the article, is homesteading with her husband in Talkeetna. This community lies on the Alaska Railroad roughly one-third of the way from Anchorage to Fairbanks.

From the sound of Mrs. Porterfield's letter, she is having the time of her life.

Because I believe Senators will enjoy this account, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

FRIENDS SAY—"STUPID, CRAZY," BUT SHE'S HAVING FUN—MRS. ART PORTERFIELD MIXES BEAR KILL WITH BREAD BAKING IN ALASKA

DEAR SOUTH DAKOTANS: I think I am now a true Alaskan as I have picked blueberries, caught a big salmon on a fly rod, and shot a bear.

Mary Ann Juresek and I went up the road last week to pick blueberries. She took her .45 pistol in case we should see a bear. We didn't find many berries. I picked a half gallon and we decided to drive on up the road for fun.

We drove up to Croto Creek where the king salmon were supposed to be spawning. The water is real clear and we didn't see any at first but pretty soon some came by, and down the creek I could see the water swirling and I thought it must be a great huge fish.

I asked Mary Ann if I could take her pistol and go down and shoot it. She said OK; so I strapped on the .45 and walked down the creek. When I got to where the swirl was, it wasn't a huge fish but a whole school of them fighting in the water where it was about 4 feet deep.

Figuring I was going to get pretty wet I picked a nice big one and took aim. I pulled the trigger and click. She hollered at me from the bridge, try again; so I took aim, pulled the trigger and bang. When I opened my eyes, all the fish were taking off except one. It was flopping around. It flopped right up to the bank and lay still. I reached down and after a couple of tries I got a good hold on it and lugged it up on the bank. About that time it came to and I wrestled it till it quieted. It was so heavy I could hardly carry it and every few feet it would start flopping and I would have to drop it. I finally got it up to the road and Mary Ann helped me get it under the hood (still flopping—I thought it was going to upset the car. Ha.)

I really thought I had done something great. When Art came home from work I told him what I'd done and he enlightened me to the fact that this is a very illegal way to take fish.

We didn't have any way to weigh the fish but it measured 40 inches. I took some pictures of the kids with it.

I canned the fish and the following day there was a party across the road at Carol and Marino Siks. Carol's folks were visiting here from Detroit. We really had a ball. There was quite a crowd and everyone was dancing—even Kula's mother who is 77 years old.

We had a broom dance where one person has to dance with a broom and when he throws the broom down everyone has to change partners. The one left without a partner has to dance with the broom. We were all laughing so hard you wouldn't even hear the music, just like a bunch of giggly school kids playing "upset the fruit basket."

Whenever things started quieting down we tossed on a polka record and it was all wild again. Art has made the polka real popular here.

We slept until 10 o'clock the next morning and then the Siks and us went up to the roadhouse (about 20 miles up the road). The men went fishing and Carol and I went rock hunting. I have gotten to be a terrible rockhound and if I don't move some of them out of the house soon we're going to have to move out.

The next night Bess LeTourneau came up and wanted to know if I wanted to go by boat down the Susitna River to the mouth of Trapper Creek to fish for silver salmon. I said "sure," so the next morning I took the girls up to Mary Ann's and Benny and I packed our gear to go fishing. Benny got to go along because his birthday was that week.

It was Benny's first boat ride and he really thought it was "neat."

Dale Sanders, who took us down in his boat, took Benny in hand and showed him how to fish and also helped him land a couple of big silver salmon.

After pulling in a few that Dale hooked, Benny decided they were too big and too hard on his hands; so he went to playing monkey in the trees.

I caught and landed four big silvers on Art's fly rod and man, do they fight. My arms got so tired that I had to rest after landing each one.

I have never seen so many fish before in my life. The sun was bright, the water was clear and you could see them in there by the hundreds. We went home with 17 fish. Ten of them I took home to can. Bess also sent about 4 gallons of strawberries home with me.

I took the fish up to Mary Ann's and she helped me can them. I got 26 cans. She made me take the fish heads home with me so they wouldn't draw the bears.

BREAD AND BEARS

The next morning I was mixing my bread but didn't have the flour all kneaded in when Mary Ann came careening into the yard with her jeep and came tearing into the house all shook up.

She said there was a bear in front of her house and she had fired over its head several times and it wouldn't go away so she shot and hit it. The bear let out a bellow and rolled into the stump row. She grabbed her three kids and jumped into the jeep and came down here.

Leaving my bread the way it was, I loaded Ardis into the car to follow her home. I asked her if I should take a gun and she said, "Yes, I only have one shell left in

mine." So I got Art's big rifle and took off, leaving the other kids home as they were playing up the road.

I didn't know if I could shoot Art's big rifle or not, as I have never shot anything but a .22, so when we got to her house I told her to wait a minute while I tried the gun out.

I loaded it, pulled the trigger, and it went bang, so I loaded it again and we went over to where she had shot the bear.

I went up into the stump row where it was supposed to be, but it wasn't there. I could see its trail so I trailed it through the stump row and she went around and met me on the other side. We trailed it across the clearing and found where it had gone into the woods.

The fern grows real thick—about shoulder high—in the woods and Mary Ann wouldn't go in so I proceeded on its trail alone. She stood on the edge of the woods screaming at me to come back. I followed it a ways and then lost the trail. After walking around awhile I found it again.

Meanwhile Mary Ann's kids were coming toward the woods and she had to take them back to the house.

After trailing the bear a ways suddenly I saw the fern wiggling up ahead. Guess I got buck fever or something—anyway I pulled up, fired at the wiggle and, of course, didn't hit a thing.

LAST SHELL

As I stopped to reload—lo and behold—I watched the last shell slide into the chamber.

The bear took off to the left with me cutting across after it, all the while looking for a tree suitable for climbing as most of the trees grow straight up with no branches except way at the top.

I spotted a tree with a crotch trunk not too far away, so when the bear got under a bush and was in view I took aim and fired my last shot. I hit and the bear screamed and bellowed.

But the blasted thing made for the very tree I had planned on climbing.

Luckily it fell at the bottom of it and flopped around. I made for the nearest tree and even though it didn't look as though it could be climbed, I figured if the bear came after me I would get up it somehow.

Mary Ann was up at the house when she heard the shot and screaming and thought it was me getting the worst of it. She came running back to the edge of the woods hollering at me. I yelled for her to bring her gun in. She followed the sound of my voice and got the gun to me—with only one shell in it.

Well, we decided we had to make this one good, so I told her to be sure she got it in the head. She told me to do it so I took her gun and crawled around the tree. Pushing the fern apart with the gun barrel in order to see where his head was and with the muzzle only about 3 feet from its head—I fired.

Couldn't see how I could miss at that range, but do you know, when I shot, that crazy bear raised straight up on its hind legs. I yelled, "Run, Mary Ann, run." She said, "Ax it with the gun." But it just lay back down.

We left it for dead and went back to the house.

I went back home and my bread had raised way up with dough hanging all over. I kneaded it down and was just getting it into the pans when Art came home from work. I had about half of it in the pans when Art said, "Let's go see that bear," so I just left the bread and off we went.

We stopped at Kula's with their mail. His mother and sister, visiting here from Detroit were anxious to see a bear before they went home so we took them along.

Art had his gun so he led the way and we went into the woods to where we had left the bear. It was gone. I could have died.

So we went bear hunting again and found it about 15 feet away laying in the ferns—deader than a mackerel.

It was a small bear so Art and Mary Ann dragged it out of the woods into the clearing and we all took turns having our picture taken holding the gun and standing with one foot on the carcass. That's standard procedure, isn't it?

Art and I dressed it out and there was "fresh meat in camp" up and down the road the next day. We could have had the hide tanned, but Mary Ann and I had shot the poor thing up pretty badly.

So ends the tale of my first bear. I have become quite famous up and down the road—I am known for being stupid, crazy, all guts and no brains, etc., but let them think it—I thought it was fun.

Mrs. ART PORTERFIELD,
Joanne Byre,
Talkeetna, Alaska.

AID TO TITO

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the problem of our relationship with the nation of Yugoslavia is a question that, like most cold war issues, cannot be defined in issues that are black and white. It is certainly true that President Tito is dedicated to a philosophy of government which we find completely alien to our own. Yet it is also true that President Tito's very formidable spirit of independence and nationalism has caused him to thwart some of the designs of Russian imperialism.

It is clear to me, Mr. President, that our support of Yugoslavia has been very useful to the long-range aims of our international politics. A very perceptive analysis of the results of our aid to Yugoslavia was published this morning by columnist Roscoe Drummond. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, from the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

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

AID TO TITO: WHAT THE UNITED STATES GOT FOR $2.5 BILLION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—When President Josip Broz Tito arrives in Washington October 17 to confer with President Kennedy on trade and foreign policy, one question which most Americans would like him to answer is this: What has the United States got for its $2.5 billion of aid to Yugoslavia during the past 15 years?

This question greatly concerned the 6 Senators and 12 Congressmen who made up the American delegation to the conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union here in Belgrade. They raised it pointedly on several occasions.

It is a good question, a fair question, particularly since Congress is being asked by the administration to reverse the decision it made a year ago denying Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment in trade. The most-favored-nation provision means that when the United States makes tariff arrangements with one country, it grants the same arrangement with other nations.

First, it should be understood that all U.S. aid to Yugoslavia is ended. Aid is neither being sought nor given.

But the United States has put a lot of resources into Yugoslavia. It is reasonable to want to know what benefit they have produced for us, because there is no justification for such aid unless it serves our national interests.

The facts, I think, show that we have received large dividends.

Until Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, Soviet-controlled military forces lined the Adriatic and stood menacingly along the borders of Greece, Austria, Italy, and Albania.

Tito's declaration of independence from Russia wiped out this menace at one stroke. American aid has greatly helped to nourish and sustain that independence until Yugoslavia could get on its feet economically. It has done so by virtue of its own hard work, through U.S. aid, and through the economic resurgence of all of Western Europe. Yugoslav trade is now 77 percent with the West, only 23 percent with the Soviet bloc and other countries.

Here are some of the other dividends which have come from Yugoslavia's independence of the Soviet Union which our aid has helped to maintain:

Yugoslavia withdrew all of its military help to the Communist civil war in Greece and the war soon collapsed.

The long-festering dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy over Trieste was amicably settled.

Albania was geographically isolated from the Soviet bloc.

Though Tito is a dedicated Communist, he withdrew his country from the Cominform, an instrument of Communist world subversion, and has refused to join the Warsaw Pact.

Only a Yugoslavia independent of the Soviet Union could pursue policies which have produced the foregoing results. Its independence is possible only because of its economic association with the United States and Western Europe.

Clearly it is in the interests of the United States to do everything practicable to keep it that way.

It seems to me shortsighted for Congress to direct the administration to discriminate against Yugoslavia in withdrawing the normal most-favored-nation provision. We were, of course, piqued by Tito's refusal to criticize the Soviet Union for breaking the test moratorium in 1961. This was one of Belgrade's political mistakes.

But Yugoslavia has often sided with the United States at the U.N. and has more frequently voted with the unalined nations than with the Soviets.

If Congress does not soon reverse its action, cutting off Yugoslavia and Poland from normal trade relations, the effect of this policy will be exactly the opposite of what its sponsors said they want. It will not help isolate Eastern Europe from the Soviet Union; it will isolate us from Eastern Europe and abandon the field to the Soviets. Surely this is a policy of retreat, not advance, and a detriment to the national interests and security of the United States.

The choice before us in Eastern Europe today is not between supporting communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. The choice is between governments dominated by Moscow and governments, like Yugoslavia's, which, while Communist, are independent, which are not abetting the Communist conspiracy, and which are pursuing their own national interests—not Russia's national interests.

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, no one in this body or in the Nation at large is unaware of the tremendous responsibilities borne by the President of the United States. None of these responsibilities is paramount over the rest but certainly in the field of foreign affairs we find the President holding control over the potential for vast good or complete ruin.

Mr. President, an illuminating look at the power of the President and its meaning for the future of this Nation appeared Sunday in the Washington Post. The article, by Chalmers M. Roberts, provides a thoughtful appraisal of a complex subject and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

RED FIREWORKS ILLUMINATE PRESIDENTIAL POWER

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The extraordinary power of the Presidency in the conduct of American foreign policy has long been evident. But not very often do we have an opportunity to catch an inside glimpse of the power which the President can exert on the other side in the cold war.

The running exchange of vitriol between Nikita S. Khrushchev's Soviet Union and Mao Tse-tung's Communist China has now provided such an insight in the cases of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

What the Moscow and Peking accounts reveal about the repercussions on American policies these past 7 years now becomes of very great importance for this reason: Both General Eisenhower and Mr. Kennedy, though of rival political parties, have followed essentially the same policy toward the Communist bloc, but the leading Republican presidential possibility, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, advocates an almost diametrically opposed policy.

A CONGRESSIONAL REIN

It may be true, as Walter Lippmann wrote recently, that GOLDWATER is "now in the process of reshaping himself for the political realities of this country." As Lippmann pointed out, for example, GOLDWATER has begun to abandon his extreme position of opposition to the graduated income tax.

It can be argued that no President could repeal the income tax even if he wanted to because Congress would not let him. The same can be said of all the measures of the American welfare state because they are the product of Congress as well as of the Executive.

But what of foreign affairs? Congress can go quite far in forming domestic policy despite a President. But congressional power is far less than a President's in the conduct of foreign policy.

For example, as a Senator, GOLDWATER could only cast one vote against the nuclear test ban treaty. But it took a President to come to terms with the Soviets on the treaty. GOLDWATER said only this month that he favored withdrawing diplomatic recognition from the Soviet Union. Conferring or withdrawing such recognition is a presidential prerogative.

And GOLDWATER repeated again this month that he favors "a blockade—as Kennedy imposed" of Cuba. That, too, was done by presidential power alone.

As to summit meetings, the Senator wrote in 1962 that "the only summit that can succeed is one that does not take place * * *." Congress cannot go to the summit; that is a presidential choice, and both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have chosen to meet with Khrushchev.

THE RELEVANT POINT

Whether the test ban is right or wrong, whether Cuba should or should not be blockaded, whether diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union should be withdrawn by the United States, or whether an American President should go to the summit is not here the point. All these issues are matters for legitimate debate, especially in a presidential campaign.

The point here is that GOLDWATER, by his words and by the earnest of his vote against the test ban treaty, proposes a very radical change in the conduct of American foreign policy. That is what Mr. Kennedy was alluding to last week in his Salt Lake City speech. And it is true even assuming that GOLDWATER would be forced by events to modify some of his positions should he displace Mr. Kennedy in the White House 16 months hence.

Hence the high degree of relevancy, as the presidential campaign approaches, of the record as revealed in the Sino-Soviet exchange of abuse.

Two cases will suffice to show the influence an American President can bring on the Communist bloc: The effect of President Eisenhower's 1959 meetings with Khrushchev here in Washington and at Camp David, Md., and the effect of President Kennedy's agreement on the nuclear test ban treaty this August.

The Chinese now say, and the Soviets do not disagree, that their dispute began with Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in the famous secret speech in February 1956. It was in that speech that Khrushchev first put forward as Communist dogma the thesis that war between the Communist states and the democracies was not necessarily inevitable. But it was not until this theory was put into action, as the Chinese see it, that the schism really began.

In October 1957, 11 days after the first sputnik, Khrushchev promised to help Mao create Chinese nuclear weapons. At that time Soviet economic and technical aid flowed to Peiping. But things changed in mid-1959, the Chinese accounts show, at about the time Khrushchev received his long-sought invitation to visit the United States.

On June 20, 1959, Peiping charges and Moscow has not denied, Khrushchev "unilaterally scrapped" the Sino-Soviet arms aid agreement. The Chinese also say that this was done "apparently as a gift" from Khrushchev to Mr. Eisenhower. That is obvious nonsense and the use of the word apparently indicates a minimum of Peiping's belief in its own assertion.

After the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting, Peiping says, "Khrushchev lauded Eisenhower to the skies, hailing him as a man who 'enjoys the absolute confidence of his people' and who 'also worries about insuring peace just as we do.'" Khrushchev did say such things in public.

The following month, Khrushchev flew to Peiping (for what turned out to be his last meeting with Mao), where, the Chinese say, he read them "a lecture against 'testing by force the stability of the capitalist system.'"

The issue of such a test by force was the Chinese determination to end the Nationalist Chinese regime on Taiwan, protected, then as now, by U.S. military power. In 1958, the Red Chinese had had a try at it but had met with military defeat resulting from American military aid to Chiang Kai-shek. And the Chinese now complain that Khrushchev's public statements at the time about aiding them were of only a limited and defensive nature, as indeed they were.

At this October 1959 Peiping meeting, the Chinese say Khrushchev in effect was approving a "two Chinas" policy and thus was backing American policy. The Soviets, in reply, call this nonsense. But the Soviets do concede that Khrushchev "said, touching on the Taiwan question, that different ways were possible to solve it—not only military but peaceful, too."

Khrushchev went to Peiping fresh from some forceful words from President Eisenhower on American determination not to let the Communists take over Taiwan by force. It is now apparent that the President's remarks, plus Khrushchev's view of America, had the desired effect.

In those days, American officials hoped that Moscow could "control" Peiping and thus prevent a Sino-American clash in Asia. It is obvious now that a real effect of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting was to deepen the Sino-Soviet schism, since Peiping refused to be a Soviet satellite.

That the schism deepened further is evident from the uncontested fact that only 9 months later, Moscow, as Peiping describes it, "suddenly took a unilateral decision recalling all the Soviet experts in China within 1 month, thereby tearing up hundreds of agreements and contracts."

There were other signs of Soviet hostility toward China, too. In mid-1960, what for generations had been the normal nomadic movement of Chinese tribes in interior Sinkiang Province back and forth across the Sino-Soviet border suddenly became a serious matter. The Chinese say that the Soviets began to kidnap their nationals and the Soviets contend that "since 1960, Chinese servicemen and civilians have been systematically violating the Soviet border."

Of course, all these and other now revealed points of Sino-Soviet friction cannot be called the product of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting. But the basic Chinese complaint is that Khrushchev, in effect, has gone soft on capitalism and has been trying to get on with the United States, at least by avoiding nuclear war.

On May 1, 1960, on the eve of the Paris summit which was to bring about another Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting, Francis Gary Powers' American U–2 espionage plane was shot out of the sky deep inside the Soviet Union.

The U–2's had been sent over Russia by direction of President Eisenhower. Except for a handful of senior Members, Congress was not told about the program and none of that handful knew of the flight on the eve of the summit gathering. This was an executive action for which Mr. Eisenhower later took full public responsibility.

Regardless of the validity of the U–2 flights, or even of that particular one, the Eisenhower admission put Khrushchev in an intolerable box with the Chinese, much more of a box, we now know, than anyone even suspected at the time. As the Chinese now say: "The 'spirit of Camp David' completely vanished. Thus, events entirely confirmed our views."

This ended the dialog between the Eisenhower administration and the Soviet Union. But a new administration took over in Washington 7 months later and President Kennedy at once sought to reestablish communication with Moscow. Though from his own viewpoint badly burned once, Khrushchev reciprocated Mr. Kennedy's overtures. His first effort of importance, however, was to test the young and new President.

Unhappily, the Bay of Pigs debacle—another Executive act not approved by Congress and started without congressional knowledge—appears to have convinced Khrushchev that the President was weak. So when they met at Vienna in June, Khrushchev cranked up a new Berlin crisis, presumably to test the Kennedy mettle.

The previous June, just before the U–2 incident, Khrushchev, the Chinese now say, had strongly attacked the Chinese at a secret world Communist meeting in Bucharest. By November, however, considering his strained relations with the United States, Khrushchev agreed to an effort at a Moscow meeting of 81 Communist parties to paper over Sino-Soviet difficulties. The patchwork did not last very long, so deep was the schism.

This attempt appears now to have been a tactical maneuver motivated by Khrushchev's ignorance of what the new American President would do.

Although the Bay of Pigs probably helped lead Khrushchev to create a new Berlin crisis, he stopped short when President Kennedy stood firm over Berlin in the fall and winter of 1961–62. In September 1961, the

Soviets resumed nuclear testing and Soviet-American relations were at a low ebb.

By spring, however, with some prodding from British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, President Kennedy opened another round of test ban talks with Moscow while resuming American tests. On August 27, 1962, the United States and Britain offered a limited test ban treaty which nearly a year later was the basis for the one the Soviets finally accepted.

The Chinese now say that "in August 1962, the Soviet Government formally notified China that the Soviet Union would conclude an agreement with the United States on the prevention of nuclear proliferation." Whatever the actual fact, the Chinese now say that this was "a joint Soviet-United States plot to monopolize nuclear weapons and an attempt to deprive China of the right to possess nuclear weapons to resist the U.S. nuclear threat. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests (with Moscow) against this."

Here it is evident that a major bone of current contention is Moscow's failure to provide China with nuclear weapons or to help her build her own. A major reason for the test ban treaty, in the view of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, has been just that: To try to keep Red China from getting such weapons.

The Chinese now contend that not only did Khrushchev ask them to sign the treaty, which of course they have refused to do, but also "threatened that if the Chinese Government opposed this treaty and refused to be bound by it, the United States would help the Chiang Kai-shek clique to manufacture nuclear weapons."

Further, the Chinese say that not only have Soviet leaders "colluded with the U.S. imperialists in an effort to force China to undertake not to manufacture nuclear weapons," but that the Russian leaders "told the Americans the secrets between China and the Soviet Union concerning nuclear weapons."

Both of these allegations are lies, as far as Washington is concerned, American officials say. The information here on Chinese nuclear development comes from sources other than the Soviet Government, it is said.

But whether or not Mao and company believe the charges they make against Khrushchev on this point, it is evident enough that the test ban treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union has further poisoned the Communist well. And that treaty was a Presidential act, subject only to the Senate approval given last week.

Of the many as yet unclear points of Soviet policy and Sino-Soviet relationships, one is the Chinese charge that Khrushchev told them in August 1962, that he would sign a test ban agreement. In fact, he did not approve one for nearly a year and then only by switching his position from a demand for a total ban with only a few underground on-site inspections to the more limited ban.

It would now appear that Khrushchev's motivation for the switch was to try to deny China nuclear weapons and to isolate her among the world's Communist parties. In that act, President Kennedy was a willing accomplice.

But it is also true that by August 1962, Khrushchev had embarked on his Cuban missile venture. Indeed, the outcome of that "eyeball to eyeball" confrontation was a major cause of delay in reaching treaty agreement.

One can only guess what was in Khrushchev's mind. Perhaps he hoped by placing missiles under Mr. Kennedy's nose in Cuba to make blackmail gains in Berlin and force a test ban treaty more on his terms, both actions which would have enabled him to say to the Chinese, "See how much I can gain without the nuclear war you want to risk." But when it came to risking nuclear war over Cuba, it was Khrushchev, not President Kennedy, who backed down.

These accounts of the interplay between Khrushchev and the two American Presidents serve amply to demonstrate the immense power which an American Chief Executive can exert—and has exerted—on the Communist world. But a premise of all these American actions and reactions has been a Presidential willingness to negotiate with the Russians and to meet with their leaders.

Of course, the twin pillars of American foreign policy, and of Soviet policy, too, are military power and the will to use it plus skillful diplomacy to exploit that power. The great danger of the nuclear age has been less that of accidental war than of war by miscalculation; diplomacy is required to avoid miscalculation.

And the major danger of miscalculation has been the possibility that the Soviet Union might conclude that the United States, as ancient Communist dogma holds, is so hostile to communism that it would sometime attack Russia. Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have denied this.

Indeed, much of the Soviet-American dialog dates from the October 19, 1954, off-the-cuff remarks by President Eisenhower that "since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace if there is to be a happy and well world."

A point at issue in the current Sino-Soviet argument is exactly what Mao said to Khrushchev about nuclear war at the 1957 Moscow meeting. The Soviet version is, in effect, that Mao, said that even if more than half the world's population were to be annihilated, he was willing to fight, whereas Khrushchev was appalled at the idea of destroying everything built since the Bolshevik Revolution.

Last July 14, the Soviets said that "the nuclear rocket weapons that were created in the middle of our century changed old notions about wars." This, the Chinese take to mean, they say, that "war is no longer the continuation of politics," as they imply it should continue to be.

If the Soviets are thus convinced, as the evidence is on that side of the argument, then a receptiveness on the American side to talk out and argue out world problems continues to be imperative. "We arm to parley," said Churchill.

And to parley is a Presidential function.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the selection of Bismarck, N. Dak., for the annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians held September 10–13, 1963, did honor to our capital city and to our State. This fine organization completed a most successful convention, after earnest deliberations, and after declaring policy for the ensuing year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions adopted printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Christian mission schools have been conducted for the education of the Indian people since the 16th century; and

Whereas the mission schools were the only schools which took care of Indian education until late in the 19th century; and

Whereas many of the delegates present here today received their training in these mission schools; be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians go on record as commending the work of the mission schools and urge the Federal and State Governments as well as private agencies to assist them in their work in any way possible.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America provide the boys of America with clean, wholesome, and useful recreation conducive to rigid training and physical development; and

Whereas it is the hope of the Indian race, that more Indian boys should receive this opportunity in acquiring scouting experience; and

Whereas Tribal Leaders' Conference on Scouting conducted at Philmont Scout Ranch have been instructive and beneficial: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the 20th Annual Convention of the National Congress of American Indians convened at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10–13, 1963, recognizing the value of our Indian youth, encourages and advises all tribes to have representation at the 1964 Philmont Conference scheduled for September 15–17, 1964, at Cimmaron, N. Mex.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas on many Indian reservations, there exists a deplorable condition in the jails because of lack of funds, and lack of personnel; and

Whereas such jails do not meet the health standards set forth by the U.S. Public Health Service and the respective State boards of health: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians assembled in annual convention at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10–13, 1963, requests a congressional appropriation to build and maintain municipal centers on Indian reservations to meet Public Health Service standards; be it further

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians further urge the Bureau of Indian Affairs to grant early approval of law and order codes adopted and submitted by tribal councils.

RESOLUTION 4

Be it resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in annual convention assembled September 10–13, 1963, in Bismarck, N. Dak., For the gracious hospitality and courteous treatment of the Indian people at the convention the National Congress of American Indians sends greetings, full thanks and deep appreciation to the Honorable William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota; Hon. Evan Lips and Hon. John Handtmann, mayors of the cities of Bismarck and Mandan; the efficient and courteous police and fire departments; to the Bismarck Chamber of Commerce; to the Host Tribes, Standing Rock, Fort Berthold, Fort Totten, Turtle Mountain, Rosebud, and Pine Ridge; to Mr. Joe Chase and his associates for arranging the international bronc riding match; to the press and the management of the convention headquarters.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas it is the policy of the National Congress of American Indians to encourage Indian youth to participate in tribal activities; and

Whereas there was an annual contest to select Miss Indian America; and

Whereas Miss Williamettee Youpee, of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, has won at Sheridan, Wyo., the title of Miss Indian America X: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians in 20th annual convention

on September 10–13, 1963, at Bismarck, N. Dak., hereby extends thanks to Williamette Youpee, Miss Indian America of 1963 for gracing the convention with her beauty and charm and for cheerfully participating in the convention activities of the National Congress of American Indians.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the aboriginal ownership of lands, waters, powersites, hunting and fishing, and other rights were affirmed by treaties; and

Whereas there has been and now are more efforts being made in the Congress of the United States and certain State legislatures to violate and abrogate Indian treaties; and

Whereas such blatant and flagrant disregard for these treaties is contrary to the Constitution of the United States which makes all treaty obligations the supreme law of the land; and

Whereas all Indian tribes are deeply concerned about existing proposals to seize certain Indian rights such as hunting and fishing areas, powersites, water rights, and land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, hereby urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the State governments to exercise greater awareness and respect to all Indian treaties; to undertake full consultation with Indian tribes and refrain from the takeover of any treaty rights without full consent of the tribes concerned.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, in convention assembled, at Spokane, Wash., on the 30th day of August 1963, is of record opposing the enactment of H.R. 6131, S. 156, 88th Congress, 1st session, bills relating to membership in Indian tribal organizations; and

Whereas provisions for elections and referendums are adequately provided for in the various tribal constitutions and that the subjects proposed to be legislated by H.R. 6131 and S. 156 are internal matters that fall fully under the autonomy of the tribes and should not be abrogated by unneeded congressional legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians assembled at convention in Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, hereby oppose the passage and enactment of H. R. 6131 and S. 156.

RESOLUTION 8

Whereas the National Youth Council drafted and passed the following resolution which reads as follows:

"Whereas the National Indian Youth Council, believing in a greater Indian America, holds it to be for the best interest and progressive action toward better understanding and improvement of conditions for all Indians to carry forward our policy and made clear the inherent rights of Indians; and

"Whereas in order to gain this end the National Indian Youth Council strongly opposes the termination of Federal trusteeship over Indians; and

"Whereas the National Indian Youth Council holds that it is morally and legally right that Indians have a voice in matters of jurisdiction directly or indirectly affecting Indians; and

"Whereas the National Indian Youth Council recognizes the rights guaranteed a people under the statutes of the United States and holds that Indians must make every effort to exercise these basic rights: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the National Indian Youth Council endeavors to carry forward a policy of making known the inherent sovereign rights of Indians to all people, opposing termination of Indians at all levels, seeking full participation and consent in jurisdictional matters involving Indians, and stanchly supports exercising of those basic rights guaranteed Indians by the statutes of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the National Congress of American Indians realize the importance of Indian youth activity and interest in political affairs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the National Congress of American Indians, in convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, hereby commend the National Indian Youth Council for their work and interest in the welfare of their Indian people."

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas President Kennedy is scheduling a tour of the West to visit regions particularly adapted for recreational purposes; and

Whereas within the areas of his visit there are Indian reservations with the most excellent recreational facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians convention assembled September 10–13, 1963, That the President be invited in a telegram from this convention to include some Indian reservations in his itinerary.

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the Governor of South Dakota on March 15, 1963, signed H.R. 791, that would force our Indian people to accept State jurisdiction under Public Law 280 without consent and in violation of our treaty rights and tribal constitution; and

Whereas this legislation would strip our courts, Federal and tribal police officers of the power to preserve law and order on Indian reservations; and

Whereas South Dakota has attempted to assume this power but declines to accept the responsibilities that go with this power, conceding that it would cost the State $500,000 annually to maintain the present levels of law enforcement enjoyed under Federal and tribal jurisdiction, by refusing to appropriate any funds whatsoever for this purpose; and

Whereas to prevent this irresponsible act from taking effect, the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota representing 43,000 Indian people joined by thousands of our non-Indian friends have petitioned the State to submit house bill 791 to vote of the people in a statewide referendum in November 1964, (gathering 20,000 signatures in what has been called the greatest Indian political feat up to this day); and

Whereas we the United Sioux Tribes are determined to win this referendum against great odds and well financed opposition, who covet our lands; and

Whereas this act denies our Indian people equal protection under the law and deprives our Indian people of a voice in their own destiny;

Whereas the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota appeal to the National Congress of American Indians for moral support to defeat the law enacted by the South Dakota State legislation which is to be placed at a referendum vote in November 1964; and

Whereas the United Sioux Tribes appeals to the National Congress of American Indians for financial aid in this cause: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Congress of American Indians assembled at Bismarck, September 10–13, 1963, wholeheartedly extends its moral and financial support to the United Sioux Tribes; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of the National Congress of American Indians is hereby authorized to make every effort to raise funds that will be utilized for this worthy cause.

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas countless numbers of Indian estates have not had probate action for years; and

Whereas bills are left unpaid and heirs are not benefiting from estates due them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 20th annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10–13, 1963, That the Examiner of Inheritance, Department of the Interior, be strongly urged to expedite all Indian probate action.

RESOLUTION 12

Whereas the Congress of the United States has several bills relating to the transfer of submarginal lands to various tribes involved; and

Whereas use of these lands and revenue derived therefrom are essential to the economic development of the Indian tribes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians in 20th annual convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, do hereby support and urge the earliest possible consideration of these bills that titles to these lands be transferred to the tribes in trust be made a part of the existing reservations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Chair and members of the subcommittees on Indian Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION 13

Be it resolved, That the National Congress of American Indian Tribes in open convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 13th day of September 1963, is opposed to S. 1049, a bill relating to the Indian heirship problem, as reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on September 4, 1963.

As reported section 7(b) of S. 1049 authorizes the sale of tribal land with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. This is a departure from the law in force since 1791 (25 U.S.C. 177) forbidding the sale of tribal land unless explicitly authorized by act of Congress. Section 7(b) would open the way to break up tribal landholdings by moving them into individual ownership. It would destroy the tribal land base and multiply the heirship problem, S. 1049 avowedly is designed to alleviate.

Section 7(b) was not in any draft of bill considered at hearings before the committee and was not the subject of discussion at such hearings. Indian tribes have not been afforded an opportunity to be heard on what would be a revolutionary change in Federal policy which will have a shattering effect on tribal landholdings.

Within a year after S. 1049 becomes law, fractional heirship interests will be sold with a preferential right in a tribe to purchase heirship interests provided the tribe has the funds to pay for the land and has a land management plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior. For funds, S. 1049 authorizes an increase of $35 million to the revolving credit fund of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, presumably to loan to the tribes to finance the purchase of heirship interests. However, the sales feature is not keyed to the availability of funds to the tribes and an approved land management plan. Heirship interests in land may not be sold before the tribe has funds and an approved land management plan.

The National Congress of American Indians respectfully urges that S. 1049 be rejected by the Senate or, as a least desirable alternative that S. 1049 be amended:

1. Strike section 7(b).

2. To key the sales feature to the availability of funds and an approved land management plan by amending the opening paragraph of section 6 by adding a proviso after "requirements" on page 16, line 12, reading as follows: "*Provided,* That no land within the reservation or approved consolidation area, shall be sold under this act unless

the tribe has funds available for the acquisition of such lands, or advises the Secretary in writing that it does not desire to acquire the lands."

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has declared, quote, "as trustee of Indian property we in the Bureau have a clear-cut responsibility to safeguard the Indian beneficiaries against dissipation of their funds (judgment money)." One way in which they can dissipate with little or no lasting benefit is through a blanket per capita distribution of the entire amount to the individual beneficiary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Congress of American Indians in convention duly assembled on September 10 to 13, 1963, in Bismarck, North Dakota, request and urge of congressional legislation to provide the most beneficial use of all these judgment funds (for tribal use) as determined by the individual tribal desires.

RESOLUTION 15

Whereas Mr. Oliver LaFarge, president of the board of directors of the Association on American Indian Affairs, passed away on August 2, 1963; and

Whereas Mr. LaFarge was a true friend of American Indians and worked long and hard for them and their interests in the social and economic fields devoting his talents and time unstintingly in and out of the associations; and

Whereas through his efforts and the program of the association the Indians have been aided in making appreciable progress in their programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in the 20th convention assembled September 10–13, 1963, That it expresses deep regrets for the untimely passing of Mr. LaFarge and the loss of a true and sympathetic friend of the American Indian who approached their problems with a warm and understanding heart.

RESOLUTION 16

Whereas the Foundation of American Indian Culture is being established in Bismarck, N. Dak., in order that "future generations may know of the rich and colorful civilization that existed on our continent before the white man came" and in order that the "public may become acquainted with the present-day Indian way of life," with a three-part program envisioning (1) A museum of Indian culture; (2) an information and education center on Indian culture; (3) an annual exposition of Indian arts, parades, powwows, and theatrical productions.

Whereas in the articles of incorporation under the laws of the State of Oklahoma the National Congress of American Indians is committed, among its specific purposes, "to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian race" and "to preserve Indian cultural values," and therefore to this extent has the same goals as the Foundation of American Indian Culture; and

Whereas the sponsors of the Foundation of American Indian Culture have enlisted the interest of the National Congress of American Indians in its formation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention assembled September 10 to 13, 1963, That its executive director be instructed to determine, with the advice of counsel, how the National Congress may participate in, or contribute to, the proposed activities of the foundation and if by affiliation, as provided in section 4k, article V, of the National Congress of American Indians Constitution, how the National Congress may share in the facilities of the foundation; and to report his findings with recommendations to the executive council; be it further

Resolved, That, meanwhile, the National Congress of American Indians shall cooperate in every way possible, without corporate commitment in advance of clearance by the executive council and counsel, with the foundation toward the accomplishment of common goals.

RESOLUTION 17

Whereas Indian tribal officials entrusted with responsibility for attending meetings to transact tribal business are usually compensated for attendance at such meetings; and

Whereas such tribal officials have not considered such amounts were includible as income, and

Whereas some officials of the Internal Revenue Service have lately questioned whether such payments should be reportable as taxable income and there is uncertainty whether some officials of the Internal Revenue Service are on sound ground in ascertaining taxability of such amounts, particularly since litigation is pending on this question: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, That the Secretary of the Interior is urged to intervene with the Congress, the Internal Revenue Service and such other appropriate agencies or individuals to the end that payments of amounts to tribal officials for conducting tribal business may continue to be exempt from Federal and State taxes.

RESOLUTION 18

Whereas the irrigation liens charged against individual Indian allotments were not farmed or leased builds up a backlog that hampers the leasing of said lands and causes economic hardship to individual Indians; and

Whereas there is no statutory authority allowing such charges to be waived: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians, at its September 10 to 13, 1963, convention assembled, That the convention does petition the Congress of the United States to amend the act of July 26, 1936, 49 Stat. 1804 (25 U.S.C.A. sec. 389a) to read as follows:

"Where the Secretary finds that such lands cannot be cultivated profitably due to a present lack of water supply, proper drainage facilities, or need of additional construction work, or if individual Indian allotments within the irrigation district are not farmed or leased during the current irrigation year, he shall declare such lands temporarily nonirrigable for periods not to exceed 5 years and no charges shall be assessed against such lands during such periods."

RESOLUTION 19

Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have proposed a project to dredge the Skagit River, Skagit County, Wash., from a point at Concrete, Wash., down to salt water area, and annually maintain the channel; and

Whereas in addition to dredging the channel, they may also construct a dam on the Sauk River; and

Whereas dredging of the channel on the Skagit would destroy natural spawning grounds for salmon, which contribute largely to the economic stability of at least three tribes near this river, and the salmon industry in general; and

Whereas as a result thereof, the Indians' treaty rights to hunt and fish in the counties of Whatcom, Skagit, and Snohomish would be seriously affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention this September 10 to 13, 1963, in the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., Do hereby protest and object to the plans of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as above stated, for reasons hereinabove set forth, and request of said Corps of Engineers that this project be set aside for the sake of conservation of the salmon industry for the reason that such proposal, if carried out to completion, would constitute deprivation of the fishery guaranteed to these Indians by treaty of Point Elliot, 1855.

RESOLUTION 20

Whereas at the present time, low-rent public housing is now being completed on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation;

Whereas several more low-rent public housing and other projects are now in the development stages;

Whereas the Oglala Sioux Tribe constructed these projects on force account with employment of local Indians greatly enhancing the tribal economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention assembled September 10 to 13, 1963, That it go on record as urging Government agencies to employ force account on housing as well as other industries on all reservation projects and that it will actively so urge through its executive director whenever any project of this type to be undertaken on a reservation is brought to its attention.

RESOLUTION 21

Whereas the gunnery range has been declared surplus by the U.S. Air Force;

Whereas the gunnery range at one time had provided income for the tribe and had provided grazing privileges for Indian cattle operators;

Whereas the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council requests the assistance of the National Congress of American Indians to assist in restoring the original gunnery range back to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and individual members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in the 20th annual convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10 to 13, 1963, That we urge the U.S. Government to restore the 94,000 acres of land to the tribe; and further

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to restore all individual allotments to the Oglala Sioux tribal members.

RESOLUTION 22

Whereas a right-of-way has been granted by the Department of the Interior to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., through the Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Indian community reservation in connection with the Arizona water project, without the consent of the Indians and with a resultant loss of valuable property; and

Whereas the transaction involving the grant of the right-of-way was carried on under circumstances and with representations which bespoke a gross injustice to the Indians and cast a cloud on their title particularly from the standpoint of the exact boundaries of the post area (4 by 10 miles) and the reservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention assembled September 10–14, 1963, That the proper committees in the Congress be requested by the executive director to pass a resolution for a congressional investigation of the transaction as a basis for appropriate legislation to correct the situation, to secure the Indians rights and to fix firmly the boundaries of their post area and reservation.

RESOLUTION 23

Whereas H.R. 4013 was introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas said bill provides for compensation to the Crow Tribe of Montana for loss

of lands within the boundaries of the reservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NCAI in the 20th annual convention assembled, September 10–14, 1963, Bismarck, N. Dak., hereby request Congress of the United States for the passage of H.R. 4013.

RESOLUTION 24

Whereas a vast majority of the tribes in the United States voiced objection to the passage of Public Law 83–280 in 1953; and

Whereas most tribes and the National Congress of American Indians voiced an opinion that stated that Public Law 83–280 would cause racial discrimination against Indian people; and

Whereas several States have attempted to assume civil and criminal jurisdiction under the provisions of Public Law 83–280 but refuse to accept the responsibility of financing law and order operations equal to the protection now given by tribal and Federal law enforcement officers; and

Whereas Public Law 83–280 would not take into consideration the provisions of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which allows the tribes to maintain their own law and order systems; and

Whereas the cardinal principle of our Government, that of "consent of the governed," was completely disregarded even though the tribes requested that such a provision be a part of Public Law 83–280; and

Whereas the tribes of the United States have consistently voiced their objections to Public Law 83–280 during the past 10 years: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Congress of American Indians assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 13, 1963, That we urge Congress to amend Public Law 83–280 by the passage of S. 143 and H.R. 6145 to provide for the consent of the Indian tribes; and further

Resolved, That these laws be enacted to provide for an agreement between the Federal, State and tribal governments in areas where there is mutual agreement; and further

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians urges the people of the United States to request Congress to abide by the wishes of the Indian tribes in dealing with Public Law 83–280.

RESOLUTION 25

Resolution of the National Congress of American Indians supporting the position of the Crow Tribal Council in its efforts to protect individual rights

Whereas Crow Indians classified as competent are empowered by law to enter into unsupervised grazing and farming leases of their own or children's allotments; and

Whereas pursuant to such congressional authority, many competent Crows have exercised this prerogative and executed such leases; and

Whereas the status of many such leases has been questioned by a recent solicitor's opinion nullifying an intermediate amendment to the leasing laws applicable to the Crow Reservation; and

Whereas cancellations, new leases, top leases and other agreements have been executed by the parties in an effort to correct defects and other irregularities in existing leases caused by the changed interpretation of the law; and

Whereas leases executed by competent Crows must be promptly filed with the Crow Indian Agency; and

Whereas the fact of filing does not establish the legality of such leases but serves only the purposes of recording and notice; and

Whereas the Interior Secretary or his agents are precluded by law from approving or disapproving leases made by competent Crows; and

Whereas the individual competent Crow is charged with the responsibility of complying with the terms of any lease made by him; and

Whereas the Superintendent of the Crow Agency has refused to file certain leases made by competent Crows; and

Whereas his refusal to file these leases is tantamount to disapproving and rejecting the lease and circumvents the legal prohibition against supervision of these leases by the Interior Secretary; and

Whereas this action is beyond his authority, is arbitrary and capricious; and

Whereas the superintendent of the Crow Agency fails and refuses to furnish the particularized reason for his action to the competent Crow and thereby makes it difficult for the individual to pursue his administrative remedy; and

Whereas the superintendent of the Crow Agency by pursuing this course of conduct must be deemed to be carrying out policy established by his superiors in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians duly assembled in annual convention at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 10–14, 1963, does with this resolution express its disapproval of this authoritarian, bureaucratic policy and does and hereby censors the Government officials responsible for this policy; be it further

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians does hereby request the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Philleo Nash, to abandon this policy and direct the superintendent of the Crow Agency to file any and all leases submitted to him by competent Crows and to return to the individual Crow the responsibility for compliance with the lease; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, the Honorable Senator Mike Mansfield, the Honorable Senator Lee Metcalf, the Honorable Congressman Arnold H. Olsen, the Honorable Congressman, James F. Battin, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Henry Jackson, and the chairman of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, the Honorable Congressman James A. Haley.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on July 26, 1963, Estes Kefauver's 60th birthday, he was presented with a scroll by the National Committee for a Representative Congress which paid tribute to his many years of distinguished service to the people of Tennessee and the Nation.

The sentiments expressed in this scroll so well mirror my own feelings about the man and the work he did, that I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the scroll printed in the RECORD.

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

TO HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. SENATOR

Presentation of this scroll is made for an outstanding record of distinguished service as a U.S. Senator in—

Adhering steadfastly to the principles of representative government;

Rendering highly constructive services to the people of Tennessee, faithfully and vigorously representing their ideals and objectives and making many important contributions to welfare, progress, and betterment of that State;

Standing forth as a fighting champion of true democracy to make and keep our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"—and striving also untiringly for the benefit of all mankind to bring about advancement of peace, freedom, justice, and a better way of life in all nations of the world;

In dedicating his lifework to the cause of humanity, to the firm conviction that every man is his brother, that government should protect the helpless weak from the selfish strong, that laws must serve the greatest good for the greatest number;

In living daily his love and faith for God, for country, for family, and for fellow men—a stranger to anger, hate or selfishness, a modern apostle of gentleness, patience, kindliness, tolerance, and warmth;

In establishing a brilliant record, to long endure, of high public service as a great American, a great Senator, a great Christian, a great crusader against evils and injustices—a great man of unwavering honesty and integrity, unfaltering courage and energy, yet humble and modest in his greatness, who asks of life but the simple privilege of continuing to love and work as a good friend, a good neighbor, a good and useful public servant of each and every American, and of all people of this earth.

(Text of this scroll was prepared by Charles Kress, former mayor of Binghamton, N.Y., a close friend of Senator Kefauver, associated with the Senator in the Senate Crime Investigation Committee, for presentation to Senator Kefauver on his 60th birthday, July 26, 1963.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now that morning business has been concluded, the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, September 26, 1963, will resume the consideration of House bill 6754, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1964.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to amendment No. 197 of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. On this amendment there is a limit of 3 hours on the debate, to be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and request that the time used for the call of the roll be not charged to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the Department of

Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964, and ask that it be stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend until December 31, 1965, any conservation reserve contract (authorized under subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act) which is scheduled to expire either on December 31, 1963, or December 31, 1964, if the producer concerned makes application for such extension in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendment is simple and clear. A reading of the amendment virtually explains what is involved and comprises its own argument for the adoption of the amendment. It deals with an emergency in the farm belt. That is the reason I, in conjunction with my 11 cosponsors, have brought it up in connection with the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964. If the problem is to be met at all, the amendment provides a solution to an emergency which exists as of today.

The amendment should have special appeal to two groups of Senators. First, it should appeal to those representing agriculture areas, because it deals with a problem existing in the farm belt.

Second, it should appeal to Senators—and I hope that that would comprise the vast majority of Senators—who are interested in sound fiscal policies and in economy, because by the amendment we could save more than $150 million to the American taxpayer by continuing in the acreage reserve acres which would otherwise go into production, and by going into production, would comprise a new burden on the taxpayer in payment of storage and price supports of more than $253 million. Since a continuation of the present acreage reserve in this area would involve a cost of about $100 million, there would be a clearcut savings of more than $153 million to the American taxpayers through the adoption of the amendment.

Approximately 7,400,000 acres would come out of the soil bank as of December 31 of this year unless the amendment were adopted. Approximately 3 million additional acres would be taken out of the soil bank next year, so that during the 2 years covered by my amendment, 10 million acres now locked in the soil bank would move back into production in the crop years of 1964 and 1965 unless the amendment were adopted.

We confront an extremely serious situation from the standpoint of wheat surpluses and from the standpoint of the wheat program. Senators are aware of the fact that at present there is no workable wheat program in this country, and that none is apparently contemplated for action by Congress this year. As a result of the farmers emphatically turning down the so-called wheat referendum, they rejected the only program that Congress had provided for them which would move in the direction of a restriction of surpluses and adequate payments to the American wheat farmer.

I speak now first about the concern that Senators who represent farmers in this great body should have. As a consequence of that situation from the standpoint of the farmers, the average wheat price as of August 15 of this year was $1.77 a bushel received by the farmers. On August 15, 1962, the farmers were receiving an average price of $1.99. So there has been a decline of 22 cents a bushel on the average in what the American wheat farmer is receiving for his product.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the average effective parity price for wheat for August 15, 1963, was $2.51. For many years in this body Senators have talked about getting parity for the American farmer. Sometimes we have enacted legislation in an effort to achieve 90 percent of parity for the American farmer. But when he is being paid $1.77 a bushel, obviously he is neither getting parity, 90 percent of parity, nor any reasonable approximate price with any rational relationship to parity.

The amendment would not directly affect what I am about to point out; but, incidentally, unless a new wheat program is adopted, and unless something is done by Congress to meet the challenge of the fact that we are going into a crop year with no effective wheat program, it is accurately reported by the Department of Agriculture that the price for wheat a year from now is likely to be $1.10 a bushel or $1.25 per bushel.

What effect would the amendment have on the production of wheat, on the prices received by wheat farmers, and on the impending surpluses which have already attained an unmanageable size? This year wheat production is on the average 4 percent higher than a year ago. In part, that is due to the fact that Congress failed to act soon enough in connection with the soil bank acres which went out of the soil bank and into production a year ago. At that time the soil bank program should have been extended. Ultimately it was extended, but not soon enough to prevent farmers from beginning to plow back into production the acres about which they were uncertain at that time. As a consequence, about half of the 1,400,000 soil bank acres which had expiring contracts a year ago—approximately 700,000 acres—came back into production this year and contributed, of course, to the 4-percent increase in overall wheat production which has taken place.

Unless action is taken now, a substantial portion of the 7,500,000 acres which are locked into the soil bank at the present time will go back into production. Every day farmers are plowing up soil bank acres because they have no assurance that the program will be extended, and that they can retain their acres in that status.

Farming is a seasonal business. When farmers conclude one harvest, they start planning for their spring work and for next year's harvest.

As a consequence, since the harvest is over and Congress has failed to act to extend the soil bank acres, every day we delay sees acres somewhere in this country plowed under and put back into production or back into overproduction. This constitutes the urgency which impelled us to offer the amendment to the pending bill. If we delay a week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, or a month, we aggravate the problem of agricultural surpluses that much, as farmers individually return their acres to production, because they cannot longer wait.

Many soil bank acres have been planted into broom grass and into other vegetation which is necessary to plow under in the fall in order for farmers to cultivate those acres in the spring. If the farmer waits until spring to plow them under he will have a tangled mess of weeds and vegetation, which will make cultivation of the soil unprofitable, if not impossible. For that reason farmers can no longer wait to make plans for next year's crop. They must decide now whether to plow the acres this fall for next year's crop or whether to retain them in a soil bank status. Obviously there is no inducement to retain them in a soil bank status as they see the date of December 31 of this year staring them in the face with an automatic expiration on the acres.

Many of such acres are in the fine wheat-producing areas of the country. Unless we act now, many of those acres will be plowed under in the next few days or in the next few weeks and made ready for wheat production to increase even further the present great wheat surplus.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question; and if I may I should also like to have the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

It is my understanding that under the conservation reserve program of a few years ago nearly 30 million acres were contracted, under what is known as subtitle "B" of the Soil Bank Act, at a price of about $12 to $13 an acre. At that time, under the farm program then existing, we were inducing the farmers to take acres out of production, which cost us $40 an acre.

My question is, How many acres are under the conservation reserve contract plan? What did it cost per acre? Has not the plan worked successfully, compared with the cost of other plans which have been offered? Can the Senator give me information on that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to make an off-the-cuff reply and then yield to my distinguished friend from Florida, who has the advantage of committee counsel by his side, who can correct any inadvertent misstatements I may make.

I believe the average cost was closer to $13 or $14 an acre, instead of $12 or $13, but that is comparatively immaterial.

The plan has worked successfully, because it has kept out of production a great many fertile acres which otherwise would have been in production,

which would have been under our price support program, and ultimately under some program of governmental storage, at a high cost to the American taxpayer.

I believe that is the reason why the soil bank itself was ultimately stopped from further expansion. It was not failing to work well from the standpoint of controlling production. It was not failing to work well so far as saving the taxpayers' money is concerned. But it tended to proliferate itself greatly in certain areas of the country, so that small communities and small cities dependent upon rural trade found themselves in an economic squeeze, because their farmer customers were locking their soil into the soil bank areas and consequently were not living on the farms and were therefore not available for continued trade in the little commercial centers catering to rural people. I believe that is the reason why it was not expanded beyond the point where it finally stopped.

There are in the instant case some 10 million acres involved. There is no protest from rural communities that the land should go back into production, because this does not involve an expansion of acres in any specific area but would provide for a stabilization of the situation and would prevent a return to production of these acres for at least 2 years. It would be hoped that during those 2 years Congress might evolve and approve some kind of agricultural program which would prove acceptable to the farmers and acceptable to the country economically.

I am happy now to yield to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, for yielding.

I understood that the Senator from Ohio wished specific information as to the amount of acreage coming out of the conservation part of the soil bank program at the end of this year, December 31, 1963, and at the end of next year, December 31, 1964. Figures furnished me by counsel for our committee are as follows: At the end of this year, 7.4 million acres will come out of the conservation reserve program and at the end of next year—or December 31, 1964—3,348,160 acres will come out from under contract. That makes a total of some 10.75 million acres which will emerge from the conservation reserve program either at the end of this year or at the end of next year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will be the remaining acreage in the program after the nearly 11 million acres come out?

Mr. HOLLAND. While the counsel for the committee is looking up that information, I will give the figures as to cost, because I believe the Senator's interest is not limited to acreage, but also includes cost. Assuming that practically all the acreage would continue in this program, because the land-use requirement rate under the new law enacted last year, which is now in operation, is only about half—about $6 to $7 an acre as compared to $13 an acre under the conservation reserve program—the total amount for the 2-year extension for the acreage coming out at the end of this year and for the 1-year extension for the acreage coming out at the end of next year would be about $211 million.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in further answer to the Senator's request about the number of acres presently locked in the soil bank, 24,957,000 acres are in the soil bank, some 10 million of which are involved in this discussion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This would take out 11 million acres, leaving about 14 million acres.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senate should not agree to the amendment, the acreage would be reduced to about 15 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean an end to the program, practically.

Mr. MUNDT. An end for everything except 15 million acres; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me change my figure from $211 million to $219 million as the estimated amount that the program embraced under the amendment would cost. The acreage figures that I gave at the beginning are the correct figures.

The figures as to the acreage that would remain under the program after December 31, 1964, are set forth in the compilation found on page 34 of the Senate hearings on S. 1588. They are as follows:

At the end of 1965, the number of acres to be released, 547,827.
In 1966, 1,973,950.
At the end of 1967, 1,360,675.
At the end of 1968, 6,489,562.
In 1969, 3,714,363.

There is a final release of 9,859 acres in 1970.

I have not been able speedily to add those figures, but it seems to me that the total would be somewhere between 13 and 15 million acres.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not still necessary——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since the Senate is proceeding on a time division, may I ask that this time be divided equally between both sides?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to have that done.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not inadvisable to allow this program to run to an end, as is now being done, with acreage being taken out this year?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one of the controversial subjects before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A program has been presented to that committee under the title of S. 1588, which has been heard by our subcommittee in that committee. Hearings were completed and printed as of September 6. That bill should shortly be before the Senate.

I understand that an identical bill is before the House committee. I am not able to report the progress there.

Several questions are in issue. One is whether or not the price prevailing in the conservation reserve program should be continued as a public burden to be paid for the removal of this acreage, much of which is not prime producing acreage.

I have already stated for the RECORD that under the land-use program adopted last year, and which is now applicable, less than 1 million acres have been retired, at a little more than $6 per acre. Of course, there are many who think that program should be expanded and be more fully used. It makes for an unfair differentiation for the owners of exactly similar parcels of land to have one contract under which they are paid at the rate of $13 to $14 an acre, and to be paid, under the provisions of the present law, about half that much.

There is another controversy, and that is as to the use to which this land should be put. The major controversy in this respect is whether it should be available for grazing or making hay. All the cattle industries, and I think the allied industries, are very much against it, because it is thought that it would only encourage a surplus in the production of red meat. Other groups are for the proposal. That is one of the subjects which I understand is highly controversial under S. 1588, which is pending in the committee.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has just entered the Chamber. He is thoroughly familiar with the problem. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, I shall be glad to yield to him at this time for such comment as he may wish to make.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield to him, since I have the floor, but the time should be charged to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I yield to the distinguished Senator, I am still willing to have the time divided, as I understand the Senator previously suggested it be divided, 50–50.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from North Dakota does not take much time. That arrangement is satisfactory to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I only regret that there was no opportunity to discuss this proposal in the Appropriations Committee. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is a very effective member of the committee. He discussed other subjects and amendments. For some reason sufficient to him, he has not seen fit to offer the completely legislative approach to this appropriation bill until after the bill has come to the floor and is now pending. I regret that he did not bring it up in committee, where we could also have had the benefit of the views of other committee members.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the Senate will have the benefit of the views of other committee members during the debate on the floor. Since this is a matter of great concern to Senators representing urban areas, where the farm economy is a primary element, the Senator from South Dakota thought it would be an effective procedure to offer the proposal on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this problem has concerned

most persons in this country, and particularly farm organizations. Every major farm organization, including the Farmers' Union, the Grange, and the Farm Bureau Federation, has recommended that 65 million acres be retired. They have proposed different plans, but in connection with the amount of acreage to be retired they have arrived at about the same total.

Some Members of Congress have been trying for years to obtain action on what is to be done with acreage coming out of the soil bank. It has been in the soil bank for several years, and is more fertile now than when it went into the program. It does not make sense to put it back into production. Much of it is being plowed now for next year's crop. If this program is continued, we shall end with bigger production, and we shall have to do something about it.

About a year ago we obtained action, in conference with the House, to take care of land coming out of the soil bank program, with the commitment by the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that this subject would be taken up immediately when this Congress convened 9 months ago. He has been trying to obtain action, but somehow we have not been able to get it. In the meantime this land is coming back into production, and it will destroy our whole program of trying to curtail production.

I think there should be in the RECORD a table which appeared on page 6 of the Senate Agricultural Committee hearings on S. 1588, giving the number of acres in each State now in the soil bank. I ask unanimous consent that the table be made a part of my remarks.

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

Conservation reserve acreage under contract, Jan. 1, 1963 [1]

	Acreage under contract [1]
Alabama	391,000
Arizona	2,000
Arkansas	526,000
California	174,000
Colorado	1,165,000
Connecticut	4,000
Delaware	17,000
Florida	214,000
Georgia	1,021,000
Idaho	250,000
Illinois	410,000
Indiana	453,000
Iowa	554,000
Kansas	1,334,000
Kentucky	363,000
Louisiana	210,000
Maine	105,000
Maryland	70,000
Massachusetts	3,000
Michigan	629,000
Minnesota	1,538,000
Mississippi	266,000
Missouri	738,000
Montana	589,000
Nebraska	800,000
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	11,000
New Jersey	44,000
New Mexico	767,000
New York	443,000
North Carolina	258,000

Conservation reserve acreage under contract, Jan. 1, 1963 [1]—Continued

	Acreage under contract [1]
North Dakota	2,411,000
Ohio	466,000
Oklahoma	1,274,000
Oregon	195,000
Pennsylvania	331,000
Rhode Island	(2)
South Carolina	617,000
South Dakota	1,591,000
Tennessee	456,000
Texas	2,804,000
Utah	212,000
Vermont	32,000
Virginia	101,000
Washington	305,000
West Virginia	55,000
Wisconsin	650,000
Wyoming	107,000
Total	24,957,000

[1] Includes 1963 1-year extensions of 701,000 acres.

[2] 500 acres or less.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent that, immediately after the chart which was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a table showing the conservation acreage to be released on December 31, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Conservation reserve acreage to be released Dec. 31, 1963 [1]

	Acreage to be released [1]
Alabama	66,000
Arizona	1,000
Arkansas	177,000
California	89,000
Colorado	154,000
Connecticut	2,000
Delaware	8,000
Florida	12,000
Georgia	93,000
Idaho	90,000
Illinois	266,000
Indiana	258,000
Iowa	347,000
Kansas	358,000
Kentucky	166,000
Louisiana	48,000
Maine	22,000
Maryland	40,000
Massachusetts	1,000
Michigan	265,000
Minnesota	587,000
Mississippi	115,000
Missouri	284,000
Montana	149,000
Nebraska	339,000
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	1,000
New Jersey	26,000
New Mexico	24,000
New York	138,000
North Carolina	64,000
North Dakota	555,000
Ohio	235,000
Oklahoma	358,000
Oregon	82,000
Pennsylvania	143,000
Rhode Island	(2)
South Carolina	50,000
South Dakota	434,000
Tennessee	148,000
Texas	691,000
Utah	56,000
Vermont	4,000
Virginia	39,000

Conservation reserve acreage to be released Dec. 31, 1963 [1]—Continued

	Acreage to be released [1]
Washington	112,000
West Virginia	21,000
Wisconsin	281,000
Wyoming	32,000
Total	7,421,000

[1] Includes 1963 1-year extensions of 701,000 acres.

[2] 500 acres or less.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My memory has just been refreshed with respect to the discussions on this subject last year and the year before last. I intend to support the Senator in his proposal. As has been stated, it has been proposed that the conservation reserve program be built up to about 60 million acres, and even to 80 million acres, so as to take out of production about 8 percent of the total acreage. The program has not been expensive. The cost of $13 an acre has been mild compared with other programs.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly right on that point. It is an economy measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion the argument that farmers would be induced to take the $6 an acre program is not justified. If 7 million acres are to be allowed to slip into production this year, and 3 million next year, the program will be gone.

Mr. MUNDT. It will be all gone but 15 million acres.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This item is so vital from the standpoint of time that I believe we cannot wait until next year. If 7 million acres are to be plowed under and put into production this year, we shall have a graver problem to contend with next year.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. That is a considerable source of concern.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator any estimates as to the amount involved in the 7 million acres on which contracts probably would not be extended, if his amendment were adopted? The Senator from North Dakota referred to some of the land being plowed for next year's crop.

Mr. MUNDT. We have no estimates as of now. I could not find them in the hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. AIKEN. They would have an important bearing on the effect of this amendment. If contracts on 1 million acres are not to be extended anyway, it would mean that what the Senator is proposing would cost about $13 million less than if every acre were continued under the program for another 2 years.

Mr. MUNDT. All we have are unassembled returns from the farm belt, from farm organizations, and from farmers themselves, about land which every day is being plowed back. I suspect that the

slippage is relatively small as of now, because harvesting is just being completed, but it increases with every day of delay.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is satisfied that under his proposal there would be no possibility of a substitution of acres in these contracts. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. They are the same acres.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not be possible to put the richer acres into production and put the leaner type of acres under contract?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

I now wish to complete my presentation on the amendment.

Before the colloquy began I was referring to the acres which would be released if the amendment were rejected. They are some of the most productive wheat acres in America. I see in the Chamber both Senators from North Dakota. The senior Senator has participated in the debate. In that State unless the amendment prevails, 555,000 acres will go back into production next spring. That is a great wheat State.

In Kansas, another great wheat State—and it proudly carries on its automobile license plates the boast that it is the wheat State of America—358,000 acres, practically all of them wheat acres, will go back into production next spring, and will become a charge against the taxpayers, unless action is taken.

In another great wheat State, Nebraska, 339,000 acres will go back into production.

In South Dakota, which has a great acreage in diversified farming, but in the western portion of which there is some of the best wheat acres in the world, 434,000 acres will go back into production.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about some of the points brought out in the colloquy. It is true that different prices for different acres have been contracted, and that the man who will get not quite as much as someone else, will be disenchanted, although he will be inclined to continue to keep his acreage locked in the reserve.

However, that is the way our free economy works. The man who may have once bought General Motors stock at $50 a share is unhappy compared with the man who bought some shares 2 weeks earlier for $40 or $48 a share. If A sells a house for $10,000 to B, who in turn sells it for $15,000, A is not very happy, and feels that he did not make the best bargain.

However, the contracts have been entered into voluntarily. They were not superimposed upon anyone. This unhappiness, by the way, is assuaged by the feeling that the program should be continued.

The reason why no action has been taken through legislative committees in Congress is twofold. Both the House and the Senate committees have held some hearings and some discussions of the subject. There is a body of opinion which would change the contractual arrangement for the soil bank acres, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out, by including the privilege of raising hay, or putting the land to pasture, for the grazing of livestock. Obviously that would be only a device to transfer the cost of the soil bank acres from the Government, which reaps the benefits, to the livestock industry, which would suffer from what would develop into a surplus of livestock products.

The livestock industry is one segment of our economy which has had no price supports and has asked for none. The industry has been getting along fairly well on its own motive power. It seeks only some kind of tariff protection, so that it can continue to enjoy the benefits of its present form of production.

If we were to permit a rise in livestock production, we would generate an overproduction of livestock, which in turn would force the livestock industry to come to Congress to ask for assistance.

Therefore, no progress has been made in renewing the soil bank acres, with the codicil attached that the acres may be used for livestock purposes.

There is another reason why no bill has been reported dealing with soil bank acres. There is a hesitancy to bring an agricultural bill before Congress, because if any is reported, it will be subject to amendment. The dairy producers are interested in certain legislation. There are several proposals dealing with the wheat situation. Farmers from the Cotton Belt have a bill they would like to have enacted. Once a bill dealing with agricultural legislation is brought to the floor, it will become subject to all kinds of amendments.

Therefore there has been hesitancy to meet the emergency in this way. However, we do have an opportunity to vote on the amendment at this time.

Concerning the cost, I point out that Mr. Godfrey, of the Department of Agriculture, testified, as shown on page 22 of the hearings, that roughly 7,400,000 acres will come out in 1963, and that would be, as compared with an extension of the conservation reserve, about $52 million a year saved, which adds up to the $100 million which I stated earlier would be saved to the American taxpayers by the adoption of the proposed amendment.

It seems to me that it is sound, good agricultural legislation to adopt the amendment now, while there is still time to prevent a major portion of the acres from slipping back into production.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield some time to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. In the colloquy of a few minutes ago, the case in favor of the amendment was clearly stated. Of major importance is the point made by the senior Senator from North Dakota, that the acres in the conservation reserve, by reason of their having been retired, are now in an advanced state of fertility and, if placed back into cropland, will produce not only their former yields but will actually increase in production. That is one point.

The second point, touched on by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is that there is no possibility for a substitution of poor acres, under the terms of the amendment. The amendment would provide only for a continuation of the acres now within the conservation reserve program.

Mr. MUNDT. It would continue the prohibition against grazing, so that it would not work an injustice against the livestock industry.

Mr. HRUSKA. That point can still be considered in separate legislation if desirable.

Mr. MUNDT. This is really a holding operation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. This is a continuation of the same program, with the same acres and with the same prohibition.

Mr. HRUSKA. Except for any slippage that may have occurred up to now, where farmers of my State and those of other States have given up hope of the Congress acting in any respect in this field, and have turned the plow to those acres. Those acres will be represented in the slippage.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Even in that connection, a farmer who has elected to put back the acres that he has plowed up can continue them in the conservation reserve, because he has not forfeited his contract. If he elects to put them to grass or to not put them into production, he can continue to enjoy the program for 2 more years.

Mr. HRUSKA. The third point I wish to stress is, that time is of the essence. Farmers will have to know soon, will they not—in a matter of days?

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. HRUSKA. They will have to know whether Congress will take action in that direction, because once seed is put into the ground the farmer is committed and is faced with a financial loss that may be prohibitive. He would not be able to turn back.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is suggesting that even if the farmers should seed the acres they could plow them under, but that the cost of doing so would be prohibitive, so the prospect of their doing so is highly unlikely.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. The situation is of utmost seriousness. Unless action is taken by the Congress, a miscarriage of the original purpose of the conservation reserve program will result. Unless action such as that proposed by the amendment is taken, the result will be new and increased troubles in another area, which will be infinitely more expensive than if action is taken at this time.

For these reasons, we should take the action proposed, and take it quickly. Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the contribution made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I should like to emphasize the point he so wisely, properly,

and prudently makes. By approving the amendment, we shall in no sense be barring the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the House Committee on Agriculture from coming forward tomorrow or next week, or at any future time, and proposing legislation to deal with the soil bank problem. At that time, these acres will still be countinued in their soil bank status if my amendment prevails. If a more acceptable or desirable program than that which has been operating in the past can be proposed, the committee will have the full right and authority to do so.

What is proposed by the amendment is merely a holding operation, which would preserve the status quo. It would continue the land in soil bank acreage, so that new legislation would not come after the fact; and acres which had been retired and reimpregnated with great new fertility and production capacities would not come into production and add to the surpluses.

I suggest that the opponents of the amendment, if there be any—and I hope there are none—will use a part of their time. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry the unanimous-consent agreement entered into by the leadership is so worded that, as I am advised, I do not have the right to carry out the uniform instructions given to all subcommittee chairmen by a resolution of the full Committee on Appropriations to the effect that when a legislative amendment is offered on the floor of the Senate, it is the duty of the subcommittee chairman to raise a point of order. It is my present understanding from the Parliamentarian that the wording of the unanimous-consent agreement precludes my following that course in this particular instance.

That fact, however, does not change the reason for the adoption of that rule by a vote of the full Committee on Appropriations. The reason for that rule is that too often, as in this case, amendments which are legislative in character are offered on the floor of the Senate without their having been submitted to the Committee on Appropriations or to a subcommittee of that committee; without their having been subjected to a hearing by the Subcommittee on Appropriations; and without the enactment of legislation to provide the course that has been suggested in the legislative amendment. The amendment now before the Senate is an illustration of what could happen if such a course were followed.

Earlier this year, a bill, S. 1588, was introduced. It was proposed as a draft bill by the Department of Agriculture and introduced as an administration measure to increase the pilot land use program which Congress enacted a year ago and which is now in effect, under which less than 1 million acres have already come under the purview of that land use program. Pursuant to the bid basis provided therein, that acreage is receiving about $6 to $6.50 annually an acre for retirement.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator referring to title I of the Agricultural Act?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am referring to the land use program, under which the annual program authorization was for $10 million only. It is that program which S. 1588 seeks to increase, in the belief that much of the acreage now in the conservation reserve program can be brought into retirement for a longer period of time under that program. That bill, S. 1588, has been subjected to hearings by the subcommittee, of which several of the authors and supporters of the proposed amendment are members. That subcommittee consists of the following Senators from the majority side:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman; the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The following members of the subcommittee are from the minority side: The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking member; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM].

S. 1588 has been subjected to hearings, and the hearings before the subcommittee have been completed. The record of the hearings has been printed, and I believe it is available to Senators. I have a copy of the printed record before me. I assume that copies may be obtained by any Senator.

As I understand, the subcommittee is ready to act on that bill. In the meantime—and this illustrates the vice of the presentation of legislative amendments—the impatient advocates of that bill, or some of them, have proposed this legislative amendment on the floor of the Senate for the first time, without its having been considered by either the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations. It is a perfect illustration of how the presentation of legislative amendments to an appropriation bill may bypass and make futile legislative measures which are of far-reaching effect, and bring on action before complete information is given.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator agree that the bill to which he has alluded, and on which hearings were held, did not deal with a continuation of the present soil bank acreage or a preservation of the existing status? The bill to which the Senator alludes seeks to expand the authority Congress enacted in title I of the Agricultural Act last year, which envisions an expansion of retired acreage by inducing new acreage to come into this type of contract. It provides for new aids and purposes in addition to those which are permitted under the existing soil bank contracts.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The bill S. 1588 suggests an enlargment of the land-use provisions of the bill enacted last year. Yet the particular subject which is embraced in the pending amendment was specifically considered by the subcommittee, as the Senator will find on pages 4 and following of the hearing record. No doubt the subcommittee will give serious consideration to exactly the same proposal as is suggested by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

In fact, a recommendation that it do so is made therein.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Legislative Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was very hopeful that the Senator from South Dakota would not press for adoption of this amendment. To my way of thinking, it is out of place in an appropriation bill. Furthermore, as the Senator from Florida has just stated, this matter is receiving the active consideration of the special subcommittee. The hearings have been completed and the committee as a whole took up the matter at its last sitting, last Wednesday. Because of the fact that the subcommittee had not reached a conclusion, the committee decided to give it a little more time, in order to try to get the opposing parties together, so that the committee could report to the Senate a bill that would be acceptable to the majority of the committee.

I wish to give assurance to the Senator from South Dakota that if the subcommittee—which, as I have said, has been active in trying to solve the problem—were to state that it had reached a conclusion, but would like to have the whole matter turned over to the committee as a whole, I, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, should be glad to call a special meeting of the committee, to the end that a bill might be reported without any delay.

Mr. President, I do not know what the subcommittee will do. However, as the Senator from Florida stated, there is a move to add to the present law. This new move is being violently opposed by the cattlemen. As was stated by the Senator from Florida, it may be that the committee will do exactly the same thing the Senator from South Dakota is attempting to have done by means of this appropriation bill.

If the Senate were to make the mistake of adopting this amendment, I am sure the House would not accept it; and it might further delay the taking of action by the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

So I ask the Senator from South Dakota not to press for adoption of the amendment, but to let the Senate act on the appropriation bill as it came from the full committee.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator alluded to Senate bill 1588. Do I correctly understand that under that bill, grazing would be permitted on the acreage that would be retired?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; and that is why the subcommittee hearing record shows that objection was made to that provision, not only by cattlemen, but also by various other large agricultural groups, and that action on an amendment quite similar, if not identical, to the one offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was offered, and that amendment is now pending before that subcommittee.

The point I am making is that the pending proposal before the Senate now is to the effect that the subcommittee be deprived of its chance to act upon the matter; that the full legislative committee be deprived of its chance to act upon the matter; and that the conference committee—if the pending amendment is adopted by the Senate—be presented with the impossible task of retaining the amendment in the conference, although it had not been subjected to a hearing by the Appropriations Committee of the other body, and although approximately $219 million of expenditures would be authorized, without the holding of a hearing on this matter before either the subcommittee or the full committee, and without permitting either the subcommittee or the full committee—by means of appropriate action by the Senator from South Dakota, who is an active member of both the subcommittee and the full committee—to have a chance to deal with the amendment.

I heard nothing of the amendment in the committee deliberations—and I did not miss any of the hearings or any of the committee meetings, and I am certain it was not brought up. If I be under any misapprehension at all in connection with this matter, I ask that I be corrected, either by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, or by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is an active and valuable member of both the subcommittee and the full committee.

I do not like such procedure, because it looks like a bypassing of committees which have been very active and have done very hard work. Senators should consider the two bound volumes which show what was covered in the hearings, and the long report of the committee accompanying the bill. Under these circumstances, the submission of such an amendment at this time, thus depriving the legislative committee of jurisdiction, and overlooking the fact that either the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations, or both of them, could have considered this matter, if it had been suggested before either of them or both of them by the advocates of this amendment, just does not follow the path of careful, cautious, and deliberate legislation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again to me? I wish to expand on this point.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield now to the Senator from Iowa. In a minute or so, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Florida in his concern over the bypassing of the committee and over the failure to permit it to have sufficient opportunity to consider some of these proposals. Certainly he must realize that almost 7½ million acres will be out of the soil bank by the end of this year. Certainly he realizes that many of us have received letters from many farmers who wish to know what to do, because the fall plowing time has come, and they want to know whether they should plow these acres and return them to cultivation, or whether to wait and to hope for a continuation of the soil bank.

One reason why I am one of the cosponsors of the amendment is that I believe the time for the committee to act is past due.

In that situation, I hope the Senator will understand that while I join with him in wishing to have the usual procedure followed in connection with such matters, on these things, I believe there does come a time when we cannot continue to wait. Certainly the thousands of farmers who are concerned about this situation expect us to take action. It is now long overdue.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I certainly have no personal feeling at all about the matter. It is clear that it was not the duty of the Senator to bring this matter before the Appropriations Committee, because he is not a member of it. However, I call attention to the fact that the amendment does not deal only with acreage which will go out of the soil bank or the conservation reserve on December 31 of this year; it also deals with acreage which will do so on December 31 of the next year. I do not understand the great hurry about this matter.

Furthermore, the amendment provides for a 2-year extension—not just a 1-year extension—of a rate of pay per acre twice as large as that being paid under the land-use program. So it is very clear that the amendment far transcends any action necessary in order to meet any situation which may develop by December 31 of this year.

Therefore, I stick by my guns in saying that I feel that the able and delightful Senator from South Dakota might have taken his colleagues on the subcommittee, or those on the full committee, into his confidence at least to the extent of discussing this matter with them, so we might have had an opportunity either to join him or not to do so. But as the situation now stands, if it were not for the unfortunate wording of the unanimous-consent agreement, I would have to raise a point of order.

However, in any case I shall have to oppose the amendment, because of the insistent directions of the full committee and also because of my own feeling that it is not good legislative procedure to propose the inclusion of such amendments in appropriations bills.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to get out of the target circle for the moment and onto the firing line, because my name has been alluded to a great many times, I should like to respond to the suggestion before he yields to any other Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted, as always.

Mr. MUNDT. Entirely so. The Senator is correct. I am a member of the subcommittee; I am a member of the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I could have offered the amendment in the full committee. The Senator knows what the vote would have been. I could have offered the amendment—and normally I would have offered it—and the action would have alerted my friend to the fact that the amendment would be forthcoming.

Why did I not offer it? I call attention to the fact that the report on this appropriation bill is dated September 12, 1963. That was the date that the full committee brought the bill up. I could have offered it at that time. I could have offered it the day before. I believe that the day before the subcommittee reported the bill and adjourned. Why? I did not do so because I continued to cherish the hope that the laborious legislative procedures which have been described today by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would bring forth some solution to the problem.

However, 18 additional days have elapsed. During those 18 days I called both committees of the Senate and the House. I asked, "What is being done about the soil bank acres?"

Every day I receive reports that soil bank acres are being plowed under—day after day and week after week. Eighteen days have elapsed and nothing has been done. That is the reason why I took the unusual procedure of moving, at the only time it could be done effectively, after a long lapse of time had made it impossible to get results early enough to be effective. I would not have offered the amendment today if a legislative proposal had been brought to the Senate. I would have offered the amendment in the committee if I had anticipated that the delay would continue so long that acres would be plowed under. This is the last opportunity the Senate will have, in time to be fully effective, to voice its will on the question.

If the Senator from Florida really believes that one of his reasons for opposing the amendment involves the fact

that approximately 2½ million acres expiring a year from now will be included, I shall be happy to accept an amendment which would limit my amendment to the acres expiring in December of this year, and we could march hand in hand down the aisle in unanimous effort. Does the Senator really feel that the amendment should not be adopted because included in the amendment is the second year allotment at 2½ million acres?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator is incorrect, because the number of acres going out of the conservation reserve on December 31, 1964, is 3,348,160.

Mr. MUNDT. If those acres were eliminated from the amendment, would the Senator then withdraw his opposition so that the Senate could agree on the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. MUNDT. Can we agree with relation to the problems which are now before the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. That makes the action more reasonable, but not entirely reasonable, because the hearings on S. 1588 were not concluded until September 6. The markup on the bill in the subcommittee was September 11, and in the full committee September 12.

Mr. MUNDT. And 18 days have elapsed between then and now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Nothing has been done to solve the soil bank problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senate has been engaged in constant debate since that time, as the Senator knows.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] seems to think that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been negligent in not acting earlier. The reason why nothing was done sooner was the hope that a House bill would be enacted. We have been waiting for the House to pass a bill on the subject. I still hope that the House will enact such a bill. To be frank, recently when we saw that action was being delayed, we held hearings so that when the Senate heard from the House, the Senate could act without delay. But up until now, as I have said, the House has not acted. I am positive that if the language that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is advocating should become a part of the bill, the House would not accept it. It would be futile to take the action requested. As I have said, Senators can act as soon as the subcommittee makes a decision. Speaking for myself only, I would be inclined to go along whether the House acts or not. I would suggest that we send the bill back to the House and let us see what action would be taken by the House.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to say two things to the Senator from Louisiana. First, I would not wish to have what I have said interpreted as criticism or a suggestion of negligence on the part of the committee, or particularly negligence of the chairman. I am quite sure that what the chairman has done has been in the utmost of good faith. I understand that there has been hope that the House would act. Nevertheless, there comes a time when the Senate should assume leadership on the question and get something done. Whether or not the House would take action on a Senate-passed bill is a pertinent question. We have an opportunity to make a great effort to act. The House will certainly act on the agriculture appropriations bill. Whether it would accept an amendment like the one proposed in conference, no one knows. The Senator from Louisiana has said that the House would not. But I am not so sure about that, particularly if a number of House Members are equally concerned about the soil bank problem, which has become quite acute. So this is the time for the Senate to take action, in the hope that the House will act.

If the House would not go along with the amendment, action by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on a separate bill would become an exercise in futility.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I reassure my friend the Senator from Iowa that the suggestion about the House being reluctant to pass Senate bills does exist in certain other fields. It does not exist in the field of agriculture and forestry. A great many of the bills which are enacted in regard to agriculture originate in the Senate. That question will not arise.

Second, I heard my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota, always resourceful, comment on the fact that he feared that the full Committee on Appropriations would have voted down the amendment because so many of the members of that committee come from urban areas. I suggest to him that he would jump from the frying pan into the fire if he should think that the House would be more likely to be friendly to the measure than the Senate committee or the full Senate, because the representation of the urban communities of the Nation is so vastly disproportionate in the House as compared with what it is in the Senate that the two cannot be compared.

In perfect good humor, the Senator from Florida did not favor the bill, S. 1588. He did favor the approach embodied in the amendment, plus some other things. The bill S. 1558 goes further than to cover the present subject. He could so vote in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor of the Senate. He does not believe that the amendment, which would go much further than is necessary in the first instance, that is involving the contracts which expire next year, and come for the first time to the floor of the Senate as a legislative amendment to a privileged appropriation bill—a bill which involves every agricultural factor in the country and many other factors not agricultural in connection with our foreign relations and in connection with various welfare programs—should be accepted. For that reason I object to it.

Replying to the question addressed by the Senator from South Dakota, if the amendment were so reduced as to apply only to the acreage coming out this year, and if it provided only for a 1-year extension, it would then be an obvious minimum effort. As such, it would be easier to stomach than the amendment as now written. As it is now worded, it is not an obvious minimum effort.

I do not find it easy to stomach at all, because I think it is an improper practice. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to accept it. I will, however, defer to my friend the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the legislative committee, on this subject, if he has any strong feelings about the matter.

I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that there is the possibility that S. 1588 will be reported in a revised form and be passed. I have already indicated my own feelings with reference to that bill. I believe the feelings of the distinguished chairman of the committee are much the same as mine. I know other members of the committee feel that way, including the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], both of whom are in the Chamber.

If that effort should fail, there would still be a supplemental appropriation bill to come before the Senate, and there would be ample time for Senators to take other members of the Committee on Appropriations in.to into their confidence and discuss the subject, if it becomes urgent by that time. That course was not followed in this instance.

I cannot yield on the question of what is responsible legislation. It is not responsible legislation to come before the Senate with a legislative enactment which would go much further than necessary to meet an emergency situation, in the face of the fact that the legislative committees have been diligent, have completed hearings, and are ready for action, and in the face of the fact that the able chairman of the legislative committee assures early action in the committee. As chairman of a responsible subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I think it would be impossible to follow the proposed course.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Because of my affection and admiration for the Senator from Florida, I hope he will not rest his opposition to the amendment on the foundation that the legislative committees are about to act. He would be on much firmer ground if he would stick to the formalistic argument that, after all, it is legislation on an appropriation bill,

and that customarily Senators are against that procedure.

The reason why that procedure is provided for in the rules of the Senate, however, is to meet precisely the kind of emergency situation we now confront. By the time the supplemental appropriation bill comes before the Senate, more days and weeks will be gone, and more acres will be plowed under. This is why the rules provide for this type of emergency procedure.

The Senator from Louisiana has very properly said that the committees have been slow in reaching this legislation. The House has failed to agree on a program. So has the Senate. I would not wish to see my friend in the position of opposing the amendment with the assumption going out to the country that the legislative committees are going to act this week, or next week, or the week after, or on any other date certain, because no one can predict such action. In the meantime, every day we are losing valuable contracted acres, and they are going into production.

This is an emergency. The rules of the Senate properly provide for this kind of a procedure on an appropriation bill to meet this kind of emergency. I hope we measure up to our present responsibilities and approve this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are rules and traditions in the Senate. I shall read from the rules of the Appropriations Committee. This is a rule adopted for the guidance of all members of the committee in the handling of bills on the floor of the Senate, submitted by the chairman and adopted on December 18, 1931. It has been the rule ever since that time:

> Any member or ex officio member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate who is in charge of an appropriation bill, is hereby authorized and directed to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriation bill.

I am only sorry that the unanimous-consent agreement, as it was drafted—due to someone's neglect; and I do not know whose—did not include the customary words that "no points of order shall be waived."

Those words are customarily included in such unanimous-consent agreements. At any rate, they were omitted. I cannot raise the point of order. In opposing this amendment, I can stand upon the substantial matter of judgment and conscience; deliberation in the passage of legislation; consideration of legislation by legislative committees first; and action by the Congress upon the recommendations of legislative committees. I shall do so.

I am particularly sustained in my feeling that I should take that position by the position of the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and by the position of the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Committee on Agriculture [Mr. ELLENDER], who has legislation on this subject under his responsibility. I could not yield on that point.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have just come to the floor of the Senate. I am not sure that I have all the facts available, but it is my understanding that the Senate finds itself in a situation in which a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into and the yeas and nays were ordered. Senators are not in a position to raise a point of order against the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota, which, without any question, involves legislation on an appropriation bill.

I was not present when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, but if those of us who had nothing to do with this kind of unanimous-consent agreement are caught in this kind of technicality, whereby there can be legislation on an appropriation bill by majority vote without the requirement of a suspension of the rule, I now serve notice on the Senate that this is the last unanimous-consent agreement on any matter that will be entered into so long as I serve in the Senate, because I do not intend to have my rights as a Senator in regard to the existing rules of the Senate taken away from me by this kind of "gimmick." The protection of the Senate from legislation on an appropriation bill is a precious and important right to every Member of the Senate. If we are in a position this afternoon that this kind of indirection can be successful, I serve notice on the leadership that they have obtained the last unanimous-consent agreement on any matter so long as I serve in the Senate, because I do not intend to have my rights under the rules of the Senate taken away by this kind of procedure. Either Senators are to have the right this afternoon to vote on this question by way of a motion to suspend the rule, or the leadership have obtained the last unanimous-consent agreement they will ever get so long as I serve in the Senate. I mean it. I never make threats. I merely state the facts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for stating his position. I feel very much put out about this matter. I do not know how the unanimous-consent agreement came to be worded in the way that it was worded, without the inclusion of the customery words in such unanimous-consent agreements that "no point of order shall be waived." I am quite prepared to feel that it was not an act of deliberation on the part of any Senator.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to the remarks of my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I have heard some of the colloquy engaged in by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I have just conferred with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I wish to make the RECORD clear.

On Thursday last, when the unanimous-consent agreement was arrived at, the Senator was discussing the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. It was well understood by all Senators that if there were an effort to have legislation on an appropriation bill, first, if such an amendment were offered, a point of order would be raised. Senators who seek to have legislation on an appropriation bill file notices of intention to move to suspend the rule. There is at the desk a notice of intention to move to suspend the rule.

The Senator from Minnesota, as the acting majority leader on that day, sought to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement, and did so on the basis of the time related to the debate on the matter of the suspension of the rule, which would permit the Mundt amendment to be voted upon. If one wishes a strict legal interpretation of the unanimous-consent agreement, there is no doubt that, if one holds to the technical aspects of it, it provides that there shall be a yea and nay vote after 1½ hours of debate on each side on the Mundt amendment. But I am sure the Senator from South Dakota, who is an honorable man, recognizes the situation that prevails and the frame of reference in which this unanimous-consent agreement was arrived at.

It is understood by Senators that the rule provides that on appropriation bills legislation can be adopted only by a two-thirds vote, that a point of order prevails against legislation on appropriation bills, and that if it is wished to have legislation on appropriation bills a Senator must file a notice of a motion to suspend the rule, which requires a two-thirds vote.

In light of that fact, I am sure that when the Senator from South Dakota discusses the matter with his cosponsors, there will be no trouble, because Senators cannot operate without honor among men. Although we must recognize the rights of each Senator, we must also recognize that good faith is involved when unanimous consent agreements are arrived at.

If Senators will be patient with one another, I am sure the problem can be met. I have every reason to believe it can. I do not believe any Senator wishes to win a point by technical application of a rule when he knows what the situation is.

I discussed the matter of a unanimous-consent agreement several times on last Thursday. I say on my honor as a U.S. Senator that it was clearly understood what the situation was with respect to the appropriation bill; about the filing of a notice for the suspension of the rules; and that it had been indicated that a point of order would be made against the proposal in the nature of legislation on the appropriation bill. A point of order had been made on another matter. A move for a suspension of the rule was defeated. So it was not as if Senators did not know what point was involved.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. My comments do not relate to the Senator from South Dakota at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from South Dakota had filed his notice of a motion to suspend the rule. My point was that Senators were caught in a technical situation the like of which had not arisen in the memory of any Senator; namely that a unanimous-consent agreement had been adopted that did not have language in it to protect all the rights of Senators under the rules. I want the record perfectly clear that my comments have nothing to do with the Senator from South Dakota.

My only comment is that the unanimous-consent agreement was agreed to by action of the Senate, although I did not happen to be present. The Senator from Florida, for example, than whom there is no more cautious and circumspect Member of this body, was not advised that he was giving up any right under the rule with respect to suspension of the rule.

Unless these prospects are mutually agreed to, so that the rights of Senators under the rules can be protected, Senators can forget about any more unanimous-consent agreements. I am not so sure that it would not be well to recess the Senate, because this matter is very important to the rights of all of us, so that the leadership of the Senate, and, if necessary, the two policy committees of each of the parties, can get together for a discussion as to an agreement which can be reached which will protect Senators with regard to the suspension of the rule.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will yield, I do not think that is necessary. I have the feeling that Senators will all be fair and just and that this unfortunate situation can be readily corrected. I put my complete confidence in the good sense and the sense of fairplay of every Member of this body, which is the only thing which enables the Senate to function.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The acting majority leader has pleaded for patience. I think I have shown as much patience as any Senator can have. On Thursday I agreed to have the bill go over until today, because Senators of both parties were traveling in various parts of the country. I agreed to the delay with the understanding that the bill would be disposed of today. I agreed to the unanimous-consent agreement. The only mistake I made was that I did not insist upon seeing the final form of the unanimous-consent agreement, which normally contains certain words which were not contained in this one.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The consent agreement is defective also because it barred all amendments. I had in mind an amendment. I looked at the consent agreement, and I found I was barred from offering it unless I offered it as an amendment to the Mundt amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree that the situation is unusual, but that situation was brought to the attention of the Senate on Thursday afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Several times.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But other Senators were not present after Senators were told there would be no more votes. Next morning Senators found themselves in a situation in which they were barred from offering amendments. There are two weaknesses in the agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are at least two irregularities as compared with the normal consent agreement.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. To continue with my lament, I agreed to have the bill go over until Monday notwithstanding that I had scheduled two speeches under very attractive auspices in my State today, and I so notified the leadership. I had to cancel both.

The Senator from South Dakota and I had no difference of opinion, because both of us, in discussing this matter before it came up, agreed that a point of order could be made, until, on consultation with the Parliamentarian, we learned that, under the unfortunate wording of the agreement, that did not happen to be the situation under this agreement.

Something happened that made persons who generally very carefully draft unanimous-consent agreements to be less careful this time, because of the omission of the words "saving points of order."

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he is familiar with the Senator's attitude. The Senator from Florida is a member of both the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to consider this question in the legislative committee if it has not been acted on before. But he cannot and will not yield in allowing this important legislation providing for perhaps $219 million of additional expenditures, to come on the floor and be agreed to as a legislative proposal to this bill. He thinks it is very poor policy for the sponsors of this amendment in the face of the attitude of Senators on both sides of the aisle who, because of this situation, are forced to take positions against them, to insist upon going ahead with the programs under the prevailing situation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa such time as he may desire.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no intention of taking a substantial amount of time on this amendment. I think Senators all understand what is provided. We are all aware of the agricultural situation which the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota attempts to meet. We also know the deep, broad interest of the Senator from Florida in farm legislation. There is no more devoted advocate of sound, constructive agricultural legislation than the Senator from Florida. No one is better informed or more zealous or sincere in his attitude. I can understand his attitude on this point. If I were in his position as chairman of the subcommittee, I might be impelled to take the same position. I do not know.

I come from an area where the land retirement program is very important. It is also important to know, even before this time, whether contracts are to be renewed or permitted to lapse. It has been pointed out that 7½ million acres are going back into production. We receive letters from farmers every day asking, "What am I going to do? Shall I plan on a crop for next year or plan to keep these acres retired?"

Our great problem in agriculture has been overproduction. We have been trying to meet that problem by taking acres out of production, by reducing agricultural production under certain plans, and this is one means by which we have to a substantial degree met the surplus problem.

No one devotes more time to the problems of agriculture than does the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. No one votes more cosmopolitanly, across the board, in favor of agriculture, and no one votes less restrictively for his area's agricultural needs than does the senior Senator from Florida. He considers the needs of all sections of agriculture. He is a sincere supporter of agriculture. However, I cannot agree with him in his line of opposition to the renewal of these leases which would expire, according to the amendment, on either December 31, 1963, or December 31, 1964.

Anyone who has had anything to do with agriculture knows that a farmer does not make a plan today and put it into effect tomorrow, the next calendar day. The farming operation is an operation of programing. Most farmers I know program at least 3 to 5 years ahead of time. They lay out their crops. They lay out their soil renewal programs. They lay out all these programs some years in advance. They do that if they are successful farmers. Of course, if they are fly-by-night farmers, they do not care. Farmers must know whether they should hold back acres now vacated and unproductive under the retirement program, or let them go back into production next year. Should farmers plow them up or should they recontract for an extension? That is the question that confronts the farmers.

We have heard a great deal about the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am a member of that committee. I am a member of the subcommittee which is

concerned. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, even though I do not always agree with him on every matter that is considered by the committee.

There is some serious disagreement on the method of approaching these agricultural problems. That does not affect the chairman's sincerity or his desire to have an effective program. There have been two or three controversies. There is S. 1588, for example, which is in abeyance at the moment. It is in committee, and has been for a considerable length of time. Another proposal has come before the committee, and has been referred to the subcommittee. It is a proposal which is totally unacceptable from the standpoint of the welfare of the whole retirement program. It would retire acres, but would allow them to be grazed. That would defeat the purpose of the program. It would not allow them to be cropped, but it would permit them to be retired, while at the same time they could be grazed for livestock production. In a way, it is a selfdefeating program that is being proposed. Two or three proposals are before the committee.

Tomorrow is the first of October 1963. It is not the spring of 1963. This is not a year before these contracts expire. This is only 3 months before they expire. The farmers today are planning their programs for next year. The farmers cannot wait for the House to originate some measure and send it to the Senate. It is time to meet the emergency. We can add the amendment to the pending bill and send it to the House. If the other body does not see fit to take it, let the responsibility be on its head. Let the farmers know where the failure lies for a renewal of the contracts on the already retired acres. Let us find out where the responsibility is. Let the farmers know why they cannot plan for next year on the acres that are now retired. Let them know why they do not know what they can do next year. This is the time to act.

I respect the zeal with which committee members protect their committee. In most instances, the committee prerogative should be respected and preserved.

However, time and again—not every day, but repeatedly—amendments are added to bills, even though the amendments have not necessarily been given full consideration by a committee. They are amendments that are considered to be necessary corrective amendments. This is such a case. We are confronted with a case in which the farmers have 7½ million acres under retirement, which are going out of retirement and back into production. We must take action to authorize an extension of such contracts, so that those who wish to extend the contracts, under the proper terms and conditions which the Government lays down, can do so. This is the time to enact the proposed legislation. If we wait until the other body takes its own time and sends legislation to the Senate, and it then goes through the committee process, we shall see Christmas come and go; we shall see the end of the contract period come and go. We shall see acres come out from under retirement before any action can be taken to correct the situation and continue the contracts.

We are faced with an emergency. Seven and a half million acres are concerned. It is a question whether the acres shall continue in retirement and thus avoid adding the production of such acres to the surplus problem. This is an emergency operation.

We have heard considerable discussion about the unanimous-consent agreement. I do not know whether the suggestion has been made that there was some kind of hanky-panky in connection with the entering of the agreement. I do not believe there was. I was not present when it was entered into. I was not familiar with the terms. I do not know exactly what it provides. So far as I am concerned, it does not make any difference to me one way or the other. If some Senators feel they have been put upon, I am sure some kind of understanding can be reached. We must be fair about these things. I do not believe any Senator wishes to take advantage of any other Senator. So far as I am concerned, that is in the hands of someone else. I will abide by whatever is agreed upon by the Senators concerned.

The 7½ million acres are bound to go out of the program on the last of December, and that means a great deal to the agricultural plant. It is a question whether we should allow 7½ million acres more of production, a great problem that we shall have to wrestle with, involving more storage and more surpluses. Action should be taken now.

I am sure the committees of the two Houses are desirous of doing something about the problem. I know that their desire is that something be done about it eventually. However, as everyone knows, the machinery of Congress does not always move with lightning speed. We all know that the machinery in committees sometimes grinds more slowly than the mills of the gods.

When an agricultural bill is introduced in the other House and it goes through the machinery that an agricultural bill must go through, and then comes to the Senate and goes through the committee machinery here, and finally is submitted to the tender mercies of the conference committee, we can well imagine that the Christmas goose will hang high, and we shall be greeting the new year, perhaps, without any legislation on this subject being enacted. In the meantime these acres will go into production and the surplus problem will mount. That is what will happen if we do not act now. This is the time to do it. The proposal before the Senate is really nothing but a simple extension. I think it should be granted, with all due respect for the cooperative attitude of the committee of which I am a member, and for the zealous, sincere members of that committee, in spite of our disagreement on this particular subject.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his indulgence.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his valuable contribution, coming as it does from a member of the Committee on Agriculture having vast experience and representing, in part, the great farm State of Iowa. He has emphasized the urgency of our action today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his kind words about me.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Iowa such time as he may require.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, is to continue for another year the conservation reserve contracts for the soil bank which would expire this year and next year.

The attitude of the Department of Agriculture seems to be that land covered by contracts which expire this year should be shifted into the land-use adjustment program authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. This is a highly controversial proposal. Congress saw fit last year to provide for a pilot program limiting to $10 million the annual amounts which could be extended for this purpose. There has not been much time for the pilot program to be tested. Furthermore, deep concern has been expressed over moving soil bank land into a program which permits grazing of the land, and this has contributed to the failure of the House to take action this year.

The sponsors of the amendment say, in effect, that pending the resolution of the controversy, we should permit farmers whose soil bank contracts expire this year and next to continue in the soil bank program. With more time, a more permanent solution probably could be satisfactorily arrived at. We think this is good business for the Government, because the land in the soil bank has been retired at an average cost of $11.85 an acre; whereas the cost per acre of land being taken out under the feed grains program has been in excess of $27 an acre. It is expected that many of the farmers and ranchers whose contracts expire this year will see fit to remain in the program for another year. They are geared into the soil bank program, and a considerable amount of their land would not bring the average income under the present feed grains land retirement program anyhow. The lower cost to the Government, of some $6 to $7 per acre, for retirement of the land for recreation and other uses, is offset by the aggravation of our feed grains surplus situation through grazing opportunities on such land. There are 7.5 million acres of farm land scheduled to come out of the soil bank program this year, of which more than 2.2 million acres are in the Midwest and 372,000 acres are in my own State of Iowa. The immensity

of this program is indicated on a table dated "5/23/61," prepared by the Soil Bank Division, of the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

1956–61 conservation reserve program: Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States [1]

State	Acres released as of Dec. 31										Total acres in reserve
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	
Northeast area:											
Connecticut	119	29	2,838	619	36	15	53	513	461		4,681
Delaware	356	95	8,662	3,023	92	352	166	5,053	524		18,323
Maine	7,725	8,148	19,339	16,584	173	1,636	8,586	31,740	27,867	756	122,554
Maryland	7,694	2,660	43,638	13,095	185	914	1,010	10,674	4,724		84,592
Massachusetts	73	28	1,254	380	27	25	10	455	442		2,694
New Hampshire	28	25	1,307	509		40	177	5,116	4,561		11,763
New Jersey	2,367	1,297	26,260	14,675	29	249	86	2,134	2,086		49,183
New York	29,741	15,657	147,679	75,619	1,111	5,340	7,267	107,375	106,467	6,084	502,337
Pennsylvania	16,336	7,926	150,697	82,492	615	1,713	2,491	50,236	53,602	54	366,162
Rhode Island	18		11	25							62
Vermont	31	44	4,011	2,497	220	155	1,359	13,398	10,946		32,661
Virginia	8,173	1,436	42,838	22,567	1,178	1,496	1,106	22,921	13,600		115,315
West Virginia	1,260	808	22,424	11,305	292	79	1,429	13,438	7,240		58,275
Southeast area:											
Alabama	8,148	3,534	81,911	40,292	382	17,911	29,982	133,577	92,198		407,935
Arkansas	25,351	19,888	198,871	83,136	1,338	7,494	24,827	159,785	77,700		598,390
Florida	6,924	3,170	12,818	18,653	256	38,851	21,543	68,439	58,554		229,208
Georgia	16,543	11,774	103,699	71,539	1,508	74,366	152,108	372,116	255,410		1,059,063
Louisiana	4,011	2,258	54,528	26,942	444	6,884	30,158	69,013	24,825		219,063
Mississippi	27,542	21,432	127,253	28,672	1,071	12,309	14,980	65,489	25,297	191	324,236
North Carolina	3,851	3,433	70,423	59,613	309	12,858	15,457	73,354	30,337		269,635
South Carolina	9,367	4,898	54,759	54,921	456	21,649	60,761	201,100	227,950		635,861
Tennessee	12,994	12,585	152,556	78,738	1,468	8,472	14,323	134,003	80,738		495,877
Midwest area:											
Illinois	11,835	2,846	275,624	87,183	918	2,032	749	43,734	11,445	345	436,711
Indiana	18,251	4,332	267,069	118,895	4,290	1,169	437	54,322	24,520		493,285
Iowa	47,804	13,789	372,195	168,150	2,308	1,026	942	34,998	17,019		658,231
Kentucky	8,726	3,949	168,804	68,802	1,085	1,349	2,218	99,962	32,911		387,806
Michigan	38,913	15,614	286,739	162,434	1,410	8,100	5,330	95,804	93,726		708,070
Missouri	33,645	30,727	283,410	160,507	2,095	5,568	4,270	221,317	87,323		828,862
Ohio	21,504	6,663	246,321	140,062	1,010	1,254	792	50,552	48,411	50	516,619
Wisconsin	42,657	14,004	306,083	171,622	1,026	11,831	6,927	105,678	88,987	105	748,920
Northwest area:											
Idaho	13,397	6,421	93,620	44,255	2,507	6,535	1,485	83,748	39,347	225	291,540
Minnesota	194,766	167,131	607,352	186,368	8,894	189,556	136,809	304,267	105,984	2,049	1,903,176
Montana	29,988	14,503	142,191	59,587	2,921	13,891	14,450	224,883	124,989		627,403
Nebraska	42,435	17,022	349,887	144,540	2,488	10,124	7,396	218,394	83,839		876,125
North Dakota	199,662	130,617	513,792	402,433	8,316	199,864	129,771	571,752	548,512		2,704,719
Oregon	19,066	10,365	84,959	36,372	1,418	8,987	6,453	40,714	24,735		233,069
South Dakota	151,661	85,374	410,602	335,511	5,911	54,448	37,831	425,490	315,245		1,822,073
Washington	9,860	13,761	114,268	45,332	3,871	3,056	10,971	95,616	39,299		336,034
Wyoming	14,322	2,935	32,503	10,756		3,827	1,396	44,342	14,325		124,406
Southwest area:											
Arizona	4,676	477	438			1,739	431				7,761
California	16,223	7,470	89,546	36,586	3,103	1,801	1,427	32,937	11,740		200,833
Colorado	99,576	40,891	137,784	30,497	3,434	178,528	82,845	604,114	122,212		1,299,881
Kansas	72,390	79,120	344,243	110,378	11,179	78,191	94,193	412,997	247,283		1,449,974
Nevada											
New Mexico	85,986	14,211	13,813	470	251,424	308,208	113,288	77,559	360		865,319
Oklahoma	136,561	83,952	334,079	155,760	4,938	129,087	81,612	341,844	225,842		1,493,675
Texas	647,503	205,321	644,624	255,606	211,250	495,680	220,696	697,746	276,691		3,655,117
Utah	22,352	6,399	44,201	13,955	841	45,293	10,077	66,858	24,089		234,065
United States	2,172,411	1,099,019	7,491,923	3,651,955	547,827	1,973,950	1,360,675	6,489,562	3,714,363	9,859	28,511,544

[1] Based on report from Data Processing Center of contracts on record Jan. 1, 1961, derived by dividing annual payment for each year of expiration for each State by the State average rental per acre for all land in the reserve in 1961.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the opinion of many cattle raisers, it would be unwise to shift all of the soil bank land into the production of feed grains or into improved pasture to be grazed, because this would tend to aggravate the feed grains surplus situation. Current proposals to develop trade relations with the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries relate to wheat, not to feed grains, which are our worst surplus-commodity problem. Also not to be overlooked is the fact that cattle prices have been depressed during most of this year, and imports of beef and veal have more then doubled since 1960, the result being that today they are equal to almost 10 percent of domestic production. Under such circumstances, to have the Government subsidize the retirement of land and then permit it to be grazed in competition with cattle raisers who are not receiving subsidies, would be unrealistic and unfair.

Action on this problem is overdue. Fall plowing is under way now. Thousands of farmers whose soil bank contracts expire this year want to know what to do. I hope the amendment will be incorporated into the bill now before the Senate.

Typical of the letters I have received from Iowa farmers are two which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OAKLAND, IOWA,
July 23, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: There are a number of items up in Congress which bother me. I am particularly concerned about the possibility of land being taken out of the conservation reserve and turned back to grazing land.

We are not what is considered large cattle feeders, but it is still our means of making a living. With fat cattle prices being what they are this year, I feel that more grazing land would only tend to aggravate an overabundance of cattle more.

We would appreciate your support on getting this land back in the conservation reserve.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. KENNETH PARKHILL.

SOMERS, IOWA,
July 29, 1963.

Senator MILLER.

DEAR SIR: I think that it would be good to continue the Benson soil bank contracts. If the law is not passed soon, there will be a lot of it plowed up and produce good crops that will add to the surplus.

As ever,

A. W. MOELLER.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks preceding the vote on the Mundt amendment an article from today's Wall Street Journal entitled "U.S. Crop Shipments Abroad Rise Sharply, Ease Payments Deficit."

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

FARM EXPORT SURGE: U.S. CROP SHIPMENTS ABROAD RISE SHARPLY, EASE PAYMENTS DEFICIT—TRADERS MOVE INTO MARKETS SOVIET CAN'T HANDLE—GAINS MAY HELP TRIM SURPLUSES—AID FROM FOREIGN AFFLUENCE

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Even as a possible U.S. wheat sale to Russia takes embryonic form,

American farm goods are swarming to foreign markets at rates surpassing expectations and toppling records.

Wheat, feed grains, cotton, soybeans, and other products are heading abroad in growing volume, thanks mainly to general prosperity and disappointing crops in key foreign lands. Agriculture Department trade analysts are privately predicting that total farm exports in the marketing year begun July 1 could mount to as much as $5.7 billion, the highest ever and well above the past year's near-record $5.1 billion. Only a few weeks ago, they looked for just a tiny gain over last year.

One happy result is to boost this country's oversea earnings of dollars; a growing share of the shipments is going to customers who pay in hard U.S. currency. "The effect on our stubborn balance-of-payments deficit should indeed be salubrious," smiles a key policymaker.

Too, there's a healthier chance now for cutting some U.S. farm gluts. Particularly steep gains are expected in exports of wheat and cotton, two of the most burdensome surplus items. Latest forecasts envision a leap of more than 40 percent in cotton shipments from the previous marketing year and a rise of roughly 15 percent in wheat. In the case of wheat, officials now look for the sharpest year-to-year shrinkage in stocks since the Korean war.

REPLACING RUSSIAN GRAIN

Russia's crop failures already figure significantly in the U.S. export outlook. The U.S.S.R. has been forced both to buy wheat from Canada and Australia and to withdraw as an important wheat exporter outside the Iron Curtain. Hard-selling U.S. traders are moving into the gap. As one direct result, Britain, Holland, Belgium, and West Germany lately have bought more than 4 million bushels of American bread grain for October and November shipment.

Less publicized phenomena are helping out. Bad weather has trimmed harvests not only in Russia but almost all across Europe this year. Damaging rains may cut Western Europe's 1963 wheat harvest to a post-World War II low of only 1.3 billion bushels, down from last year's record 1.6 billion. Free world stocks of some commodities, notably cotton, have been held low; now some rebuilding of cotton inventories is beginning in anticipation of tighter fiber supplies and bigger textile demand.

Growing populations in highly industrialized Japan and Western Europe now have increased cash to spend for more and better food and fiber. Free world treasuries are bulging with more gold, dollars and other foreign currency reserves than ever before. The latest tally, for the end of March, shows the total, not counting U.S. holdings, at $49.1 billion, up from $45.9 billion a year earlier.

ERASING A RECORD

The wealthy European nations, it's figured, will increase their dollar purchases of U.S. farm goods far more sharply than less rewarding exports elsewhere will rise; these include sales for soft currencies, barter deals and outright giveaways. Thus farm exports for dollars—excluding these other transactions—are expected to bound upward to around $4 billion this marketing year, erasing the record of more than $3.5 billion set last year.

Even before the new marketing year began, the export rise was on. Despite last January's paralyzing dock strike on the east and gulf coasts, total farm shipments from January through July totaled more than $3 billion, a modest $60 million gain from the 1962 pace. There's more of a surge when January is excluded; for the 6 months ended in July, the outgo came to more than $2.8 billion, topping the year-earlier performance by $200 million.

Nevertheless, even the most optimistic analysts caution that their predictions could go awry. For one thing, a coming U.S. Government report on the effects of smoking on health, if as unfavorable as some reports indicate, might hurt tobacco sales abroad. Shipping space could turn out to be a problem too. "With the Russians and Chinese moving so much grain from Canada and Australia," suggests an official, "any volume of ours moving above $5.6 billion probably will have real trouble finding space in ship bottoms."

Furthermore, much of the coming export bulge probably will be temporary. "You just can't expect crop disasters every year," says a U.S. policymaker. Too, European protectionism could fence out more American goods, as in the famous chicken war raging lately.

WIDE FLUCTUATIONS

U.S. farm exports often have fluctuated widely. From $4.7 billion in the 1956–57 marketing year, the total fell to $3.7 billion 2 years later. Sales built up again to a record of more than $5.1 billion in the year ended in mid-1962, and then eased off to around that figure last marketing year.

For the current year, Agriculture Department specialists size up product-by-product increases this way:

Wheat exports, which totaled 639 million bushels valued at nearly $1.2 billion in 1962–63, are expected to mount to a record of at least 740 million bushels valued at more than $1.3 billion. As recently as Labor Day, the official forecast was only 675 million bushels. With this aid, the Nation's wheat surplus is expected to shrink to just below 1 billion bushels by mid-1964; that would be a cut of 200 million from the heap on hand on June 30 this year, and the sharpest decline in more than a decade.

Other glut-cutting seems less certain. But cotton shipments, which last marketing year slumped to around 3.5 million bales worth $492 million, are expected to jump this year to around 5 million bales valued at more than $700 million. Feed grain sales, which last marketing year reached a record 15.3 million tons worth $737 million may amount to a new high of 17 million tons valued at nearly $820 million. Exports of soybeans, plus oil crushed from soybeans and cottonseed for cooking and other uses, could climb from last year's $778 million to as much as $900 million.

Despite current clouds over tobacco, sales of U.S. leaf promise to show gains from the poor 1962–63 showing of 474 million pounds valued at $378 million, down 7 percent from the previous marketing year. Shipments of rice, vegetables, and cattle for breeding may gain modestly.

While a slump in poultry still seems inescapable, some Agriculture Department specialists expect new markets, such as Japan, to help offset the loss caused by European tariff barriers. Shipments of broiler chickens and turkey meat, the major U.S. poultry products exported, slumped from January through July to less than half the 138 million pounds shipped a year earlier. But the gap has narrowed somewhat. The 10.2 million pounds recorded for July alone were more than half the 16.6 million of the like 1962 month.

To cash in on the generally brightening prospects, American salesmen are globetrotting as never before. No less than 62 U.S. food and agricultural firms, including Chicago's Quaker Oats Co., Armour & Co., and Libby, McNeill & Libby, have agreed to exhibit and sell their products at the largest international trade fair ever sponsored by the Agriculture Department. It is scheduled to open November 7 in Amsterdam and will last 18 days. "We're nearly sold out of exhibit space," says a Department official.

Already, emissaries of more than 40 American producer and trade groups, working with Federal officials in jointly financed market research and promotion projects, are crisscrossing 50 countries pushing U.S. farm products, notably wheat, soybeans, and poultry meat.

Permanent U.S. trade centers established by the Commerce and Agriculture Departments in London and Tokyo are serving as listening posts and information booths on farm marketing possibilities in Europe and Asia. At the Tokyo center, a score or more of U.S. poultry packers are wooing Japanese businessmen and consumers with exhibits and free samples in a show aimed at promoting chicken and turkey eating in Nippon. A U.S. official hails the show as a "tremendous success," though the cash payoff remains to be seen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the question of the disposition of the acres coming out of the soil bank is of particular interest to Minnesota. The cumulative participation as to the number of farms shows that in 1961 Minnesota was second only to Texas in the number of farms with conservation reserve acres, 19,991 Minnesota farms having contracts. The cumulative number of acres in conservation reserve at that time in Minnesota was 1,896,228—a number exceeded only by North Dakota and Texas. Contracts on some of these acres have expired, but Minnesota still had 1,538,000 acres in the conservation reserve program at the beginning of this year.

Nearly 24.3 million acres still remain in the soil bank, and about 7.4 acres are scheduled to be released this year. In 1964 another 3.3 million acres will come out.

Action will be necessary to keep these acres—or an equivalent number of acres—from being returned to cropland production. The question is, What is the best means by which to accomplish this?

The subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture has held hearings on this problem, and has also held an executive session on it. The administration had proposed to change the program from cropland retirement to cropland diversion, but a number of questions have been raised which require additional time for consideration by the committee.

I am a member of the subcommittee and I wish to assure Senators who are supporting the pending amendment that I, too, am interested in getting action on a bill to meet this problem. But I do not believe we should take the unusual route of attaching to an appropriation bill an amendment which provides for an extension of this program.

Some of the land for which conservation reserve contracts will expire is already committed by the landholder to be returned to crop production next year. A mere extension will not keep this land out of crop production in 1964. Even if all the land were retained, we would still only be putting off the solution for another 2 years, at which time we would find over 10 million acres coming out of contract at one time.

The method proposed in the Mundt amendment would also be more expensive than some of the proposals now under study by the subcommittee. Consideration is being given to some form of limited land use for reserve acres. This would permit lower payments than at present. If acres taken from cropland use were diverted to pasture, wildlife, recreational use, woodlots, or other uses, the Secretary could reduce the cost per acre of the program.

In my judgment, one of the principal reasons for dealing with this problem in a separate measure is to try to meet the serious objection to the original soil bank measure—that is, as to the effect of this type of total withdrawal of farms on the rural community. If we can make some provision for keeping farms in operation—rather than have them totally withdrawn from production—we can strengthen the rural community, and certainly can strengthen the justification for this program.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to propose a further unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I heard the colloquy in which the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Florida said that when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into last Thursday, certainly there was no intention on the part of any of us to have the Senate rule changed by means of the unanimous-consent agreement. I believe it was then the intention—certainly it was mine—to have the Senate proceed by a single vote to overrule the point of order, then suspend the rule, and then agree to the amendment.

But although that was the understanding, it is obvious that the language used in the order did not make that clear. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota believes that the unanimous-consent order will terminate all debate at the end of 3 hours; that then there will be the single vote; that it was never intended to deprive the Senator from Florida of the right to make his point of order; and that, until today, all of us anticipated that all that was included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

So, Mr. President, in order to bring this matter to what I believe will be an amicable conclusion—because in 25 years in Congress I have never resorted to sharp legislative practice; and I do not propose to do so today, simply because I temporarily have a weapon in my hand—I ask unanimous-consent agreement that the unanimous-consent agreement of last Thursday be modified so as to provide that by one two-thirds majority vote the Senate may suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, so that my amendment will then be in order, and may then agree to my amendment—all in a single vote—and thus be able to accomplish both objectives by a single vote, whenever the time under the agreement has expired.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator assumes that I, in pursuance of my obligation, will make the point of order; and that then the Senator from South Dakota will make his motion that the Senate overrule the point of order, and agree to the amendment—all in one vote—which would require a two-thirds affirmative majority.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. My amendment has already been submitted; so I assume that the Senator from Florida will make the point of order that the amendment proposes the inclusion of legislation in an appropriation bill, and that then—by a single vote—the Senate will pass upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that, under the existing agreement, a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate would both suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI and agree to the amendment; in other words, both actions would be taken by means of the one vote.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I did not understand the Chair's ruling. I certainly intend to make the point of order. If the proposed modification of the unanimous-consent agreement would not permit the point of order to be made, I wish that fact to be ascertained at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is assumed under the modified agreement, that a point of order will be made, on the ground that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill. Such an amendment cannot be offered until paragraph 4 of rule XVI is suspended; and a two-thirds majority is required in order to take such action.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in order to simplify our arriving at the objective which all of us have in mind, I include in my request a provision to the effect that it is agreed that the point of order which it was understood would be made by the Senator from Florida has now, in fact, been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's request will be modified accordingly.

Is there objection to the modified request for unanimous consent to modify the existing unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I understand that it is now understood that, by means of only one vote, the Senate will deal with the question of suspending the rule and also with the question of agreeing to the substance of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And a two-thirds vote will be required, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe it is now understood that the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, has raised the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that assumption is now understood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it is also understood that a two-thirds vote will be required in order to suspend the rule and also in order to agree to the substance of the amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. He has been most considerate, and I wish the record to note that in our discussions he has been most cooperative. He could have insisted upon a technical interpretation of the unanimous-consent agreement; but, in the typical fashion of a gentleman and an honorable man, he did not do so. So I express to him my gratitude and my appreciation.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota—although I know that he already knows this—that I never expect anything from him but the kind of magnanimous consideration he has accorded in this instance—which I recognize, and for which I express my gratitude.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me add that I have so much confidence in my amendment that I hope that in any event it will be agreed to by a unanimous vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be willing to accept a substitute for the amendment? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield briefly to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

CONSERVATION AND LAND USE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe in programs that put farmland into conservation uses. Through the years I have firmly supported proposals that provided for cost-sharing conservation practices under the ACP program. I have supported the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. I proposed a conservation acreage reserve program that was designed to conserve our invaluable agricultural productivity, our natural resources, and at the same time, to protect and improve farm income. I voted for the Soil Bank Act of 1956, not because this was the best program possible, but because it was the best program available. My colleagues will recall that this act was passed only after the presidential veto of a farm bill that was designed to make positive improvements in farm prices and farm income—the soil bank program was only a minor part of that larger proposal and was passed as a separate act after the veto in the fervent hope that farmers would be provided some positive income improvement by Congress in that dark year of 1956.

That fervent hope was dissipated in the following years as crop production increased and surpluses piled high. The

hope for improved net farm income was dashed as year after year, between 1956 and 1960, net farm income decreased annually around $1 billion. Rural communities suffered as whole farms were placed in the reserve and the owners moved away. Widespread objections to the conservation reserve were voiced by farmers and businessmen. It was for these reasons that in 1960 the U.S. Senate voted to terminate the conservation reserve program.

Misunderstandings with regard to the conservation reserve program that confronts us center on the question: Is there good use for this land, or must it be kept idle? Some cattle producers believe their prices are threatened by use of the land in question for pasture. On the other hand, there are reports that additional pasturage would be in the public interest because beef production should be increased through the years to meet the needs of our growing population.

Because of these differing opinions the Congress this year has been unable to pass any legislation dealing with either a program of land use or an across-the-board extension of expiring conservation reserve contracts. This has led to a great deal of confusion among the farmers of my own State of Minnesota and throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I am not going to take sides in this question. I am, however, introducing today what I consider to be a compromise—a bill which takes into consideration the arguments made by representatives of each side of the question. I do this in order to erase the confusion which presently exists among our farmers and I hope this legislation will get the bipartisan support it will need to be enacted.

Very simply, Mr. President, what my bill does is provide that those persons whose conservation reserve contracts expire this year and next can extend them until December 31, 1965, subject to the same rules and regulations under which the Soil Bank Act now operates.

My bill goes further, however. It adds that until December 31, 1965, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into land-use agreements covering an acreage of land equal to the acreage on which conservation reserve contracts expire this year and next but which are not extended.

Mr. President, my bill contains features of both the Soil Bank Act and the land use provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. I am hopeful it will receive early consideration. I cannot vote to suspend the rules and merely continue the old soil bank program. We need a better program—we need land use—not idle land. We need to conserve our soil—and put it to constructive use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2193) to authorize extension of expiring conservation reserve contracts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am prepared to do likewise; and I now do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. So do I.

Mr. MUNDT. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be a short quorum call prior to the vote, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the yeas and nays have been ordered on this question.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A two-thirds vote is required for a suspension of the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not believe that the assistant majority leader's question was complete. A two-thirds vote is required for a suspension of the rule and adoption of the amendment in a single vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement, a two-thirds vote will be required to suspend the rule and to adopt the amendment. That can all be accomplished in one vote.

The question is on agreeing to a suspension of the rule and agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 20, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Aiken	Curtis	Morton
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hruska	Pearson
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Carlson	Lausche	Scott
Cooper	Mechem	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Miller	

NAYS—59

Anderson	Hartke	Muskie
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Pastore
Brewster	Holland	Proxmire
Burdick	Humphrey	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Case	Kennedy	Smathers
Church	Long, Mo.	Smith
Clark	Long, La	Sparkman
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	McCarthy	Talmadge
Edmondson	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Walters
Ervin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Gore	McNamara	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—21

Allott	Goldwater	Moss
Bible	Javits	Neuberger
Dirksen	Johnston	Pell
Dominick	Keating	Prouty
Douglas	Kuchel	Simpson
Engle	Mansfield	Stennis
Fong	Metcalf	Tower

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the rule is not suspended, and the amendment is not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H.R. 6754) was read the third time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand the unanimous-consent agreement, the vote on passage of the bill will occur at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 30 minutes of debate on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture contains a feature which could well mark the turning point in our efforts to find a solution to the difficulties we have come to lump together under the label of "the farm problem."

I refer to an item of $35 million earmarked for strengthened research on utilization of agricultural commodities. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] whose leadership is responsible for the addition of these funds in the Senate bill, has already told us of the serious imbalance between our research to improve crop production and our efforts to find new uses for the things we grow. The funds being made available in this bill will insure that we are devoting at *least* as many of our resources to utilization research as we are to production research.

All of American agriculture owes a debt to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for their work in developing this program, which is in response to the Senate's recognition of the need for action when, last October, it approved Senate Resolution 415, calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a program for effective strengthening of utilization research.

At the same time, Mr. President, recognition is due the unflagging efforts of my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who earlier this year introduced a bill—S. 1156—to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, headed by Mr. J. Leroy Welsh of Omaha. For many years, from the time he served in the House, my colleague [Mr. CURTIS] has been in the forefront of those urging a stepped-up program of scientific inquiry into new and improved uses for our farm products.

His bill would implement the excellent report of the Welsh Commission which, at President Eisenhower's direction, outlined 106 broad fields of research and development, including hundreds of product uses, that seem to promise fruitful results.

Particular emphasis was given in the Commission's findings to the use of grain alcohol as a gasoline blend. The chemical feasibility of such use is well established. What is required now is an energetic effort to increase the economic feasibility.

There are literally hundreds of other projects which may be pursued with good promise of a quick and profitable return. The program submitted to our committee by the Agricultural Research Service calls for initiating and expanding studies on nearly 200 different projects. Special emphasis would be placed on two highly promising areas—cereal and forage crops, and poultry, dairy and animal products. Substantial increases would be allotted to work on cotton and wool, oilseeds, fruits and vegetables, and new and special crops.

Mr. President, this Government now spends on the order of $15 billion a year in research and development. There is good reason to question whether it is spent wisely. We have heard sharp and angry citicism of some projects which appear to have little practical value and we know that crash programs, such as those in our space effort, are, in and of themselves, wasteful and extravagant.

The $35 million proposal in the bill now before us is anything but a crash program. It provides for a steady, healthy growth of the Federal scientific effort to a size and strength commensurate with the Nation's need.

When the President's scientific adviser, Dr. Jerome Weisner, was before our Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, he conceded that Congress now appropriates billions for research largely on faith, with no real assurance of what the Nation will get for its money.

The opposite is true of the program we are discussing today. Utilization research has a solid record of returning $25 for every dollar spent.

For many years, Mr. President, the American farmer has been caught in a vicious cost-price squeeze. While the price he receives for the things he produces by his own labor and investment has gone down, the price he must pay for the things he needs has risen steadily.

By finding new markets, through new uses for agricultural products, we can restore the health of our farm economy. This is of prime importance to States like my own where agriculture is the basic industry.

As new uses and new processes are developed, we can expect that processing and manufacturing plants will be established in the areas where the products are grown, thus contributing to a balanced and efficient economic situation.

Mr. President, the big clock down at the Census Bureau last Friday ticked off its estimate of America's population at 190 million. In about 3 years, the figure will reach 200 million. We are confident of our ability to produce food and clothing for that many people, but the question may well be asked whether our usual sources will be adequate to meet the demands for the things we otherwise consume.

Take paper, for instance. No one who lives in this town needs to be reminded of America's voracious appetite for paper. We use fantastic amounts of films, fibers, plastics, and coatings.

The ARS proposes to launch a major research effort concerning the use of starch, which makes up 70 percent of cereal grains, for these products.

So-called cereal pulp products, consisting mainly of chemically-converted wheat flour or cereal starches produced by inexpensive processes will yield papers of higher tensile strength than all-wood pulp papers. If initial findings are borne out in larger scale tests, this development has an excellent potential for improving a variety of paper products—newsprint, coating adhesives, coarse paper, and building and insulating boards—and would require the use of 100 to 180 million bushels of grain.

There are other exciting prospects in new uses of cereals.

Entirely new organic materials can be created through fermentation of grain and can be used in a wide variety of processes.

Winter wheats can be treated to make them more acceptable in foreign markets, thus teaming research with another important factor in reducing our surpluses, world trade.

We have only begun to explore the by-products of wheat milling which can be upgraded into concentrates that are rich in vitamins, antibiotics, hormones, and other growth-promoting substances.

The program outlined by the Agricultural Research Service represents a careful screening of projects in a planning document which the Service keps current at all times. It is a listing of projects which show promise but for which funds have so far been unavailable. Given the Senate's direction to propose a program at the level of $35 million, the scientists and technicians have combed the planning list for the most promising and worthwhile—and realistic—activities.

The Agricultural Research Service, under the capable direction of Dr. Byron Shaw and his able assistants, has given us a clear blueprint for an expanded and strengthened utilization research program. They are prepared to carry it out. I am hopeful that in the conference with the House, the Senate managers will persuade their colleagues from the other side of the Capitol of the importance of this program.

MARKET NEWS SERVICE

Mr. President, very late in the Appropriations Committee's markup of this bill, the matter of the Federal-State market news leased wire system came up. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has explained, no hearings were held on this subject, so a subcommittee was appointed to meet with the Secretary of Agriculture and, if appropriate, bring the matter to the floor of the Senate for discussion.

In his remarks on last Wednesday—page 18006 of the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD—the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] explained that:

After conferring with the Secretary of Agriculture, the subcommittee felt that his explanation of what was expected to be done in that field is reasonable.

Mr. President, since I was not a member of that subcommittee, I would be most interested to learn what the subcommittee found reasonable about the Secretary's assertion that his Department will be the sole judge in those cases where it is decided to cancel the contracts of subscribers to this service.

In his letter to the chairman [Mr. HOLLAND], the Secretary says in one place.

No system of censorship or management of the press is involved in any manner.

Three paragraphs later, he makes the assertion that his Department reserves the right to cancel the service "in its entirety and in the sole judgment of USDA if, for some unforeseen reason, it should turn out to be detrimental to the best interests of agricultural producers as a whole."

The point, Mr. President, is this: the information supplied by this market news service is public property, bought and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. It belongs to each of them and to all of them.

To have the Secretary claim the right to decide who gets it and for how long and under what circumstances is preposterous.

The information available over this service is no different from information contained in a printed leaflet, such as the Department's famous pamphlet on infant care. Does the Secretary claim that he has the right to decide who shall receive those pamphlets and what use shall be made of them?

There are serious questions concerning this market news service, Mr. President. Does it mean that each department will soon have its own teletype news service, and then, in the name of economy, they will all be combined into one central service?

The Soviets have a system like that. It is called Tass.

But whether such a Government news service is in the offing or not, it is clear that we must not leave to an official of the Government the authority to decide, willy nilly, whether subscriber A should have the service and subscriber B should not.

Suppose in exercising its "sole judgment" the Department of Agriculture decides it does not like the editorial policy of one of its newspaper subscribers. Is that a basis for cancellation?

It is my hope that the Agriculture Committees of both Houses, as well as those committees concerned with true freedom of information, will turn their attention to this potentially dangerous attempt by the Secretary to set himself up as a censor of publicly owned news.

Mr. President, America's free press has been viewing Mr. Freeman's scheme with a very jaundiced eye. An example appeared in the September 27 issue of the Lincoln Journal. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled, "Freeman's News Service."

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

FREEMAN'S NEWS SERVICE

The U.S. press and public expect a free flow of information from their Federal Government. But Secretary Orville Freeman, in the Department of Agriculture, appears to be a little too generous with news from his bailiwick.

He has told the press, in effect, "You won't even have to bother coming around any more, boys. We'll just gather up all our news and put it out for you." Freeman even proposes setting up an agricultural news service to get this information to the press media, as the Associated Press and United Press International do.

It's not surprising that much of the press has replied, "Thanks a lot, Orville, but no thanks."

Not that they're a bunch of ingrates. But the idea raises a host of questions—professional, political, and practical.

Foremost among them might be: How would the Department of Agriculture have "covered" the story of Billie Sol Estes, or the disappearance of several million tons of Government-owned grain? Would it have reported them at all? How would the Department have presented the news on the recent wheat referendum which it plugged so actively?

The present method, in which privately owned and competing news services and news media seek and distribute the news, might not be perfect. But it beats the daylights out of Secretary Freeman's proposal.

For whenever the independent press is not allowed to gather and disseminate news, including news about Government, this Nation will be in a real bad way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, unless there are further demands for time, I am prepared to yield back the remaining time on this side on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement each side has 15 minutes. The Senator from Illinois is prepared to yield back his remaining time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield back my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is temporarily absent to attend a funeral.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Gruening	Monroney
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hartke	Morton
Bayh	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bennett	Hill	Nelson
Boggs	Holland	Pastore
Burdick	Hruska	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Church	Kennedy	Scott
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Cotton	Long, La	Smith
Curtis	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarthy	Symington
Dodd	McClellan	Talmadge
Eastland	McGee	Walters
Edmondson	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McIntyre	Yarborough
Ervin	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mechem	Young, Ohio
Gore	Miller	

NAYS—5

Brewster	Ribicoff	Williams, Del.
Lausche	Thurmond	

NOT VOTING—21

Allott	Goldwater	Moss
Bible	Javits	Neuberger
Cooper	Johnston	Pell
Dominick	Keating	Prouty
Douglas	Kuchel	Simpson
Engle	Mansfield	Stennis
Fong	Metcalf	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 6754) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first, I wish to express the thanks of the leadership to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his diligence and patience in handling this very important appropriation bill. The Senator from Florida made considerable personal sacrifice to accommodate other Senators, and I want him to know that his consideration is appreciated. I also wish to thank the Senator for the meticulous manner in which he explained all the features of this bill, so that the RECORD might be substantially clear as to what was done in connection with this rather substantial appropriation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statement of the acting majority leader.

ALIBATES QUARRIES OF ANCIENT MAN IN THE TEXAS PANHANDLE SHOULD BE A NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, more and more citizens of the Southwest are becoming aware of and joining in support for the efforts to assure preservation of the famous Alibates flint quarries near Amarillo, Tex. These quarries, proposed for designation as a national monument by a bill which I have introduced, S. 1348, have been used as a source of flint for projectile points during 12,000 years of American history and prehistory.

The importance of preserving this site is well described in a recent, concise, and informative article published by the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe and written by Jim Clark.

I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Sunday News Globe, Sept. 8, 1963]

FLINT QUARRY OLDEST MINE

(By Jim Clark)

If not preserved as a national monument, a mining and trading business operated by prehistoric man near here 12,000 years ago may be lost to vandals and souvenir hunters.

The business—in continuous operation for 11,300 years—is the Alibates flint quarries, on the Canadian River 35 miles north of Amarillo.

Earliest inhabitants of the North American Continent walked hundreds of miles to collect flint from the quarries. It provided weapons for hunting woollyhaired, long-tusked mammoths which thundered over this region 10,000 years before the birth of Christ.

Location of the quarries and nearby Indian pueblo ruins is one of the State's best-kept secrets. But opening of the 25,000-acre Lake Meredith in 1965 will make them available to the public either by automobile or boat.

The quarries and ruins are in the heart of a scenic recreation area to be acquired by the lake developer. Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, CRMWA, has agreed to dedicate required acreage as a national monument if a well-backed proposal gets necessary Department of Interior and legislative approval.

National monument status for the site would make this area's oldest economic resource the newest—through tour revenues—and provide one of the finest educational exhibits in the Nation, promoters say.

Telltale signs of ancient civilizations are hundreds of grass-covered quarry excavations. Artifacts still crop up among the flint chips and cores surrounding each pit.

The pueblo ruins, a quarter-mile away, are the tattletale of a people who tilled the soil and built flourishing villages 600 years before white man laid claim on the country.

Archeological evidence indicates flint from the quarries—valued because of its brilliant coloring and quality—was a sought-after trade item among prehistoric man.

Tools made from Alibates flint 12,000 years ago have been uncovered in archeological diggings as far away as Montana.

The flint—a stratum spread over a mile-long zone and lying between areas of agatized dolomite—occurs in reds, blues, whites, purples, yellows, tans, grays, and blacks. Much of it is banded, striped, splotched, streaked or dotted.

Man first found the quarries 6,000 years before the wheel was invented or the first writing appeared, 500 years before the ice age peaked and 7,100 years before the great pyramids of Giza were built in Egypt.

"I am sure that Alibates flint was used frequently for such point types as Folsom, Plainview, Scotts Bluff and Eden * * * for at least some 12,000 years up to the time of pottery cultures in Texas and New Mexico," Dr. Alex D. Krieger, University of Washington archeologist, has written.

The Alibates quarries were "certainly the most important ones," Dr. Robert E. Bell, University of Oklahoma archeologist, has observed. "They appear to be the most extensive and to have been used over the longest period of time."

Dr. Waldo R. Wedel, Smithsonian Institution curator, referred to the "famous" Alibates quarries in his book, "Prehistoric Man on the Great Plains."

After the time of the mammoth hunters, flint from the Alibates quarries was used by ice age man for stalking giant bison, camel, sloth and tapir, once plentiful over much of the Southwest.

The people who followed prehistoric man to the quarries established a complex economy based upon corn, agriculture, hunting and trading of Alibates flint.

A 66-room pueblo ruin in the quarry area, excavated by a Works Progress Administration crew in the 1930's, produced 16,000 identifiable artifacts—11,000 of them not native to this region.

The artifacts, representing a culture from 900 to 1300 A.D., are in the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum at West Texas State University, Canyon.

Unexplored limestone slab pueblos may represent an older or more recent culture than those excavated by WPA workers and area archeologists. A 100-room pueblo ruin in the area can be excavated and restored.

The excavated puebloes contain vast quantities of flint shaved from larger pieces carried from the quarries for working.

At the quarries and pueblo ruins the archeologist today finds weapons and household tools, along with pottery shards, stone implements, and remains of materials imported to this region.

Prehistoric man used flint blanks (ready to work pieces) as a medium of trade, archeologists verify.

The importance of Alibates flint to prehistoric man and its us as both a utilitarian and trade item was emphasized by Dr. Kirk Bryan in a paper published by Harvard University.

"The Sources of Tools and, at the Same Time, the Factories of Prehistoric American Man" was the title of Bryan's paper, published by the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology.

Tools and weapons made from the easily identifiable Alibates flint have been found in Clovis and Folsom civilization finds in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, and Montana.

From 900 to 1300 A.D., pueblo dwellers used the valuable flint to trade for red pipestone from Minnesota, shells from the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean, obsidian, turquoise, and painted pottery from New Mexico, painted pottery from Arizona, and obsidian from the Yellowstone area of Wyoming. Artifacts made from these trade items were found during excavation of the pueblo complexes.

"It is apparent that prehistoric man made special journeys to the quarries just to obtain his flint," Dr. James J. Hester said when confirming "extensive use of Alibates flint in the 12,000-year-old Clovis culture mammoth kill site" near Portales, N. Mex. Hester is curator of the Museum of New Mexico.

Reports in scientific journals point to the cultural, economic, geological, and historical significance of the quarries and pueblos.

Edward B. Jelks, executive director of the Texas archeological salvage projects, University of Texas, conceives for the proposed national monument an in-place exhibit "to portray in dramatic fashion the aboriginal quarrying methods, stone chipping techniques, and trading activities."

To Floyd V. Studer, an Amarillo man well known in the field of archeology, preservation of the "source of the finest material available to prehistoric man in North America would provide the finest and only in-place educational exhibit of its kind in the Nation."

"Alibates flint was to prehistoric man what the finest steel is to man today," says Studer, who has worked the quarries and pueblo ruins since 1907.

Fauna and flora of the region in an in-place exhibit at the quarry and pueblo sites would be "a wonderful way to tell young people about those who lived before them," thinks Henry Hertner.

Hertner, an Amarillo businessman, is promoting national monument status through his work with the Potter and Texas State Historical Survey Committees and the Panhandle Geological Society. The project also is supported by several other individuals, governmental authorities, and organizations.

First substantiated proof that the quarries were worked 12,000 years ago came in 1925, when archeologists in New Mexico uncovered an Alibates flint point in the vertebra of a now extinct giant bison killed by Folsom man.

Seven years later, archeologists carried use of Alibates flint back even farther, through discovery of the Clovis culture in a cave deposit in southeastern New Mexico. Clovis man lived between 12,000 and 15,000 years ago.

"It would be a tragedy if this landmark in the history of man on this continent should not be preserved for the study and enjoyment of future generations," Texas Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH said in introducing his bill to preserve the quarries as a national monument. The bill is now in committee.

YARBOROUGH'S sentiment was expressed long ago by a former Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

"This spot is worthy of being made a national monument," M. L. Wilson wrote after visiting the quarries and ruins in 1939.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS SUPPORT COLD WAR GI BILL, BY RESOLUTION OF THEIR NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, with a national membership of approximately 100,000, held their annual national convention in this city on August 4 through 11. I am proud to announce that the Jewish War Veterans National Convention adopted a resolution in support of the extension of educational benefits to the veterans of the cold war.

This resolution recognizes that the failure to provide educational benefits to those men and women who entered service after January 31, 1955, discriminates between veterans, with that discrimination based solely on the date of entry into the Armed Forces and not because of different duty requirements, and that this failure and discrimination violates the principle of aiding those whose civilian lives have been interrupted by service based on the compulsory draft.

Mr. President, this resolution is another indication of the widespread and growing support which is rallying behind the passage of the cold war GI bill. I urge the consideration and passage by the Senate of S. 5, the cold war GI bill. I urge all Americans with a sense of justice to join in its support.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America at their annual convention be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXTEND EDUCATION BENEFITS DURING PERIOD OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Whereas the 82d Congress passed the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, Public Law 550, which among other benefits, provided that persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States were eligible for the educational benefits theretofore provided under the GI bill; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by proclamation did terminate the benefits of the aforesaid Public Law 550, said termination date being January 31, 1955, and thereby the educational benefits to the men of our Armed Forces have been terminated; and

Whereas the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America believe that the educational benefits provisions of Public Law 550 were of value to this country; and

Whereas failure to provide educational benefits to those who entered service after January 31, 1955 (1) discriminates amongst servicemen based strictly on the date of entry into service and not different duty requirements; and (2) abandons concept of providing an opportunity for higher education and for training which has been allowed since the GI bill on the premise of assistance to those whose lives were interrupted by service based on draft: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 68th annual national convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 4–11, 1963, favors the extension of the educational benefits of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, Public Law 550, during the period of time that selective service is effective, and that the eligibility to these benefits be made retroactive so as to cover those members of the armed services whose service was started or terminated subsequent to January 31, 1955.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the New York City Community Mental Health Board, relating to the Community Mental Health Act.

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

RESOLUTION ON COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Unanimously adopted September 24, 1963, by the New York City Community Mental Health Board.

Whereas the State of New York was the first in the Nation to enact legislation enabling State and local governments to share in the support of local mental health facilities by the passage of the Community Mental Health Services Act in 1954; and

Whereas the State of New York continues to be first among the States in the total and per capita expenditures for community mental health; and

Whereas the city of New York by its own willingness to appropriate funds for mental health services is, in large measure, responsible for this position of State leadership in community mental health; and

Whereas the President of the United States, on February 5, 1963, sent a special message to the Congress relative to mental illness and mental retardation, recommending Federal support of construction and initial staffing costs of comprehensive community mental health centers; and

Whereas Federal appropriations for the initial staffing costs of comprehensive community mental health centers are of equal importance to construction grants, if the State of New York and the city of New York are to successfully establish comprehensive community mental health centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York City Community Mental Health Board respectfully petitions the Governor of the State of New York to exercise his influence upon and give leadership to the Members of the U.S. Congress including the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York to support all provisions now included in the bill known as S. 1576, which provisions are importantly related to construction and staffing of comprehensive community mental health centers, especially supporting those provisions making available Federal funds for staffing of such community mental health centers during the period of transition from Federal to State and local sponsorship.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 8363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 474, H.R. 3369.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up amendment numbered 203, offered in behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . Section 104(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1975c(b)), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1964".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. It provides for a 1-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe there is a disposition to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that it is our hope and intention to be able to complete action on the bill and the amendment before too late this afternoon. Therefore, all Senators should be on notice accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my opposition to the bill to extend the life and the activities of the so-called Civil Rights

Commission is neither perfunctory nor for home consumption.

I am well aware of the almost insuperable difficulties involved in finding even a trace of objectivity when any phase of the politically charged racial issue is involved in a measure pending on the floor of the Senate. The drums of propaganda have been beaten so long and so loud that public opinion has become embittered against the millions of God-fearing, honest white people of the South to such an extent that it almost represents a national disease.

Of course, there are some law violators in the Southern States. There are some brutal men living in the South, as in other areas. There are fiends in human form, who commit indescribable crimes. However, the great majority of the white people in the South, on this issue, have been found guilty only of undertaking to maintain two social orders within a single political system.

They have not sought to impose upon our Negro citizens or to mistreat them. Their objective has been to preserve the identity of the white race. So intense is national feeling against the people of the South, that despite all that can be said or done by the representatives of these people in the Senate, in behalf of these people, who are innocent of any wrongdoing, and who have only defended social order which had been approved by Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States for almost a century, words in their defense are not considered worthy even of a hearing. Sometimes the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is about the only publication that carries the southern viewpoint beyond the confines of this Chamber.

The agency known as the Civil Rights Commission should be permitted to expire today and to liquidate its business within the next 60 days, as provided in the original act, because I assert that this agency has shown a bias and prejudice which should disqualify it from further operations.

If any other agency of this Government had displayed the same malevolence against any other section of this country or against any considerable number of people of this country that has been shown against the white people in the South who oppose the use of Federal power to mix the races in all the relations of life, that Commission would have been abolished long ago. If it had not been abolished, the President of the United States, in response to national demand, would have demanded the resignation of the members who composed the Commission.

The greatness of this country was derived from individualism. Today the cult of conformity is in the saddle. The recommendations that this Commission has made well illustrate the danger posed by the power of the cult of conformity to the liberties of our people and the continuation of our way of life.

Today the conformists are heard to favor projecting the power of the Federal Government into the social relations between the races. Tomorrow it can be in the political field, in favor of the establishment of a single, monolithic political party in this country. Following that, we can have a drive to make all the people who live in this country conform, by belonging to one religious denomination.

There have been periods of bitterness and strife in this country before. The ugly head of sectionalism has been reared in other periods of our history.

I challenge any period, even that immediately following the bitterness of the Civil War, to produce as vicious a proposal as that made by the Civil Rights Commission to the President of the United States last year. This group requested the withholding of every benefit of the Federal Government under all of our laws from the people of an entire State because of the acts of a Governor or the governing authorities of a State.

Out of the frustrations of their conceit, this group recommended to the President of the United States that he inflict dire and inhuman punishment, on all the people of a State—punishment that has been universally denounced under the name of genocide throughout the entire civilized world.

They demanded that the President in effect repeal the Constitution by Executive order.

Mr. President, so far as I know, this proposes a policy of cruel and inhuman punishment upon the guilty and the innocent alike, that is without parallel since man had any reason to boast that he has emerged from the animal state and has become a civilized being.

When Hitler laid the heavy hand of Nazi force upon the tiny hamlet of Lidice, because one of his gauleiters was killed near that community, a tremendous outcry was raised throughout the entire civilized world.

Still, the Civil Rights Commission has proposed to visit most cruel punishment upon the thousands of the weak, the helpless, and the sick of an entire State, and its recommendation meets with the plaudits of many of those who condemned the crime of Lidice.

What has been proposed by this organization? It has proposed to take from all the veterans of all our wars, including veterans who bear on their bodies the scars of disabling wounds received in their country's service, the benefits voted by a grateful people. It would likewise deny to the widows and orphans of those who have died in battle the meager benefits which every other widow or orphan outside the limits of that State receives.

It is proposed to deny even the benefits of social security payments to those who have contributed to the social security fund, if they happen to live within the confines of the State which has been proscribed by this sadistic group.

The plan of the Commission would deny to the dependent children of that State, and the old and helpless who are existing on a mere pittance, scarcely sufficient to preserve life, the benefits which every American citizen similarly situated who lives in the other 49 States would continue to receive.

This vicious plan not only manifests blind and unreasoning hatred against the white people of the South; it also demonstrates the monumental hypocrisy of those who propose it and of those molders of public opinion who support it, as well.

It so happens that most of those who support this genocide plan against the white and the black, the young and the old, whether they are innocent or guilty of favoring mixing the races are the same group who cried out the loudest against what was called, a few years ago, guilt by association.

Every Member of this body will remember the condemnation heaped upon anyone who asked a question at a hearing that might imply the guilt of a person because of offenses of those with whom he associated. But today, the hypocrites throughout the land, including those in Congress, who purported to be outraged when guilt was implied to any individual because of his associates, are willing to condemn to privation, suffering, and, in many cases, death, thousands of innocent people because of their residence within the boundaries of one of the 50 States of the Union. That is the only crime with which they are charged.

I, too, oppose any presumption of guilt by association; but I submit to the judgment and conscience of history, not to the hatemongers and demogogs of this hour, that the doctrine of guilt by association, which was found so detestable, is as nothing compared to proscribing guilt by residence to all those living within a given area.

The pages of the press in the past few days have been filled with news about an organization called Cosa Nostra, which constitutes a criminal syndicate or a criminal conspiracy of gangsters who apparently have committed every crime in the decalog. But were it to be suggested that the benefits that the Civil Rights Commission insisted be withheld from all the people of Mississippi, white and black alike, be withheld from the families of the members of Cosa Nostra, we would find the members of the Civil Rights Commission leading a parade of "sanctimonious Pharisees"; and the parade would include hundreds of politicians, including many Members of Congress, editorial writers, columnists, and commentators. This same group who recommended genocide in Mississippi would stage a public demonstration against any suggestion of applying the same rule to the widows and families of the most notorious criminal element in this land.

The same would be true if any person were to suggest seriously that veterans' pensions and aid to dependent children, to the helpless, to the blind, and to other members of the families of those who have been found guilty of treason, murder, or rape be denied. A storm of protest would be generated throughout the country. The editorial pages, the commentators, and the columnist who rallied to the proposal of genocide by the Civil Rights Commission against all those within a State would literally drip with tears of sympathy for the threatened victims. They would launch scathing denunciations against any person who made such a proposal.

Mr. President, the Nation is in danger today from the trend to conformity. I am completely sincere in my belief that our system cannot continue to endure if the present trend to conformity, under the lash of Federal legislation, proclamation, and judicial edicts, is not stemmed and reversed.

If an inquisition supervised by the Civil Rights Commission can inflict brutal, cruel, and inhuman punishment without indictment, trial, or even a specific charge of guilt, without any witness being even suggested, without any pretense of a court hearing, all without shocking the conscience of the American people, we are in a fair way to move from inquisition to inquisition until all those who do not conform to the central power and majority opinion have been eliminated.

Then we may end by having one great political party and one magnificent religious organization; but we shall have one tyrant, we shall have no liberties, we shall have nothing that could be a just source of pride to any American, a pride that would cause him to throw back his shoulders and say, "I am an American citizen."

Mr. President I cannot refrain from stating what I feel about in this matter, although I know my statement will not meet with the approval of many of my colleagues. I cannot have any respect for any man, whatever position he may occupy, who would make a proposal so completely lacking in compassion, human sympathy, and Christian charity as the genocide plan of this Commission.

We have in this country courts to enforce our laws; and it so happens that those who today carry the banner of conformity have both the means and the lawyers sufficient and able to overwhelm the courts with cases, and also the power to name the judges who would try them. So it is not necessary to resort to a position so brutal and extreme that it would inflict so much suffering and privation upon all the poor people in a given State merely because they happen to reside in a State whose officials have committed an act which meets with the disapproval of many of the people of the country and of the members of the Commission.

I state very frankly that I have been shocked to see the American people accept as acquiescently as they have a suggestion of this kind. We have gone a long way from the things that have made this country great. This plan strikes down every protection which the Founding Fathers thought they were leaving to their posterity.

It leaves every American naked before the power of he who holds temporary power.

It relegates government by law to the limbo of the forgotten and substitutes government by men—the very thing our Government was created to avoid.

Mr. President such a proposal flies in the face of almost every provision of the Constitution of the United States. It is not my intention at this time to make a detailed Constitutional argument; I shall reserve that for a later date; but I will say that under such a suggestion the Constitution of the United States might well be eliminated. If the Constitution still prevails, it would simply be grotesque to suggest that any punishment can be visited upon one group of people because of the acts of another or of several others, even though he might be the Governor of a State or though they might be all the officials of a State or even though they might be the overwhelming majority of the people of a State. American justice is intended for the individual. But this malevolent proposal attributes guilt to all those who live within a State, including, as a practical matter, the thousands of them who are in favor of all of these so-called civil rights bills. Nevertheless, they would feel the heavy hand of the Federal power fixed to their throats and choking out their lives, through starvation and privation.

There will come a time, Mr. President, when we will go back to the Constitution. I shall not lose my faith in that. I do not believe that our system of government is ready to perish. But such proposals, as are made by this group, calmly accepted by millions of our people, give me pause.

I hope and I pray that the American people will not be blinded by hate, to the extent that they will strike down the only protection which all of them have.

Mr. President, I say that any group that will go to this extremity in their assault upon the Constitution of the United States, and in their proposal to punish the innocent along with the guilty, without any trial whatever, do not deserve any additional lease on life at the hands of Congress.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I share in full measure the views expressed by him in his remarks.

A few days ago, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial, from which I wish to quote one statement as an indication of the unfortunate state in which this Nation now finds itself:

> In recent times, among other things, America's traditional tolerance toward minorities has shown a tendency to get twisted. If a person is a member of a minority, his rights are sometimes alleged to be superior to the majority, by virtue of his minority status.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the extension for one moment of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I am opposed to it because my study of its recommendations has left me with the abiding conviction that the only program it offers to the American people is a program based upon the strange thesis that all Americans must be robbed of their basic economic, legal, personal, and property rights for the supposed benefit of only one group of Americans selected from the entire body of American citizenship, solely on the basis of their race.

The United States is confronted at this moment with a most crucial question. This question can be stated in this form: Shall all Americans have their constitutional birthright and their fundamental freedoms exchanged for a sorry mess of governmental tyranny?

The wisest men who ever lived upon the North American continent, or anywhere else on this sphere, were the Founding Fathers, who drew up the Constitution of the United States. They were acquainted with the long and bitter struggle of man for the right of self-government, and for the right to enjoy basic freedoms, and they had found this truth inscribed in letters of blood on every page of their history.

> No man or set of men can be safely trusted with unlimited governmental power.

Their objects in drawing the Constitution were to provide not only an instrument for self-government, but an instrument which would prevent the subjects of government from suffering tyranny at the hands of their rulers. They had read with understanding minds the statement of the great English political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes:

> Freedom is political power divided into small fragments.

They knew that whenever all the powers of government are vested in one man, one body, or one government, such government is a tyranny, regardless of the name by which it may be called. So they wrote a Constitution which divided the powers of the government which they were creating into small fragments. They gave a part of the powers of that government to the Federal Government on a national level, and they reserved the remainder of governmental powers to the States. They did so to prevent either the Federal Government or the governments of the States from tyrannizing the subjects of government.

When they came to the establishment of the Federal Government itself, they likewise followed the principle that freedom is political power divided into small fragments. They divided the powers of the Federal Government among the Congress, which is authorized to legislate; the President, who is authorized to execute the laws; and the courts, which are authorized to interpret the laws.

They knew another truth which was declared by the greatest of all English judges, William Murray, Earl of Mansfield, in the case of *King* v. *Shipley*, 3 Douglas Reports 170. In that great case the Earl of Mansfield said:

> To be free is to live under a government by law.

By that statement the Earl of Mansfield meant that men cannot enjoy freedom except under a system of laws which apply alike to all men in like circumstances. Virtually every recommendation which the Civil Rights Commission has made to the President or the Congress conflicts squarely with both of those fundamental propositions, namely, the proposition that freedom is political power divided into small fragments, and that to be free is to live under a government of laws rather than a government of men.

I have stated before on the floor of the Senate that the constant agitation on racial questions which prevails in our country is impairing our national sanity. I wish we could pause long enough to read all the recommendations made by the Civil Rights Commission in their

1961 report before we vote on the measure to extend the life of the Commission.

I wish it were possible to delay a vote until we could read the report of the Civil Rights Commission for 1963, which was submitted today. This report is the most drastic report yet submitted. It is wholly incompatible with the system of government established by our Constitution. Time and time again in the voluminous report for 1961, and time and time again in the report for 1963, the Civil Rights Commission recommended to the President that the President issue Executive orders prescribing rules of conduct and establishing punishments for violation of those rules of conduct. Such action on the part of the President would be clearly the exercise of lawmaking power. The lawmaking power consists merely of the power to prescribe rules of conduct and to establish sanctions for the violation of such rules.

In the constitution of my native State is the following declaration:

A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.

In judging the advisability of continuing the life of the Civil Rights Commission, we would do well to recur to some fundamental principles.

I wish to read two passages from the Constitution of the United States. The first is article I, section 1:

All Legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I now call attention to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which specifies legislative powers which Congress is to have. After specifying those powers, the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have Power—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The most lucid interpretation of those two provisions of the Constitution appears in a comparatively recent case: *Youngstown Co.* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. at page 579.

(At this point Mr. THURMOND took the chair as presiding officer.)

Mr. ERVIN. This case involved the validity under the Constitution of the action of President Truman in seizing the steel mills without congressional authorization. The Court held this action unconstitutional in an opinion interpreting in a most lucid manner the first and eighth sections of article I of the Constitution. I read a portion of the opinion, which appears on pages 587 and following:

Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant Executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The President's order does not direct that a congressional policy be executed in a manner prescribed by Congress—it directs that a presidential policy be executed in a manner prescribed by the President.

* * * * *

The Constitution does not subject this lawmaking power of Congress to Presidential or military supervision or control.

It is said that other Presidents without congressional authority have taken possession of private business enterprises in order to settle labor disputes. But even if this be true, Congress has not thereby lost its exclusive constitutional authority to make laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof.

The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times. It would do no good to recall the historical events, the fears of power and the hopes for freedom that lay behind their choice. Such a review would but confirm our holding that this seizure order cannot stand.

Despite the fact that the Constitution vests all of the lawmaking power in the Congress and none whatever in the President, the Commission on Civil Rights has made scores and scores of recommendations to the President that he usurp and exercise the lawmaking power of the Congress to carry out recommendations made by the Commission.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand how anyone could think it necessary to establish so many governmental agencies to deal with this particular field of our national life. There is the Civil Rights Commission, which will be extended, if the amendment is adopted, to deal with this field. There is also the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, doing in large part the same work. It is already in existence, duplicating the performances in many activities of the Commission on Civil Rights. It is recommended in the President's civil rights program that there be established a third Federal agency, a Community Relations Service to act in this same field. As a consequence, the country will probably have the Civil Rights Commission to agitate, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to aggravate, and the Community Relations Service to conciliate. And all this in spite of the fact that under orders issued by the Secretary of Defense, the military commanders are being converted into political arms of the executive branch of the Federal Government and are being compelled to put the Armed Forces of the Nation at economic warfare with the civilian population in order to coerce those civilians engaged in commercial enterprises to surrender to the Federal Government the right to use their own property as they see fit and the right to select those for whom they will perform personal services.

The Civil Rights Commission has made some drastic recommendations for legislation in respect to voting, school desegregation, employment practices, housing, and justice. Before I discuss the recommendations relating to voting, I wish to read three provisions of the Constitution which have been interpreted many times by the Supreme Court to vest in the States the power to prescribe qualifications for voting.

Section 2 of article I:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

A portion of section 1 of article II:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

I now read the third of these passages, which is from the 17th amendment:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The Supreme Court has, quite correctly, held time and time again that, under these provisions of the Constitution, the power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Federal officials belongs to the States, and to the States alone.

It has further held in many cases that this power of the States is subject to this limitation only: namely, that the States cannot establish as a qualification either race or sex.

In the case of *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Elections*, 360 U.S. 45, the Supreme Court unanimously held that, under these constitutional provisions the States, and the States alone, have the power to prescribe the qualifications for voters for Federal officers. In the course of that opinion, the Court said:

We come then to the question whether a State may consistently with the 14th and 17th amendments apply a literacy test to all voters irrespective of race or color. The Court in *Guinn* v. *United States*, *supra*, at 366, disposed of the question in a few words, "No time need be spent on the question of the validity of the literacy test considered alone since as we have seen its establishment was but the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision, and indeed, its validity is admitted."

The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * * absent of course the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution in its provision for the election of Members of the House of Representatives and the 17th amendment in its provision for the election of Senators provide that officials will be chosen "by the people." Each provision goes on to state that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." So while the right of

suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution * * * it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed.

Despite those clear provisions of the Constitution and despite the equally clear decisions of the Supreme Court construing them, the Commission on Civil Rights has recommended time and time again that the Congress usurp and exercise the powers of the States to prescribe qualifications for voting. In its recommendations, the Commission even goes so far as to recommend that Congress abolish all literacy tests and declare that anyone who has completed the sixth grade of school shall be allowed to vote, irrespective of whether he learned to read and write while so doing.

Time does not permit me to deal in detail with all the other recommendations made by the Commission. When the school desegregation decision was handed down, it reversed a decision of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina, written by Circuit Judge John J. Parker, in the case of Briggs against Elliott.

Subsequent to the reversal of his decision, Judge Parker wrote an explanation of what the *Brown* case decided. He said:

What it—

That is, the Supreme Court—

has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. This, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the State may not do directly or indirectly; but if the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools, as they attend different churches (132 F. Supp. 776).

The Commission on Civil Rights adopted this interpretation of the school desegregation case made by Judge Parker as being a correct interpretation of that decision.

Notwithstanding that fact, the Civil Rights Commission would deny to the children of all communities the right to make their election to attend such schools as they see fit. They ask for the enactment of laws to compel the immediate integration of all of the public schools throughout the United States, and insist that the Attorney General of the United States be given the power to set in motion the machinery which they wish to have established to effect their desire, regardless of the wishes of the communities involved.

It is high time that the American people ascertain exactly what the Commission is recommending for them in respect to employment and other matters in its report for 1963, which has just been made public. The recommendations which this report make are, in effect, that all the powers of State governments and all control of individuals be transferred to bureaucrats on the banks of the Potomac River insofar as may be necessary to compel, by the coercive power of law, total integration in all phases of American life.

The Commission has just made a drastic recommendation with respect to employment. I read this recommendation which is made on page 91 in the report made public today by the Civil Rights Commission:

That Congress enact legislation establishing a right to equal opportunity in employment when that employment is assisted by the Federal Government or affects interstate commerce, with authority to institute action and to issue appropriate orders vested in a single administrator located in the Department of Labor, and provision for appeal to an independent authority.

By that recommendation, the Civil Rights Commission asks that Congress rob virtually every employer throughout the United States of the legal power to determine whom he shall hire, whom he shall promote, whom he shall demote, and whom he shall discharge in the carrying on of his business, and confer it upon a single administrator sitting in the Department of Labor at Washington.

Virtually every employer in the United States is included. Those connected, in one way or another, with the Federal Government, or with the carrying out of contracts financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government embrace a substantial percentage of the employers of the United States; and, under the loose interpretation now being given the commerce clause, virtually all the rest are included.

I warn the employers of America that if this recommendation of the Commission should be implemented by Congress, they may be harassed by the charge that they have engaged in discrimination on the basis of race every time they hire one man in preference to another; every time they promote one man rather than another; and every time they pay one employee more than they pay another employee.

Whenever such charges are made, they will spend their time, not in litigation in their home communities, where the Constitution contemplates that litigation should be conducted, but in litigation before a bureaucrat in the Department of Labor in Washington.

I wish I had time to discuss the recommendations of the Commission in respect to housing. The Commission recommends, in substance, that all Americans who have any connection whatever with any housing program conducted by the Federal Government shall be required to surrender to the Federal Government, as a condition precedent to participating in such program, the right to determine ultimately to whom they can sell or rent their property. Those rights are to be taken away from Americans throughout the Nation, and they are to be subject to the determination of bureaucrats on the banks of the Potomac River.

Recently N. S. Meese made some comments upon the Property Owner's Bill of Rights, recently adopted by the directors of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. His comments are so wise, I believe they should be made available to all Members of Congress as well as the public. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

COMMENTS OF N. S. MEESE UPON THE PROPERTY OWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

For the past decade or two a considerable number of well meaning but confused social reformers have been trying desperately to demonstrate that there is such a concept as "property rights" distinct from what they are pleased to call "human rights," and that the former are being given high priority in all capitalistic societies in which a free economy prevails. Obviously, however, property as such has no rights. In their lip service to the concept of freedom they have failed to understand that the right to possess, use, and dispose of property is freedom's quintessence. This is implicit in the Constitution of the United States. Ownership encompasses the ability to hold exclusively, to use, and to dispose of what one owns uncoerced in any way, so long as the rights of others are not adversely affected.

The concept of private property is anathema to Communists and other collectivists generally. As an institution, it is, according to Karl Marx, "the economic tool for the enslavement of the masses." Commonsense tells us, however, that the person who is prevented from possessing, using, or disposing of the fruits of his own labor, or of their enjoyment, is not free.

The directors of the National Association of Real Estate Boards pointed this out at their Chicago meeting on June 6 last, and in so doing made clear the dangers inherent in some of the legislation, both national and local, under consideration or already enacted by our various lawmaking bodies. They adopted what they have named a "Property Owners' Bill of Rights," and said in part:

"Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. This endangers the rights and freedoms of all Americans. Therefore, a bill of rights to protect the American property owner is needed.

"It is self-evident that the erosion of these freedoms will destroy the free enterprising individual American.

"It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be allowed, under law, to retain:

"1. The right of privacy.

"2. The right to choose his own friends.

"3. The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates.

"4. The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.

"5. The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference by laws giving special privilege to any group or groups.

"6. The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants.

"7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions.

"8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property.

"9. The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns—to maintain the stability and security of his income.

"10. The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others."

The directors and the national association itself are to be highly commended for the forthright statement made. If the United

States is to survive as a sovereign constitutional republic, further erosion of long-recognized human rights implicit in property ownership should be prevented rather then encouraged. The loss of any part of the right to possess, use, transfer, or otherwise dispose of what is one's own can do no less than stimulate further encroachments on liberty.

N. S. MEESE.

Mr. ERVIN. One of the declarations of the bill of rights of property owners is as follows:

4. The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental inteference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.

Americans participating in Federal housing programs or residing in the District of Columbia will not enjoy that right any longer if the Commission on Civil Rights has its way. It would take from them the right to determine how they shall use their property, how they shall sell their property, how they shall rent their property.

The Commission would take from a veteran the right to receive a loan from the Veterans' Administration unless he surrendered to the Federal Government the right to determine to whom he shall sell or rent his house.

Not only that, but the Commission recommends that lending institutions—banks and savings and loan institutions—which participate in any way in any Federal program, or which have their deposits insured by Federal agencies, shall be required, as a condition of participating in such program or of having such insurance, to have their loans supervised and controlled by agents of the Federal Government supervising such lending institutions.

The Commission recommends that the Federal Government deprive bank depositors of the protection of deposit insurance unless banks accept its dictation in respect to loaning their deposits.

There are some other recommendations relating to what the Commission calls justice. One of them was made today in its report for 1963. If Congress should be so foolish as to adopt this recommendation, the Attorney General of the United States, whoever he might be, would be in charge of the legal affairs of every American citizen insofar as those affairs may involve a right under a Federal statute or the Federal Constitution. It is printed at page 124 of the report of the Civil Rights Commission for 1963. It reads:

That Congress empower the Attorney General to intervene in or to initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured to them by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

It would take thousands and thousands of lawyers to carry out such a provision as that. If that provision were enacted into law, an American citizen could not even have the privilege of conducting his own lawsuit based on a Federal statutory or constitutional ground if the Attorney General wished to intervene and take charge of it.

Another recommendation made by the Commission is that Congress should pass a law making it a crime for any State or local law enforcement official to use more force than is necessary in arresting or detaining a person charged with crime. I assert that that recommendation is absolutely inconsistent with any sound conception of good Federal-State practice. If that recommendation were enacted into law, it would do more to prevent law enforcement at the local level than any course of action imaginable.

If this recommendation were enacted into law, it would confront every State and local law enforcement officer with a dilemma. If he failed to use the force necessary to effect the arrest of the person charged with crime, the accused might escape; or the officer might possibly be beaten or murdered. If he miscalculated and used more force than that necessary to effect the arrest he could be hailed into Federal court and prosecuted as a criminal merely for trying to do his duty, with the United States of America, acting through the Attorney General, on the side of the criminal, instead of on the side of law enforcement.

To summarize, I am opposed to an extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission because virtually every recommendation it has made throughout the course of its existence has been a recommendation inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States or a recommendation that all American citizens be robbed, either by act of Congress or by Executive order, of basic economic, legal, personal, or property rights, or a recommendation that vast discretionary power, uncontrolled by any proper legal guidelines, be vested in the President or the Attorney General, or some other official of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Aesop wrote a fable about a lion which invited another animal to come into his cave and pay him a visit. The other animal refused the invitation, saying, "I notice that all tracks lead into your cave, but none come out." That fable is a good description of the Federal Government. Under the recommendations of the Commission, the power to determine what rights the States shall have, and the power to determine what rights the individual shall enjoy, would be transferred to the Federal Government, to be exercised by executive officers whose very identity, in many cases, would be concealed from the States and the persons upon whose rights they were passing.

We have this warning from Aesop's fable. We have this warning from our own experience. Rights once surrendered to the Federal Government are never returned to the States or the people.

We also have this warning from the poet Thomas Moore:

O Freedom! Once thy flame hath fled,
It never lights again.

The Senate would do well to heed those warnings when it votes on the question of extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This Commission has steadfastly recommended that the powers committed to the States by the Constitution be transferred to bureaucrats on the banks of the Potomac River, and that American citizens throughout the length and breadth of the land be robbed of their basic economic, legal, personal, and property rights. I close with this statement from Regulus:

The greatest glory of a freeborn people is to transmit that freedom to their children.

I shall vote against the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I shall vote against the recommendations it makes. Americans of our generation have received as a heritage the greatest country on earth with the greatest system of government on earth. I will not vote to deny our children the glory of living in that kind of a country under that kind of government.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to express my compliments and commendation upon the outstanding, eloquent, able, and extremely convincing speech delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate with the Senator from North Carolina for almost 7 years. I have never known a lawyer whom I have found to be more eloquent, more able, more effective, and more profound. I compliment him upon his remarks and associate myself with them.

I, too, shall vote against the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission. It was created in 1957 as a temporary agency; and, as most Federal temporary agencies go, it has continued on and on. It was extended in 1959 for 2 more years and was extended again in 1961 for 2 more years. We are now asked to extend it for another year. I predict that 1 year hence, Congress will be asked again either to extend it or probably to make it a permanent Commission, as an attempt has already been made to do.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to convey a piece of information to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Bills are pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission until the last lingering echo of Gabriel's horn trembles into ultimate silence.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct. Will he yield further, to permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have just had occasion to scan hurriedly the report of the Civil Rights Commission, which was issued today. It demonstrates again, more conclusively than it has in the past, its extreme partisan bias. It demonstrates its desire not to solve any problems in the area of human relations but, rather, its desire to fan flames and exploit issues. For instance, in this particular report, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, it has made recommendations, in all these areas, that contravene the Constitution of the United States. It recommends that the Attorney General be allowed to intervene in any and all cases and to initiate civil proceedings for the protection of all persons' civil rights, In other words, that particular recommendation would

make the Attorney General the guardian over all American citizens.

The Commission has also recommended that local government officials—mayors, councilmen, and so forth—be made liable for the alleged misconduct of police officers in the performance of their duties for the local government. Nothing whatever could be more extreme than to attempt to make whole municipalities and their public servants responsible for the nonrelated acts of employees at that particular agency of Government.

To follow this line of extreme reasoning, if an American citizen committed a misdeed, it would make the President of the United States responsible for that person's alleged misconduct.

I call the attention of the Senate to another extreme recommendation on page 125:

That Congress amend section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Georgia: If that recommendation were enacted, could not the Federal courts absolutely take away from the courts of the States the power to protect themselves and their citizens?

Mr. TALMADGE. They certainly could. If this recommendation were implemented by appropriate law, it would have the effect of abolishing all State courts, and all matters could then be transferred to Federal courts for their jurisdiction. It would have the sum total effect of abolishing State jurisdictions in the 50 States of the Union at the whim or caprice of the Federal Government, any time, at its discretion. It seems to me that this is the most far-fetched of all the far-fetched recommendations I have ever seen come from the Civil Rights Commission.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the American system of government or the American system of jurisprudence could recommend at one fell swoop that the State courts be subordinated, if you please, denied, if you please, the right to pursue their respective jurisdictions, and be made amenable to Federal procedure.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator agree with me that the recommendation reflects a conviction on the part of the Civil Rights Commission that the Federal Government should be concerned with the protection of those who murder, rape, and rob, rather than with the protection of those who do not wish to be murdered, raped, and robbed?

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree with the able Senator. The recommendation brings to mind the fact that Congress should not be so much concerned with a recommendation to extend this Commission as it should be concerned with preserving our constitutional system, and probably bringing impeachment proceedings against those members of the Commission who made these unconstitutional recommendations.

I thank the able Senator for yielding to me, and again compliment him on his very able, eloquent, and effective speech.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair.) The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in 1957, when the proposal was before the Senate for the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights, I stated in rather lengthy detail my objections to the creation of such a commission. At that time, the proponents of the measure strongly contended that the Commission's activities would be related solely to the question of voting rights. However, the language of the bill was, in my opinion, much broader, and would allow the Commission to interfere in areas far afield from voting. The subsequent activities, investigations, and recriminations of the Civil Rights Commission have borne out my fears, much to my regret.

In addition, the original proposal was for a temporary Commission to be limited to 2 years duration. Much was said to the effect that there was no harm in creating a temporary commission of limited jurisdiction. The Senate was repeatedly warned that there is nothing as permanent as a temporary Federal commission, but the warnings fell on deaf ears. Now we are faced with a request for the third successive extension of the life of this "temporary" commission. Everyone's worst fears and doubts have been realized.

It occurs to me that the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission has become more symbol than substance. The reports of the Commission, which have been numerous, contain little of the quality or objectivity which would be necessary to make them persuasive. This is true regardless of the reader's persuasion or position in the field of so-called civil rights or race relations. The vast majority of the recommendations of the Commission have been so absurd that such notable prointegration journals as the New York Times have been forced to disassociate themselves from the recommendations. I have particular reference to the proposal contained in the interim report of the Commission, issued in April of this year, which contained the recommendation that the President of the United States, by Executive order, withhold Federal funds from the State of Mississippi. This proposal is so patently ridiculous and unconstitutional that it was roundly denounced on every leading editorial page in the country. Even the New York Times had this to say concerning the Commission's high-handed attitude and recommendation:

The Civil Rights Commission's recommendation that President Kennedy consider withholding Federal funds from Mississippi in punishment for its mistreatment of Negroes amounts to a proposal to read that State out of the Union. We can think of no suggestion less calculated to promote civilized race relations or to cool the inflamed passions that erupted in the Civil War.

Even though the New York Times did denounce this recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission, it did not do so with the fervor and energy which this recommendation deserves. More to the point is the editorial entitled "The Extortioners," which appeared in the April 19, 1963, edition of the Richmond News Leader. This editorial reads as follows:

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission finally performed a genuinely useful service on Wednesday: It provided the most brilliantly revealing insight we yet have seen into the murky depths of the ultraliberal mind at work.

The Commission recommended, in effect, that the President of the United States, by his own decree, withhold Federal contracts and grants-in-aid from the State of Mississippi until the State ends what the Commission regards as "subversion of the Constitution." We say the Commission "in effect" made this arrogant recommendation, because the Commission lacked even the courage of its contemptible convictions. In mealy-mouthed sentences, the Commission urged Mr. Kennedy to "explore his legal authority" for such decrees, and asked Congress to "consider seriously" the idea of appropriate legislation.

In the eyes of the Civil Rights Commission, the question is whether "Federal funds contributed by citizens of all States" should be made available "to any State which continues to refuse to abide by the Constitution and laws of the United States." That two such respected law deans as Robert G. Storey, of Southern Methodist, and Spottswood W. Robinson 3d, of Howard, could have signed such a recommendation only makes the proposal all the more incredible.

Who is to judge, pray, when an entire State is subverting the Constitution or refusing to abide by the laws of the United States? Does the Commission on Civil Rights propose to serve as prosecutor, judge, and jury, and convict an entire State on its own naked say-so? The proposal draws applause from those liberals, mind you, who profess to support due process of law. What due process of law would they accord Mississippi?

Talk of subverting the Constitution. The Commission's proposal would not merely subvert the Constitution, but obliterate it altogether. The Commission is inviting the President to usurp powers nowhere granted him by law; the Commission would simply repeal the section of the Constitution which says that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States. Does the Constitution say that no bill of attainder shall be passed? The Commission would have Mr. Kennedy simply proclaim a bill of attainder against the whole State of Mississippi.

Our dictionary defines "extortion" as the act of obtaining a desired end "by force or undue or illegal power or ingenuity." That is precisely what the Civil Rights Commission has in mind here. It would obtain voting rights for certain Negroes in certain counties by force, undue or illegal power, and ingenuity. Especially ingenuity. The Commission points out in its report to the President that $650 million in grants-in-aid and prime contracts are marked for Mississippi next year. The sum includes Federal grants for aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, aid to veterans, highway construction, vocational education, small business loans, river and harbor improvement, and the like. "The Commission does not want the people of Mississippi, either Negro or white, to lose benefits available to citizens of other States," says the Commission, and it rolls its eyes to heaven; the sanctimonious statement follows that the Commission has concluded that only by threatening such a withholding can Mississippi be persuaded to mend her ways.

Now, this newspaper repeatedly has condemned the indefensible shenanigans by which officials of a few Deep South counties have denied voting rights to qualified Negroes. We have said, time after time, that if the South is to stand on the Constitution, it must stand on the whole of the Constitution. If we expect others to respect the 10th amendment, we of the South cannot trifle with the 15th amendment. This defines the "right to vote" as just that: a matter of right. The right must be upheld.

But this is a far cry from saying that every Negro who presents himself at a registrar's office is, by reason of his race, specially qualified to register and vote. In one great test case of this alleged "subversion," the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals summarily threw out of court a case in which a Negro contended his right to vote had been arbitrarily denied him. The Negro was wholly illiterate, as the evidence plainly proved.

Plenty of law is on the books now, by which these intransigent local officials may be punished for their chicanery. The idea of denying all the people of Mississippi, white and Negro alike, their fair and rightful share of Federal appropriations for which they have been equally taxed is a monstrous perversion of both law and equity.

The Civil Rights Commission has had little enough reason for existence. This outrageous recommendation provides abundant reason for wiping it out completely.

Mr. President, bad as is this recommendation, it is only characteristic of the Commission's biased and perverted attitude which has prevailed since its formation in 1957. The President of the United States promptly and emphatically repudiated this Interim Report, stating that he neither had, nor wanted such power as the Commission recommended he invoke. The fact that all individuals in responsible positions quickly denounced this recommendation is heartening, but the punitive nature of the proposal clearly reflects the attitude of the Commission.

The Civil Rights Commission has contributed nothing to improved race relations, but has done much to deteriorate them. The Commission is an ill-conceived, sloppily constituted, and arbitrarily administered disgrace to our governmental structure. It would be an act of wisdom for the Congress to permit to die that which should never have been spawned, and which grows more hideous with each day's passing.

Mr. President, there is no place in our society for an organization such as the Civil Rights Commission. In the first place, it is a symbol of a basic controversy, and as such, is not judged on its merits when its revival is under consideration. Were a commission—in any other area of activity except that of race relations—to come before Congress with a record of activity such as has the Civil Rights Commission, it would stand no chance of continued life or of continued Federal appropriations.

In no other area of activity would an instrument of the National Government be permitted to flaunt the basic and fundamental rights of citizens by outrageous denials of due process of law. Not even committees of Congress could deny due process of law and go unscathed as has the Civil Rights Commission.

On October 7, 1959, a Federal court composed of three Federal district judges, in Shreveport, La., ruled by a 2-to-1 decision that the Commission, acting according to its rules, had attempted to conduct its investigations in a way which violated two sections—4 and 6—of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Commission had undertaken to investigate the sworn affidavits of 67 Negroes in Louisiana that they had been denied the right to vote. In pursuance of its investigation, the Commission had subpenaed 17 voting registrars. The attorney general of Louisiana asked that the Federal Court prohibit the investigation because it would violate the statutory rights of the registrars. The court upheld the contention of the State attorney general, and ruled that the method of investigation was illegal because the Commission failed to inform the registrars of what they were accused, and refused to permit them to be confronted by, and to cross-examine, those who had complained to the Commission. Federal District Judge Dawkins, giving the deciding opinion, made the following statement:

Third, entirely aside from the statutory questions just discussed, the courts of the United States, and their Anglo-Saxon predecessors, always have seen to it that, in hearings or trials of all kinds, persons accused of violating laws must be adequately advised of the charges against them, confronted by their accusers, and permitted to search for the truth through thorough cross-examination.

Following the decision of the Federal district court, the Civil Rights Commission appealed directly to the U.S. Supreme Court. The latter Court heard the case (*Hannah* v. *Larche*, 363 U.S. 420) on January 18–19, 1960; on June 20, 1960, the Court reversed the ruling of the lower court.

Justice Douglas rendered a dissenting opinion, with which Justice Black concurred. Justice Douglas pointed out that, although the Civil Rights Commission is primarily a factfinding agency only, and although it does not indict, it does seek to disclose activities which are criminal. He concluded, therefore, that voting registrars called before the Commission should be granted the rights of those who are accused of crimes. Justice Douglas noted that:

Under the Commission's rules the accused is deprived of the right to notice of the charges against him and the opportunity of cross-examination.

The Commission may, he said, "deny him—the accused—the opportunity even to observe the testimony of his accusers."

Justice Douglas stated that only the grand jury, under the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution, has the authority to make accusations without granting the ordinary rights to the accused. But he pointed out that the grand jury is not a continuing agency of government, and that it is composed of neighbors of the accused, and that it is intended to safeguard the accused against arbitrary action by a public prosecutor—

They are the only accusatory body in the Federal Government that is recognized by the Constitution. I would allow no other engine of government, either executive or legislative, to take their place—at least when the right of confrontation and cross-examination are denied the accused as is done in these cases.

Justice Douglas supported the complaint of the registrars as follows:

Respondents ask no more than the right to know the charges, to be confronted with the accuser, and to cross-examine him. Absent these rights * * * injury too plain and obvious here.

As I stated, Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission, because it deals in the field of race relations, which unfortunately has degenerated into a cloud of pressure politics, is removed from the realm of objective evaluation, either by the Congress, the Court, or the Executive.

Indeed, the Department of Defense, even when acting on a question involving the security of the United States, was restrained by the Court from utilizing procedures in its industrial security program which by comparison to the procedures of the Civil Rights Commission were the very essence of due process. For an illustration of the immune status of the Civil Rights Commission, one has but to compare the judicial discussion of the Commission's procedures in *Hannah* v. *Larche*, 363 U.S. 420 (1960), with the judicial discussion of the procedures set up for the Department of Defense industrial security program in the case of *Green* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1958).

Mr. President, from its inauguration, the Civil Rights Commission has been completely lacking in objectivity. The reports of the Civil Rights Commission are defective, first, because they depend too much on facts which were not obtained by firsthand observation, but which were selected from secondary sources; and, second, because the facts which they cited were used in an attempt to vertify prior conceptions of the situation in Southern States. Thus, Mr. John S. Battle said of the first report—1959—of the Commission, at the time of his resignation from the Commission, that it was "not an impartial factual statement, such as I believe to have been the intent of the Congress, but rather, in large part, an argument in advocacy of preconceived ideas in the field of race relations"—quoted by the New York Times, October 13, 1959, page 1.

Mr. President, nothing good can come of a Commission which exhibits a complete disinterest in the truth, and which operates to the sole end of fabricating support for preconceived prejudices. The exclusive immunity which this Commission has enjoyed not only allows it to deprive citizens of due process of law and to operate in utter disdain of any pretense at objectivity, but this immunity also shields gross impropriety and inefficiency in its internal administration and lack of cooperation with the Congress and its committees that would not be permitted by any other agency of Government.

The reports which have been issued by the Commission since the initial one in

1959 have improved neither in quality nor in objectivity. For instance, in its 1961 report on education, the Commission stated that private school tuition grants, which are offered in some States, threaten the quality of public school education. They even went so far as to say that it threatens the very existence of the public school system. Yet, in the same report, the Commission recommended that all Federal funds provided under the impacted areas legislation and destined for school districts which are not completely integrated be withheld. While criticizing, a State program as destructive of the public school system, the Commission in the same breath offers a recommendation which is certainly more likely to affect the quality and even existence of the public school systems.

In the Commission's 1961 report on voting, the recommendation is made that a sixth-grade education be conclusively presumed as evidence of literacy for the purpose of voter registration. Many eminent law professors and constitutional authorities have pointed out the patent unconstitutionality of such a proposal, and Congress has completely rejected this recommendation.

Generally an agency of the Federal Government is called upon to justify its expenditures and continued existence by the showing of some contribution to the public good. This has not been the case, however, with the Civil Rights Commission. The Commission has enjoyed a position apart from the normal governmental agency, a position unparalleled in the history of this country. Any other commission or Federal agency which merely duplicated the work of another branch of the Government would be quickly and unhesitatingly abolished. Yet, Mr. President, even though the Civil Rights Commission merely duplicates the work of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, there is very little chance of its being deactivated.

Mr. President, we must remember that the area to which the Civil Rights Commission was originally intended to be limited, according to the proponents of the bill which created the Commission, was voting rights. In this area, the Commission has had little to do. Perhaps this is why it has extended its tentacles into other areas of activity. The number of voting rights complaints received by the Civil Rights Commission during the period from July 1, 1962, through May 17, 1963, numbered 101. Ironically, the total number of voting complaints received by the Civil Rights Commission since its inception 6 years ago is a mere 740 of which only 424 have been sworn complaints. It should be noted that this small number of complaints, as compared with the number received in 1 year by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, is in spite of the fact that the Civil Rights Commission, for all intents and purposes, actively solicits the complaints.

Mr. President, I believe that it is time that the Congress took recognition of the complete futility of the Civil Rights Commission and did the Commission, the Congress and the country a great favor by allowing the Commission to die the peaceful death that it so richly deserves. Now is the time for the Congress to create the exception to the rule that there is nothing so permanent as a temporary agency of the National Government. No good has ever come from the Civil Rights Commission in the past and there is no basis for the belief that the future will be any different. The activities of the Commission have created much ill will and increased racial tensions, and its potential for disservice in the future, if its life is extended, is beyond estimate. Under no circumstances should Congress succumb to the entreaties to extend its life.

Mr. President, the last report of the Civil Rights Commission goes beyond the realm of reason. Anyone can read that report and see the lack of objectivity on the part of the members of the Commission. As I stated, it would be a great service to the people of our country, to the Congress, and even the Commission itself, if the Commission were not continued. I hope that the Congress will see fit not to continue the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I support the proposal before the Senate for an emergency extension of the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for a 1-year period. I do this with considerable regret. I regret that the machinery of the Senate and the Congress has not permitted us thus far in this session of Congress to act on S. 1117, which I, with a number of my colleagues, introduced to expand the authority and give a greater degree of permanancy to this increasingly important commission.

Hearings were completed on this and other bills by mid-June. Testimony from witnesses from throughout the Nation underscored the value of the Commission's hearings and reports in defining for the American people the important work which must be accomplished if we are to insure full enjoyment of basic rights by all Americans.

My concern today is that in acting on the proposed temporary extension the Senate does not set aside the very real work yet to be done this year. Part of this legislative work involves proposals for an expanded responsibility for the Commission and extension of its life for a sufficient period of time to avoid the demoralizing start-and-stop activities it faces when extensions of only 1 or 2 years are granted.

More important still is the work to be done on the omnibus civil rights proposal submitted to the Congress by the President. It is now October. Some small progress is evident. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee reported last week a strengthened omnibus bill. The Senate Commerce Committee is nearing completion of its work on the public accommodations section of the civil rights proposal.

This progress is good. All who support the broad civil rights program of the President—and I am confident they are more than a majority of the Senate—must make firm resolve to complete legislative action on this program this year.

I for one announce my desire to remain here through Christmas if that is necessary.

If there is a firm resolve, as I believe there is, among the majority of the Members of the Senate to write a broad and comprehensive civil rights package this year, I believe it will be accomplished before Christmas Eve. Where there is a strong will in the majority to take action, a way can be found.

Turning to the proposal at hand, the Senate should take temporary action today on the life of the Civil Rights Commission as a harsh reminder of the work yet to be done this year.

In passing this 1-year extension, let us thank the distinguished members of the Commission who have touched the conscience of America through their incisive and searching and courageous reports on areas of American life where we have done less than our best as a nation.

Michigan is proud of the distinguished Chairman of the Commission, Dr. John Hannah, who is serving in this at times arduous role, and the Nation is proud of all the members of the Commission who have given so fully of their time and energy.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] gave a notable speech on the floor of the Senate entitled, "Must the Alliance for Progress Be Lost?" He directed his remarks to the tragic situation which exists in the Dominican Republic today.

Before I comment on the speech by the Senator from Alaska, and make a few comments separate from that speech, I should like to qualify the Senator [Mr. GRUENING] as a witness and an expert who is entitled to speak on Latin America, for I know of no other Senator better qualified to discuss Latin America and I know of no one in the State Department who is his equal in knowledge of Latin America.

I make these comments this afternoon in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate which deals with Latin America.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has been a keen student of Latin America for many years, and his book on Mexico is still a general reference work on Mexico and related problems in Latin America in many colleges in this country. I have no fear of successful contradiction when I say to Senators if you entered any college course dealing with Latin America, and particularly with Mexico, you would undoubtedly find Senator GRUENING's book on Mexico one of the reference works used in the reading list of that course.

With this expert background, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] addressed himself this afternoon to the situation which has developed in the Dominican Republic, and expressed his views as to what U.S. foreign policy should be in relationship to the Dominican Republic.

I respectfully disagree with one of the major conclusions and recommendations of the Senator from Alaska, but I shall speak more of that in a moment. First I wish to emphasize certain premises laid down in his speech. I quote the following from his speech:

The fact remains, Mr. President, that Dr. Bosch was the constitutionally elected President of the Dominican Republic. The military opportunists who ousted him acted entirely outside the Constitution of the Dominican Republic. They acted to further their own political ambitions.

They must not be permitted to reap the advantages of their ill-considered actions.

This is the point at which the United States must draw the line.

Here we must stand firm if there is to be any hope at all for the future of the Alliance for Progress. The U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Theodore Moscoso, has called the overthrow of Dr. Bosch a setback for democracy. It is that, and more.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, it is a direct result of the past policies of the Government of the United States.

We have talked strongly, but carried a little stick.

We have not matched our deeds to our words.

Need I remind you of our vacillations in Peru, in Ecuador, in Argentina, in Brazil?

Later in his speech the Senator from Alaska said:

I commend the President of the United States for the forthright stand he has taken with respect to the usurpers of power in the Dominican Republic. The pseudo-military junta in the Dominican Republic which has ruthlessly sought to deal a body blow to democratic principles should not be permitted to reap the slightest advantage from its perfidious conduct. It has acted against the best interests of the Dominican Republic and its peoples.

By withdrawing diplomatic recognition and halting foreign economic assistance this administration has acted fairly, intelligently and justly. What it has done is for the best interests of all the Dominican people.

I urge my administration to hold firm.

I urge my administration to withhold diplomatic recognition of the new illegitimate regime in the Dominican Republic and to withhold all further foreign economic aid until Dr. Bosch has been brought back and duly installed as the legitimate head of state.

We can insist upon nothing less.

Because if we do not insist upon the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, then we will be endangering other civilian governments not only in Latin America but in the rest of the world as well. We will be in effect inciting similar military revolts in Venezuela, Colombia, and in other Latin American nations which are trying to establish democratic regimes. We will be playing into the hands of the Communists who will rejoice at the installation of totalitarianism.

I heartily endorse all the comments I have quoted from the speech by the Senator from Alaska. I completely agree with him. I shall enlarge my own views upon them momentarily.

In the conclusion of his speech the Senator from Alaska made a recommendation which I do not endorse and do not share, when he said:

In effect, Mr. President, I urged that the United States send a destroyer to intercept the vessel carrying President Bosch into exile and order it to return him to the Dominican Republic. I would advise, also, Mr. President, that if the vessel does not heed such an order that it be boarded, that President Bosch be taken from it and returned under U.S. protection to the Dominican Republic.

This is not, I must point out, a return to the days of gunboat diplomacy. That at the time I deplored and spoke and wrote against. In those cases, when we intervened in the early days of the century in Haiti the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Mexico we intervened without any request from and against the wishes of their duly constituted governments and their peoples. This is not the case in this instance. Moreover, this is no violation of any treaty commitment against intervention. We are not intervening. We are fulfilling a request from the authorized representative of a duly constituted government for help. We are doing no more than we did when we sent troops to Lebanon.

Although I recognize the Senator from Alaska as a great expert on Latin America, I would dissent from this recommendation because, when all is said and done, it is a proposal for military action against the Dominican Republic. That country is in the throes of a revolution—not a revolution we like, but nevertheless a revolution. In my opinion, that would be U.S. armed intervention in the revolution, and we would be condemned by the other countries of the world as in fact committing an act of war. Therefore, I do not share this particular recommendation of the Senator from Alaska. I heartily endorse his earlier recommendation against recognition of the revolutionary government, and I shall continue to take that position.

LIKELY POLICY TOWARD DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

I wish to speak now for a moment as to what the probabilities are, knowing the State Department as I know it, knowing the past actions we have taken in somewhat similar situations, and based upon a briefing the Foreign Relations Committee has had in consultation with the State Department.

The Dominican Republic has an importance for the Alliance for Progress out of all proportion to its size. When the Trujillo regime was overthrown, we indicated our intention to help the Dominican Republic become a model of democracy and economic progress for all of Latin America. The military coup is a direct and major challenge to the Charter of Punta del Este. Our reaction to the coup, and that of all of the American republics, is accordingly a test of whether the Charter of Punta del Este is a positive hemispheric commitment or merely one more in a long line of pious declarations that have characterized the inter-American system.

The seriousness of a successful and unchallenged military coup goes far beyond the Dominican Republic. It encourages similar occurrences in other Latin American countries, some much larger than the Dominican Republic.

As the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] so clearly pointed out, it poses a particularly great threat in Venezuela, where President Betancourt's democratic regime is already beleaguered by both left and right.

If the Dominican coup should go unchallenged, it could encourage or precipitate a coup in Venezuela, with infinitely worse consequences. A Venezuelan coup could presage the collapse of the Alliance for Progress and the disintegration of the Latin American policy of the United States, as the Senator from Alaska forewarned earlier this afternoon.

The proposal of the Senator from Alaska that we use armed force to restore President Bosch goes too far. It would constitute intervention in clear violation of the Rio Treaty; would greatly frighten and alienate the other Latin American states; and, in my judgment, would make us an aggressor nation.

Our policy should be one of applying the strongest possible sanctions against the ruling junta short of military intervention and within the legal proscriptions of the Rio Treaty and the Organization of American States charter.

Our immediate reaction should be:

First. The immediate suspension of all economic assistance to the Dominican Republic.

The great President of the United States made it very clear, upon receiving the shocking news of this coup, that aid had been cut off. It should not be resumed until constitutional government is restored.

Second. The imposition of a trade embargo except for essential food and medical supplies.

Third. A public statement that the United States is withholding diplomatic recognition from the military regime. It would be unwise to say that we will never recognize the regime or that diplomatic relations will be resumed only if Bosch is restored. This kind of ultimatum might require force to implement, and it would be embarrassing to have to back down.

In my opinion, we would not be justified in using force in order to impose our will upon a people who are in the midst of a revolution.

Fourth. A public statement by the President or the Secretary of State demanding that the junta turn power back to the legitimate government of President Bosch.

Fifth. An appeal to the Latin American republics to take identical measures.

It is extremely important that we recommend immediately to the Organization of American States an extraordinary meeting of the organization and an extraordinary meeting of the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States to consider all the implications of the military coup in the Dominican Republic.

Sixth. The convening of the Organization of American States Council to condemn the coup formally and to consider collective measures—economic, political, and perhaps military—to bring about the restoration of the legitimate government of President Bosch.

U.S. MILITARY AID HELPS MAKE COUP POSSIBLE

I wish to say a few words about the military implications of the coup. The

Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is correct. The United States cannot wash its hands of this coup, for the hands of the United States are not lily white. We built up this military junta. The United States supplied the Dominican Republic during fiscal 1963 far more military aid for its size than we supplied any other country in all of Latin America. We have supplied the Dominican Republic military aid to the tune of $1.26 a person, or a total amount of $3,981,000. We have built up the power of the military junta.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, for years I have been pleading that our military aid must be granted under restrictions and controls, because we cannot justify granting this military aid and having the military aid used time and time again to overthrow civilian governments—playing right into the hands of the Communists.

Several weeks ago I was the head of the American delegation to the inauguration of the new President of Peru. I consider him to be one of the great men of Latin America, and I am very hopeful. But there are some who think that because a man of great ability was elected in a free election a considerable time after a coup had occurred in Peru, it justifies a military coup. It does not.

During the course of that inauguration I sat for some 3 hours and 15 minutes in the reviewing stand, watching a military parade. I saw rumbling down one of the main boulevards of Lima, Peru, a large number of American Sherman tanks. I said to myself, "For what purpose? Are these tanks necessary for internal security?" Nonsense.

I saw block after block and mile after mile of heavy American military equipment rumble down that boulevard. Again I asked myself the question, "For what purpose?"

The undeniable fact is that American military aid in Latin America has built up in country after country a powerful military caste, nondemocratic in its ideology, nondemocratic in its philosophy, and nondemocratic in its tactics, for military castes the world around are not noted for their belief in the institutions of democracy. Nor are they noted for their belief in the basic concept that the state must be the servant, and not the master, of its people.

In Latin America the notion of the state being the servant, rather than the master, of the people is a philosophy foreign to the thinking of the military castes that are dominant in too many Latin American countries.

The United States of America is supporting and building up that system . We cannot escape the charge of support by saying we do not join in the philosophy of the militarists. Nor do we stay within the realm of fact when we say we must support the military caste system in order to protect the people from communism. To the contrary, it happens to be the view of the senior Senator from Oregon that huge military grants to Latin American countries are serving to drive people into the arms of communism.

After that military parade in Lima, Peru, it was interesting that members of delegation after delegation attending that inauguration, from many places in the world, came to me and said, "Senator, we just do not understand the military aid that you are carrying out in Latin America. We do not understand. What makes you think that this is the way to check communism in Latin America?"

This situation becomes a matter of balance. It becomes a problem, as I said recently in a statement I made to the people in my State, of trying to find the dividing line between the military aid that is necessary to enable a democratic government in Latin America to prevent a Communist coup and the military aid that encourages a militarist faction to seize power. I am for aid needed to prevent a Communist coup. But the equipment we would send for that purpose is quite different from Sherman tanks, quite different from heavy pieces of rolling artillery, quite different from the type of equipment that we have heretofore sent down there which is said by many to satisfy the desire of the military caste for prestige. That equipment would be useless in the case of a war with Russia, and useless even in respect to the defense of the hemisphere. Any talk to the effect that it is necessary to protect a country from any other country in Latin America is so much nonsense. They know and we know that no war between two Latin American countries will be countenanced. It could not be brought off, because we and the other members of the Organization of American States would not allow it. That happens to be one of the realities, too.

Let us assume the full hypothetical situation. Let us assume that it were a possibility. On what grounds could the United States justify supplying American military equipment to both sides to conduct such a war? If there were a danger—and I repeat that there is not—of a war between two Latin American states, our hands not only would not be clean, but they would be red with blood. On the basis of cause and effect, we would be the cause of producing the effect. We would have been the causal effect in supplying the weapons.

I know the argument is made that if they do not get it from us, they will get it from Russia, or perhaps from France, or from Great Britain. I have never followed the theory that we can justify committing a wrong because if we do not do it, someone else will do it. This is a moral wrong. What we need to do is to try to find that balance in supplying the necessary military assistance to help a government maintain internal security. I assure Senators that $3,981,000 to the Dominican Republic goes far beyond that balance. It is responsible for building up the power of the Fascist regime of the military which has taken over under Col. Elias Wessin y Wessin. Who is he? He is a man with a sordid record of Fascist police state leanings in the Dominican Republic.

The President of the Dominican Republic, under a constitution which in this respect is similar to the Constitution of the United States, providing that the President is the civilian commander in chief of the Dominican armed forces, sought to remove this Fascist-oriented, police-state colonel who headed the coup. When he sought to exercise his constitutional power, the military took over, with the support of the arms that we had furnished them.

We cannot hold support in Latin America that way. We cannot justify building up the military leaders, training them in American military training programs, and have them go back to their countries to drive with Sherman tanks through palace gates or use American military equipment to overthrow the constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

We have done more for the Dominican Republic in fiscal 1963 than what I have already pointed out. It is time for the American people to know these facts. Such facts will come out on the floor of the Senate in the historic debate in a few days on the foreign aid bill. I shall continue to give my colleagues in the Senate at least an opportunity to vote to cut military aid. I am perfectly willing to renew my offer of last year that every dollar of reduction in military aid be added to economic aid. We must establish economic freedom, not military suppression, in those countries. It is economic freedom and not military oppression that is needed in Latin America.

It is bread, not bullets, that we need to export to Latin America.

In fiscal 1963 we made available to the Dominican Republic $24 million of grant aid in addition to military grant aid. It is said by some of the alibiers for this revolutionary military junta that they purchased some military supplies in this country. That is a euphemism. We gave $24 million to the Dominican Republic to stabilize its economy and its Government, and to support its budget. One item in that budget was the purchase of arms. That means that we provided weapons. The word "purchase" should be kept in quotation marks in discussing this subject. It is only a matter of paperwork. We built the military power of the junta in the Dominican Republic. The sad thing is that from the very beginning the Moscow propaganda has been an attack on us. The interesting thing is to hear some say, "We must brush it off, because these are Communist charges that we built up the military power of the junta."

The ugly fact is that it is the truth. It always pains me when the Communists have anything on us; and they have this on us. In this connection they are right, and we are wrong. The military record of the United States in the Dominican Republic will be used to our disadvantage around the world. The senior Senator from Oregon believes that the way to meet them is to clean house; the way to meet them is to cleanse our record; the way to meet them is to make it clear now to Latin American countries that wherever military forces may be lying in wait to repeat the coup of the Dominican Republic against constitutional governments, we are through building up militarists to overthrow democratic governments. We can cite incident after incident of mistakes that the Bosch administration has undoubtedly made. We

could spend a great deal of time doing the same thing in the case of our own Government, could we not? I hold no brief for such mistakes.

But I do hold a brief for standing four-square in support of the constitutional, democratic form of government that was established in the Dominican Republic by the processes of a constitution. Until that government is changed by the constitutional processes, I am opposed to any recognition of a military, Fascist, police state in the Dominican Republic.

I am opposed to any further aid to this dictatorship. I am opposed to standing by, just waiting for develop-state in the Dominican Republic.

I favor the U.S. Government taking the initiative now. We should have done it already. The Organization of American States, in extraordinary meeting of the foreign ministers of Latin American countries, should decide what shall be the policy of the countries of the hemisphere in respect to such military coups. I was one of the delegates to the Punta del Este conference that brought forth the Act of Punta del Este. As I said previously in my remarks, and repeat now: We cannot square our commitments in the Act of Punta del Este with the taking of a sideline-standing position on what has happened in the Dominican Republic. We have an obligation to see to it that the commitments of the Act of Punta del Este are carried out, because we, too, have an obligation to take the initiative and should proceed to take it without further delay.

It is interesting to consider that we will stand by, or have done so up to the moment, at least, while a great democratically elected President of the Dominican Republic is bustled off into exile by a military, revolutionary group, using a few civilians as stooges of the military coup. I shall comment on that point for a minute.

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

Mr. MORSE. I have almost finished; then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

It is said that the military group has set up a council of civilians and has promised to hold elections probably in 2 years. That is the old pattern. It has been pulled off in revolution after revolution. The military junta gets some stooges who are not wearing uniforms to act for it; but those civilians can hardly draw a breath without first getting permission from the military, police-state group. Let no one be fooled into believing that a civilian council in the Dominican Republic is running the Dominican Republic at this hour. The Dominican Republic is being run by Col. Wessin y Wessin and his Fascist gang.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was quite correct when he referred to them as mobsters, for they meet all the qualifications of mobsters and gangsters.

I am also sorry that our own military groups in various parts of Latin America are apparently running up for themselves such a record of failure. They seem to be unable to lead and persuade their military associates, with whom they are supposed to be working, and trying to lead, in support of the military system we have in the United States which is based upon the constitutional principle that the military is subordinate to the civilian government; that the military takes its orders from the civilian government; that the head of the civilian government is the Commander in Chief; and that when military leaders seek to overthrow the constitutional, civilian head of the democratic government, they became traitors and should be dealt with in all international relations on the part of our country with such a country, as traitors. They should never be recognized to carry on diplomatic relations with the U.S. Government.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify my own views with those of the Senator from Oregon, insofar as they reflect the deep conviction that the United States should not recognize the military junta; to do so would be a profound error. There are other things our Government can do. I shall take my own opportunity to address myself to that subject later; at this time I shall stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the deep feeling that our Government should not do as it did in the case of Peru—turn tail and recognize a military junta. To do so would be disastrous.

I have been to the Dominican Republic. I was at the inauguration of President Bosch. I think I know something of the ambit of the problem.

That is question No. 1 that our Government must answer. I have no doubt in my own mind as to what is the national interest. The national interest is to say "No" to the military junta.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close my remarks by congratulating the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for his speech this afternoon. I am sorry that I find myself in disagreement with him with regard to one of the recommendations he has made; that is, the recommendation of military intervention. Nevertheless, he has made a worthwhile contribution to the discussion about what should be the posture of the United States vis-a-vis the United States and the Dominican Republic.

I hope the Department of State will take note that there is a growing opposition in Congress to the policy that the Department has been following concerning military assistance to Latin America and to some other places in the world, and also its policy to date, that, after all, if a military junta takes over, we should face reality and deal with it on the same basis as its predecessor. In my judgment, we should ostracize it.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is detained from the Senate today. He feels deeply about the proposed legislation pending before the Senate. He has requested me to read his remarks giving his views on the proposal to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I shall now read the remarks prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], which I read at his request, may be printed in large type in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS READ BY SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I strongly and vigorously oppose the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The history of this agency—and its onesided adherence to concepts which are fostered and dominated by political expediency—have only served to reinforce my conviction that the Commission is neither necessary nor desirable. In my judgment, a further extension of its life would be a grave disservice to the entire Nation.

The Commission's inflammatory statements, its findings based on biased and flimsy evidence, its apparent tendency to believe the worse, and its bizarre and absurd recommendations are hardly the type of oil which would be poured on troubled political waters by an agency truly and earnestly interested in peaceful solutions to racial problems. The aid and comfort rendered by it to civil rights extremists finds a logical outlet in the wave of disorders and disturbances which are now sweeping the Nation.

The Commission perhaps achieved the epitome of absurdity in its recommendation last April that Federal benefits be withheld from Mississippi because the Commission—acting as prosecutor, judge, and jury—came to the unilateral and unsubstantiated conclusion that there were open and flagrant violations of constitutional guarantees in that State.

This extreme and absurd recommendation was met—immediately and almost unanimously—by a literal torrent of repudiation, condemnation and careful disassociation. This came from every source and quarter—from the President, from the majority leader of the Senate, from Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, and from the editorial pages of our leading newspapers and other publications.

Some, including the President, have apparently changed their minds. In the Civil Rights Act of 1963 the President has asked for the very power which last April he thought was unwise.

The Commission proposed to crucify and work irreparable hardship on the innocent children, the aged, the blind, the needy and the infirm because of alleged wrongs by Mississippi officials administering Federal funds. They propose an unusual method to right the alleged wrongs. They propose to do it by withholding from the needy of the State of all races welfare funds such as old-age assistance, aid to the blind,

child welfare funds, Federal lunchroom funds, and the other funds which are so necessary to the continued welfare of the indigent.

The recommendation of the Commission would have been laughable, if it had not come from an agency of the Government which is charged with the duty of giving fair treatment to all of the citizens affected by its operations, not just to a special and privileged minority group. Even as the Commission charged that there were denials of constitutional rights in Mississippi it called for steps—the withholding of Federal funds from Mississippi—which would clearly, patently and manifestly violate the same Constitution.

I opposed the creation of the agency from the very start. It was represented to the Congress as a temporary information-gathering body which would go out of existence when its task was completed. However, true to the history of such "temporary" agencies, the Commission is still with us, and is now clamoring for further life so that it can continue to meddle in and interfere with matters which are of no legitimate concern to the Civil Rights Commission, or any agency of the Federal Government.

From any standpoint, the Commission has no real reason for continued existence. The real work in the field of so-called civil rights is being done by the Department of Justice, which has its own civil rights division financed at the expense of the taxpayers. It is the Justice Department's lawyers, headed by Mr. Bourke Marshall, who are dispatched to such places as Birmingham when disturbances and disorders occur. What, I ask, can the Commission do which is not already being done by the Attorney General and his agents?

I say again, Mr. President, that the Congress will be performing an act of both mercy and sound judgment if we now let this useless appendage to the body politic die the peaceful death which Congress originally ordained for it some 6 years ago.

Instead of extending the life of this Commission—and thereby licensing it to continue its agitational activities which succeed only in stirring up racial strife and discord—we would do a far greater service for the Nation if we devoted our energy to the restoration of peaceful and harmonious relations between the races. The Government should abandon its support of those who are so eager to sow racial bitterness and discontent for their own selfish ends. Let us return to the concept of rule by the established and orderly processes of law. Let us restore the problem of race relations to its proper place in the legal scheme of things, and let men of good will work together for a proper and peaceful solution, in accordance with established legal procedures and remedies, without being hampered by the extremist activities of a group of political busybodies. Federal intervention in local affairs must not continue to be an institutionalized special privilege for minority political pressure groups.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and in doing so I thank the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who had precedence on the list before the Chair, for permitting me to read this statement at this time.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is very kind. Of course, he knows better than anyone else in the Senate that the list at the desk is meaningless. However, under any such circumstances I would be very happy to yield to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New York that the list is not always meaningless, and it should not always be meaningless. I know there are occasions when the Presiding Officer does not see fit to follow the list; but certainly there are occasions when it is helpful to the Senate to have the Presiding Officer follow it.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. First, Mr. President, let me say that I would not wish anyone to draw from my willingness to allow the distinguished Senator from Georgia to speak before I did, the conclusion that I am in any way in agreement with any of the remarks he has just made on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I am happy to yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to speak now, unless it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate vote tonight on the pending question.

I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia, who is in charge of the opposition to this proposed legislation, can advise the Senate whether there is any probability that the vote will be taken tonight. If the Senate is not to vote tonight, I much prefer to postpone until tomorrow my brief remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot inform the Senator from Florida as to the plans the acting majority leader has about the vote. When I discussed the matter with him, we agreed that there would be no unanimous-consent agreement; that debate would run on until the normal hour this evening; and that if the vote was not taken this evening, it would be taken tomorrow; and we hoped that it would be taken on an early hour tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, I am not privy to the decisions of the leadership; but I express the hope that we shall finish our action on this proposed legislation tonight. After all, we must remember that the life of the Commission ends tonight. So it would seem rather ex post facto to act on this matter tomorrow or the next day, rather than tonight, after we have come this far. So I hope we act on it tonight—although I do not know whether that is the intention.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say that more often than not, the distinguished Senator from New York is correct in his legal conclusions. However, unfortunately he is not correct in the statement he has just made, for although the Commission was directed to file its formal report today, the law, I regret to say, specifically gives it 60 days in which to wind up its affairs. So there is no doubt in my mind that if, during that period, this bill, striking out the old termination date, and inserting a new termination date, were to be enacted, there would be no interference with the action of the officials and other employees of the Commission in drawing their compensation—particularly during this 60-day period, because that is provided by the law.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is technically correct. In my statement, I should have made reference to the fact that the final report was to have been made today. The Commission will, under the existing law, go out of existence 2 months from today; but the Commission's officials said that today they would give notices of termination to all but 19 of their employees. I do not know whether they have, in fact, been given that notice. Under the circumstances, I hope they have not been given it, but two-thirds of the staff was to receive such notice today.

So I am sure it would be pleasant for them and for their families to know before midnight tonight whether they would continue their work, or whether they would have to turn to something else.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Indeed, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no one could possibly question the loyalty of the distinguished junior Senator from New York to the Civil Rights Commission. During the past 2 or 3 months, there have been few days when the Senator from New York has not raised in this Chamber some question about extension of the Commission's life; and he has invoked the assistance of the majority leader, and the minority leader, and any other Senator who was in a position to help get this bill before the Senate and get it passed. But, as a practical matter, the Senator knows this bill cannot possibly be passed by the House within the period of time he has indicated. I understand that the Rules Committee will not meet until Wednesday; so it would be Thursday before the House could pass the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I was hoping that unanimous consent would be obtained there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, the Senator from New York is an eternal optimist; but I regard it as highly unlikely that the bill would be taken up by unanimous consent in the other body. I imagine that at least a few Members of the other body would avail themselves of their parliamentary privilege of objecting to its consideration by unanimous consent.

Mr. KEATING. I think that is quite possible.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do know that the leadership were basing their plans on the assumpiton that they would get a rule from the Rules Committee.

Mr. KEATING. But I thought that if the bill had passed today by the Senate, that would be sufficient assurance,

and then they would withhold the notices. However, I have not been in touch with them; and perhaps they have done so. But I agree with the Senator that, according to my understanding, the best we can hope for is action by the other body on Thursday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to state that three of the division heads of the Civil Rights Commission have already resigned, and they were going to send out the notices today. However, I now understand that they are to be sent out tomorrow.

I join the Senator in the feeling that the extension should be passed today. I have a suggestion to make to the Senator on that point. As the Senator who has the floor and desires to speak, I shall seek out the acting majority leader and the minority leader and let them announce the program to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that I have no purpose in delaying action on the measure. It is immaterial to me whether the vote is had tonight or tomorrow. I assume that by the time the two Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had concluded their discussion, it would be very difficult to obtain a quorum; and we intend to have a yea-and-nay vote on the passage of the measure.

Mr. KEATING. If a vote could be had now, I would not speak. I shall be very brief in my remarks.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After discussions with some of our colleagues today, it is the intention of the leadership to ask for a vote tomorrow after debate on both sides of the issue. I am sure that there will be a vote very promptly after the morning hour.

I have no intention of asking for a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe it best to proceed in the normal fashion as soon as the morning hour is completed and the unfinished business is laid before the Senate. There may be some further discussion. The Senate will then proceed to dispose of the amendment by a yea-and-nay vote. I hope the vote will be favorable.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address an inquiry to the acting majority leader. Do I correctly understand that a yea-and-nay vote has been ordered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that Senators who have other business to take care of today can now be assured that no yea-and-nay vote or any other vote will take place tonight, but that the vote will take place tomorrow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has been made absolutely clear—by the relatively short speeches that have been made by Senators, those who are opposing the bill—that there should be no unusual delay. Senators who have not spoken might have slightly different approaches if they had had an opportunity to state their positions. So far as my position is concerned, I should like specifically to call attention to two statements in the report which the Civil Rights Commission made today, both of which I think unfair and untrue, as they relate to my State. Other Senators may wish to bring into the RECORD similar specific points. Certainly I desire that privilege; and I am glad to rely on the assurance given me by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Of course, it comes as a relief to hear that the Senator from Georgia and others will not engage in extended debate on the subject of the amendment. But I think it is quite apparent from what has happened—which I shall enlarge upon briefly in my remarks—that the Senator from Georgia already has been most effective in having the original amendment watered down to a simple 1-year extension. So the Senator has accomplished a large proportion of his objective, I am sure, in his conferences prior to the meeting of the Senate, in which he is so very effective, as all of us know, whether we happen at the moment to be on the Senator's side or on the opposite side.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish that I might possess a small part of the power and influence which the Senator from New York attributes to me in his statement. If I did, the measure would not pass.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every Senator should have the right to express his point of view on the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission, or whatever view he may have about the continuation. There is no intention to cut off debate. There has been no intention to have otherwise than full and fair discussion of the issue, with no dilatory tactics. The vote will come tomorrow. That is the intention, unless Senators prevent us from doing so by their engagement in other business.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Senators who oppose the amendment have no purpose in delaying a vote. I would be less than frank if I did not say that if I thought we could defeat the measure, we probably would undertake to delay it. But the measure is a particular pet of Congress, and our ranks are so thin that we cannot offer much more than token resistance. We do not wish to see the Senate get into the habit of imposing cloture on proposed legislation that wears the euphemistic or misleading title of "Civil Rights." We have no purpose to delay unduly a vote on the measure. We feel that we should state our objections. We can only hope that they will be brought to the attention of the American people.

When the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] states the facts in his State, it will probably come to the attention of the thousands of people who visit that State that the Senator from Florida is correct and the Commission is wrong. We hope that this little germ will grow until truth will gradually unfold before the entire country. When that glad day happens, we shall then be able to do away with this so-called Commission.

If I had anything like the amount of influence the Senator has suggested, the proposed legislation would never be enacted. I consider the 1-year extension to be a great catastrophe. It is a waste of money. It is a waste of effort. It causes trouble. It brings forth bazarre recommendations for flank, rear, and frontal attacks, and attacks from above and below on the Constitution of the United States. If I possessed only a small proportion of the influence which the Senator attributes to me, I assure the Senator that, instead of extending the life of the Commission for 1 year, the measure would not be agreed to tomorrow or on any other day.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my point is that the distinguished Senator has already exerted great power by getting an amendment which called for a permanent agency and an increase in powers watered down to a 1-year extension without any of those increased powers. I can think of no one who is deserving of greater credit for that questionable result than the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish that I might claim full credit for that result; but, I may say, there had been a tacit understanding for some time that the Commission would be extended for 1 year without any prolonged discussion and without any effort on our part at this time to educate the country as to its vices.

Through some mishap a resolution was submitted which went far beyond that understanding. It would not only extend the Commission for more than 1 year, but it assaulted President Kennedy's program. He had recommended an extension for only 4 years. Through some inadvertence, the amendment which the majority leader and the minority submitted was a frontal assault on the program of the President of the United States. It proposed to carry the program much further than the President suggested. Of course, when they found out that, through inadvertence, they were attacking the program of the President of the United States, no great persuasion on the part of the Senator from Georgia was required. All I had to do was to call attention to the fact that they had submitted an amendment which, through inadvertence, they did not intend to submit; and that damage was soon repaired.

There is now before the Senate a very bad measure, but it is not nearly so unpalatable as the one which was inadvertently submitted. I wish I could claim credit for that transformation.

I do not believe it make a great deal of difference. We know that there is cooking in the Judiciary Committee in the other body a witch's broth such as

has never been concocted in all the history of legislation.

As vile as the inadvertently submitted amendment was, it would be almost a leavening influence on that proposed legislation. In contrast to the drastic provisions of some of the other sections that go far beyond the recommendations of the President of the United States, the proposal to make the Civil Rights Commission permanent was very mild. It was really inconsequential. To contemplate what has happened in that other committee is so shocking to me that I am almost constrained to take my seat. I have difficulty maintaining a standing position when I think about any such proposal as that considered by the House committee being seriously made to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. It warms the cockles of my heart to hear the Senator from Georgia plead for the enactment of the President's program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not plead for it. I do not have responsibility for it.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has displayed responsibility for the President's program on many occasions.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has responsibility for the pending amendment.

Mr. KEATING. We are happy to know that the Senator insisted on the President's suggestions being followed. We all owe him a debt for having brought that point to the attention of the leadership.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator is a very dextrous acrobat with words, but he knows I did not take any such position as that. I referred to the leadership and the leadership's responsibility for the President's program.

The Senator might not believe it, but there was a time—it is almost shrouded in antiquity now—when the Senator from Georgia might have occupied the chair of the majority leader.

Mr. KEATING. I know, and with grace and charm.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator from Georgia did not feel he could commit himself to support, in toto, any President's program. Therefore, the Senator from Georgia did not feel that he should be in possession of that seat, when some of his friends perhaps foolishly thought he could be elected as majority leader.

I had a good reason. I was not exactly fearful of election, but I was fearful of the consequences of undertaking to fill that chair, and of the many conflicts which would inevitably have come between the leader and the President's program.

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is not present. He will return in a day or so. He can explain this situation perhaps better than I.

I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I only wish it were true.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, two points stand out. I did not expect that there would be this interchange at this late hour.

There is no question that this is a proposal to extend the Commission for 1 year, instead of for a shorter or longer period of time.

I believe the President's program is completely inadequate on the extension of the life of the Commission, and I hope the extension will be permanent, as proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and my colleague [Mr. KEATING].

Be that as it may, we are left between heaven and earth on the 1-year extension. The same argument will be made, that the life of the Commission should not be extended permanently, because it will still have 6 or 8 months to run when the House bill reaches the Senate—whenever that happy day may be. I would prefer either a short extension, or to make the fight now.

Be that as it may, there are employees of the Civil Rights Commission who are thinking tonight about whether they should resign or stay. I hope that those employees will pay serious attention to what has been said by the leading opponent of the Civil Rights Commission and of this legislation, namely that this proposal is the "pet" of the Congress. The opponents have no hope of defeating this legislation. The life of the Commission will be extended.

I add my prediction that it will be extended again and again. I think there is an excellent opportunity to make it permanent.

That is not the battle being fought now. I hope the employees of the Commission, who are responsible for its very life and its monumental service in the cause of civil rights, will take as much as we take in the debates and in the difficulties which rage throughout the country, as much as those who are demonstrating in the country day after day take by way of arrests and confinement in order to understand the measure of their own service. I hope they will seriously consider staying with the Commission.

This is the hour when the true friends of civil rights and the Commission ought to stay with it.

I am grateful to my good friend for yielding to me. I address this appeal to those who work for the Commission tonight. They have every reason to stay, not to leave. Once the Commission is dismembered, it will be very hard to put it together again. It would be as good as a victory for those who oppose it if the Commission did not have the personnel and the talent necessary to do the job.

I am grateful to my colleague for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful to my colleague for making this appeal. We all know that some of the leading employees of the Commission have resigned because of the uncertainty as to the Commission's future status. I am sure they will be heartened by this debate, and by the indications that the Commission, which has done such outstanding work will be continued.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the able Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] in urging the employees of this Commission to stay on their jobs and live up to their responsibilities.

The law is quite explicit. Even if the Commission's life were to expire, there would be a period of 60 days in which to wind up its work. The agency is not going to expire. It will be continued. It has done good work. It has performed valuable service.

The Commission's powers are indeed limited. The President's program provides for increased authority and power, to be sure, for a 4-year period rather than a permanent extension, but I believe that is really not the central issue, because most of the laws passed by the Congress provide a limited authorization and a return for renewal and review. I am not particularly concerned about that matter, provided the agencies have the support of the Members of Congress. I believe this agency does have it.

I am pleased that the debate about the Civil Rights Commission which has taken place has been to the point, relating to its work and its recommendations. There are honest differences of opinion about that. I am confident that, with the cooperation which has been extended, the Senate can act tomorrow and extend the life of this Commission, so no one needs to resign from his position of duty or in any way fear for the future of the Commission.

Indeed, this kind of work requires a sense of sacrifice and dedication. I cannot imagine that those who are deeply involved in the civil rights struggle would resign from their posts, because this is the kind of work which requires almost superhuman dedication. I am sure they have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I interject myself for the last time in this discussion by saying that, judging from the recommendations of the Commission and what I know of the activities of its employees, I do not share the fears expressed by the senior Senator from New York. I do not fear that any of those employees are likely to leave their positions and go off seeking other employment. They are a very zealous group. Their recommendations demonstrate that fact. They cover a wide range.

I would apprehend that if the bill to extend the life of the Commission did not pass for several weeks none of them would leave his employment, if they were told by the Commission that they were sure the life would be extended.

I believe that during the time of the Irish revolution there was a man named MacSwiney who went on a fast for some 60 days to prove his devotion to the cause of the Irish revolution. In my opinion, if it were necessary—and it will not be necessary—most of the employees of this Commission would willingly meet or exceed MacSwiney's record to show their devotion and loyalty to the cause that the Commission represents.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in response to the distinguished Senator

from Georgia, it is a fact that a large number of the staff have already resigned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am shocked to hear that.

Mr. KEATING. They have.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought they were much more loyal than that. I am disappointed.

Mr. KEATING. They have resigned because of harassment, not because of any disloyalty. I can understand that. This Commission has been harassed throughout its life. Instead of being made a permanent agency of the Government, it has had to come up for renewal at periodic intervals and on each occasion it has had to go through this same ordeal, usually on the very eve of the expiration of the life of the Commission. Many of the employees have gone to other agencies or to other activities, where such constant harassment does not take place.

I do not think they can be criticized for that. Many are still there and we are urging that they remain on the job because we believe this Commission will be extended. My colleague from New York has the names of those who have resigned in recent days.

Mr. JAVITS. The directors of the program division, general counsel, and head of the education program have all resigned. Layoff notices which were to have gone out today have been deferred until tomorrow.

In respect to the observation of the Senator from Georgia, we must remember that these people have to earn a living, and they cannot be on the edge of doom all the time, not knowing whether the agency they are working for is to be continued or not. It is human to be extremely upset by the way this matter is handled when this particular agency is up for consideration, as to whether it may or may not work out, and then only on a very tentative and temporary basis, even if it is continued. The appeal which I made is addressed to the people who are still working. All we are doing is giving them some sense of assurance. I am sure the Senator from Georgia is not trying to make our path any easier. I know his dedication and sincerity, as he knows ours.

At least, it represents some feeling on the part of those who feel as I do on the very night when the Commission expires. Even with the 2-month period, they have to start being laid off. The way things look, the life of the Commission will be extended for a year. In extending it for this temporary period, my colleagues who feel as I do think it is our duty to make the appeal we have made, and that is the point of my remarks.

Mr. KEATING. The actual date of the expiration of the Commission is 60 days from September 30. But we would all be critical under ordinary conditions if an agency which kept on a large number of employes after its final report had been filed under the law. Under the unusual circumstances which now exist, however, I do not think anyone, including the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is so influential on the Appropriations Committee, among many other areas of activity, would be too critical of these people being retained while this unusual situation, which never should have been allowed to develop, is going on, and these people are not absolutely sure from one day to the next whether they will continue in this agency or have to seek other employment.

I hope the staff director, or whoever is handling the matter, will defer these notices until the House has had a reasonable opportunity to act in the matter. I express the fervent hope that before the week is out we will see favorable action on the extension of life of the Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator from New York and his colleague have observed, my position on this question is well known. I do not know whether the Senator was being sarcastic or cynical in referring to my great influence on the Appropriations Committee. If I had had the influence he attributes to me, there would not have been any faith in the continuance of the employment of these people to start with. There would not have been any appropriation made for the Civil Rights Commission—not after its first 2 years, which I believe the law provided originally. I did not see the danger in it when the measure first passed. I hoped it would be a fair and objective group.

I am somewhat surprised at the statement made by the senior Senator from New York that so many of these people have already resigned. I think they all know the score. They know what is going on down in the Congress. They have a pretty good idea of what is going to happen to this 1-year extension. I doubt whether there is a single employee, a humble messenger or a file clerk, who is in any quandary or is in any cloud of mystery as to what is going to happen to this 1-year extension proposal. They all know it is going to be extended.

I am sure their move in leaving the agency was not propaganda to influence the Congress. I am quite confident that these people have separated permanently from the agency and will not be back after the emergency passes.

I cannot believe that anybody would resort to that kind of propaganda or that they thought they would be taking a chance. There are 435 patriots in the other body who have only a 2-year lease on life, or in their jobs, and they work up to the very last to carry on their efforts and have faith that their contract will be renewed by the electors. The personnel of the Civil Rights Commission have much more assurance that the life of the Commission will be extended than some of the Members of the other body have that their contracts will be extended 2 more years.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that would be so, but that would hardly be a yardstick they would want to rely on. The personnel of the Commission had great doubts as to what was going to happen to the Commission, because of the way the Congress dealt with it in the past.

Mr. President, as is well known, some of us have been trying for weeks to obtain agreement on a course of action to save the Commission of Civil Rights from an early demise.

Assurances were given by the leadership that steps would be taken toward this end. In view of these assurances, I withheld any moves to extend the life of the Commission in the hope and expectation that the leadership would take the initiative in bringing this about.

This has now been done in accordance with the assurances given, but it is already evident that a price will have to be paid because of the decision to await the 11th hour before acting to save the Commission.

A recent story in the New York Times quotes so-called civil rights strategists as contending that the original amendments submitted last week for a permanent Commission and an enlargement of its power was a dreadful mistake. I do not know who the source is for this story, but if any mistake has been made, in my judgment, it is in backing down from this proposal. It is incredible the way supporters of civil rights catch cold everytime the opponents of civil rights sneeze.

I am not for precipitating anything, although I wonder how action on any subject at this late date in the session can be called precipitous.

The threat of a filibuster has been raised so we are ready to buckle under and settle for a 1-year extension with no change in jurisdiction for any agency which has as much right to permanency as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the REA or any of a host of other agencies.

There is a lesson in this experience for civil rights legislation. It is time we learned that civil rights cannot safely be placed at the bottom of every legislative agenda without grave danger. Before this session is over, we will have to demonstrate that those of us in favor of civil rights are as determined to obtain meaningful legislation as those opposed to civil rights are to prevent enactment of any legislation. Let it be made clear that there will be no accommodation or compromise because of parliamentary tactics when general civil rights legislation is before the Senate.

A stopgap extension may be all we can get at this time, and, of course it is better than to let the Commission die, but the Senate might as well be on notice now that when the omnibus civil rights bill is before us, this fight to give the Civil Rights Commission a full vote of confidence will be revived and fought with the same determination with which it is resisted by the opponents of civil rights.

There may be some in this Chamber who believe the civil rights problems facing our Nation will disappear if we keep our backs turned long enough. But I do not believe a majority of the American people or the Congress accept this view.

There outstanding Americans who comprise this Commission deserve our gratitude for the service they have performed. They are John A. Hannah, Robert G. Storey, Erwin N. Griswold, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.,

Robert S. Rankin, and Spottswood W. Robinson III.

This Commission deserves a pat on the back for the work it has done, not a kick in the pants. It deserves to be given a clear path for continued progress instead of being sent upon a journey down another dead end street.

Before this session is over, a majority of Congress must be given an opportunity to express its will on this subject no matter what hazards and obstructions are placed in our path.

Listen to these words spoken by a great American more than 46 years ago:

> The Senate cannot act unless its leaders can obtain unanimous consent. Its majority it powerless, helpless. In the midst of a crisis of extraordinary peril, when only definite and decided action can make the Nation safe or shielded from war itself by the aggression of others, action is impossible.
>
> The Senate is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action.
>
> The remedy? There is but one remedy. The only remedy is that the rules of the Senate shall be so altered that it can act. The country can be relied upon to draw the moral.

These were the words of President Woodrow Wilson, a native of Virginia, uttered in 1917 when the Senate filibustered to death a bill authorizing the arming of merchant vessels on the eve of our entry into World War I.

How much longer, Mr. President, are we to labor under rules and precedents which permit the paralysis of the Senate in periods of national crisis? How much longer shall we accept an unconstitutional rule which says in effect that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is needed for civil rights legislation, but a majority vote for all other legislation? President Wilson did not regard this as a matter of mere Senate procedure. He regarded it as an impediment to the fulfillment of our national obligations and led the battle against the filibuster. Unfortunately, the reforms which he spearheaded were inadequate to the task and the Senate today as in 1917 still cannot act when its majority is ready for action.

There appears to be an impression that the September 30 date is not significant since technically the Commission will not go out of existence until 60 days thereafter.

This impression is incorrect. The fact is that the Commission already has been adversely affected by the delay and uncertainty as to its future existence and functions. The Commission's staff has been diminishing during past months from a high of 76 to the current level of 59. I have been advised that two-thirds of the current remaining staff are about to be notified that their services will be terminated on October 31 and by that date the staff would be reduced to 19.

A number of us have expressed the hope that this will not happen.

Just imagine, for a moment, if our own Senate staffs were operating under a similar deadline and had no assurance that their employment would continue after today. Would we expect trained and experienced professionals to wait around patiently until the last moment before their formal separation notices were received? And once they had made other arrangements, would there be any justification for expecting them to return when the authorization for their continuance finally was approved?

We are treating this Commission like a stepchild. Wittingly or otherwise, we have created the worst possible conditions for its operations. It would be too much not to expect the morale and confidence of its employees to suffer as a result of the alternating harassment and neglect to which this agency has been subjected throughout its brief history.

The total budget of the Commission is not substantial in terms of other governmental expenditures. But it is obvious that the cycle of indecision which has afflicted the Commission throughout its life is indefensible even from the narrow perspective of economy and efficiency. Certainly the time has come to relieve the Commission of the burden of periodic renewal and to allow it to plan its activities and operations without wondering if there is any point in looking beyond September.

Mr. President, there is just no excuse for any further delay in dealing with this subject. We must be willing to demonstrate at least on this one issue that we want to continue learning about the civil rights problems facing our Nation and to do the best we can to solve them.

This is not a time for reluctant gestures. We must not appear to be throwing scraps to a beggar. Rather we should seize every opportunity to make it clear that we warmly embrace the Commission, that we believe in its work, that we want to help it achieve its objectives, that its cause is our cause.

We can best accomplish these objectives by giving the Commission a new lease on life at the earliest possible time and not after its resources are placed in cold storage.

The civil rights crisis facing this country has "urgent, do not delay" written all over it. Congress is courting disaster by the dilatory and desultory manner in which it has dealt with this issue to date.

We can take only a small step today. But let it be a firm sure step which will give the Nation some hope that Congress has the ability and the will to cope with the problems of civil rights.

There is talk about civil rights legislation being put off until next session. I hope these reports will be discredited by the leadership. There is no question of sparing time for this subject, we must devote to it whatever time is needed for meaningful action. The people have been remarkably patient, but this patience must not be confused with indifference. Before too many more weeks go by, there must be consideration of comprehensive civil rights legislation in the Senate and no compromise on simple stopgap devices will be acceptable at that moment in the Nation's history.

Mr. President, I recently filed separate views to a proposed report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights on a bill to extend the Commission on Civil Rights. Those separate views support an amendment which was defeated by a tie vote in the subcommittee, to extend the Commission indefinitely. Since the report has not yet been published, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my separate views be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT OF SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ON LEGISLATION TO EXTEND CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

SEPARATE VIEWS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING

Under the present law, the Commission on Civil Rights is required to submit a final report on September 30, 1963, and to wind up its affairs within 60 days thereafter.

The bill reported by the subcommittee (S. 1117) extends the date of the Commission's final report from September 30, 1963, to September 30, 1967, but continues to provide that the Commission shall cease to exist 60 days after submission of this report.

When the bill was before the subcommittee, I offered an amendment to extend the life of the Commission indefinitely by repealing the termination date in the present law. This amendment was defeated by a tie vote. It is my intention to offer a similar amendment to the bill when it is before the Senate.

Of course a 4-year extension in the life of the Commission is better than none at all. It would be calamitous to allow the Commission to die this year when there is still so much work to be done.

But a 4-year extension will not solve the serious problems confronting the Commission. It will not permit long-range planning of investigations and reports. It will not allow recruitment for a reasonable period of the best available talent. It will not relieve the periodic harassment and uncertainty to which the Commission has been subject since its creation. This limited extension certainly will not reflect the strong endorsement given the past work of the Commission in both party platforms.

An indefinite extension of the Commission would not preclude the Congress anytime it thought appropriate from terminating the Commission. If the Commission ceased to serve a useful purpose, a majority of Congress could put it out of existence at any time. But an indefinite extension would spare the Commission the periodic ordeal to which it is now subjected by its opponents. This is an ordeal it must now face even though it enjoys the full confidence and support of a clear majority of the Congress and the American people. This is an ordeal which it faces not because of any doubt by a majority that its work must go forward, but because there are some that oppose the very notion of a Commission exploring the civil rights problems of America.

The Commission would still make periodic reports to the Congress and would be subject to whatever oversight any appropriate committees of the Congress wished to exercise. In fact, under the language of my amendment the Commission would be expressly required to submit comprehensive reports every year, while under the amendment proposed by the committee no report would be expressly required until September 1967. In this respect, therefore, an indefinite extension of the Commission will provide us more information concerning its work than would a 4-year extension.

The hazards of a limited extension of the Commission are well illustrated by the situation which confronts the Commission at this very session. The intolerably long delay in acting on civil rights legislation threatened the Commission with extinction by inertia despite the fact that its continuance would be supported by an overwhelming vote. This is shabby treatment for a Commission of outstanding men and a poor reward for the magnificent contribution

they have made to the Nation. But more importantly, it would be inexcusably shortsighted for the Congress to ignore an agency out of existence at a time when help and critical guidance in meeting our civil rights problems is so essential.

Because of the uncertainties involved in the Commission's continued existence, the Commission staff has been diminishing during the past months from the high of 76 to the current level of 59. As presently scheduled, on September 30, 1963, two-thirds of the current staff will be notified that services will be terminated on October 31 and by this date the staff would be reduced to 19.

In this day when experienced and qualified personnel are so hard to find, it will be 1 year before a skeleton staff can be rebuilt and several years before the new staff can achieve the experience and skill possessed by those now with the Commission. The contribution the Commission is to make during the crucial years ahead will have to be postponed until it has regrouped and trained a new staff. This would constitute not only a tragic waste of money but more important a waste of talent at the very time when our Nation needs this talent to work on the resolution of the civil rights issues.

The total budget of the Commission is not substantial in terms of other governmental expenditures. But it is obvious that the cycle of indecision which has afflicted the Commission throughout its life is defensible even from the narrow perspective of economy and efficiency. Certainly the time has come to relieve the Commission of the burden of periodic renewal and to allow it to plan its activities and operations without wondering if there is any point in looking beyond September.

When I consider the difficulties that have confronted every attempt to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights, I wonder what those who claim we have moved too far in the field of civil rights have in mind.

We created many years ago permanent agencies to prevent unfair trade practices and unfair labor practices. If any working man or woman has been discriminated against because of his union activities—the full resources of the Federal Government are available for his protection. This is as it should be. If any consumer has been deceived by fraudulent advertising—the Federal Government does not hesitate to appoint counsel, conduct a hearing, issue a cease-and-desist order and take the case all the way up to the Supreme Court, if necessary, and this is as it should be. But let someone suggest that there should be a permanent agency to study and recommend steps to protect the constitutional rights of Americans—and howls of protest are heard. This is very definitely not as it should be.

Just this year, the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously approved legislation to provide a public defender for the defense of alleged criminals. Is there less justification for a public defender for Americans who are charged with no crime and who seek only to enjoy the rights and privileges promised them in the Constitution?

The truth is that in no area of major national concern has the Federal Government moved more hesitantly and more timidly than in the area of civil rights. Many of the same Congressmen who consider it their solemn duty to prop up the price of a bushel of corn, just don't see that the Federal Government has any business getting mixed up in the question of civil rights. And on another level of interest, many who speak with such eloquence about America's mission in the world, close their minds to the devastating impact of our racial troubles in the vast majority of places in the world where the white race is in the minority.

In my judgment, the conditions which exist in our Nation today make indefinite extension of the life of the Commission imperative. We must demonstrate that the Federal Government has a full awareness of its responsibilities to protect civil rights. Otherwise, impatience is bound to turn to outrage and demonstrations could easily be transformed into riots.

For those who wanted to see, this Commission has for several years been spotlighting the conditions which have finally been given such prominence in places like Birmingham, Oxford, Miss., and Albany, Ga.

As a result of its reports, no one can deny any longer that in America qualified citizens are denied the right to vote because of the color of their skin, that schoolchildren are excluded from certain public schools because of their race, that Negro Americans do not have equal employment opportunities and the same ability as whites to live and bring up their families in decent homes. As a result of its reports, we are compelled to admit, that the Federal Government is a financial partner in practices designed to perpetuate segregation in hospitals, in public libraries, and even the research programs of some of our universities. The Commission has laid bare the facts. Abolishing the Commission won't alter any of these facts—but giving the Commission an indefinite life may help us find the path of improvement.

A vote of confidence in the Commission will demonstrate that we are ready to face the facts, and, hopefully, to do something about them. It will help demonstrate to our own citizens that they can look to their national representatives to assist them in their striving for first-class citizenship. And it can help demonstrate to the whole world that while America has its problems, it also has the will and determination to cope with them.

While I endorse most of the recommendations of the Commission, agreement with the Commission's recommendations is no more necessary for its extension than is agreement with the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board necessary to justify its indefinite continuance. Indeed, this is not even the appropriate occasion for dealing in detail with the Commission's recommendations—although they certainly must be dealt with by the Congress—and the executive branch, for that matter—before much more precious time is lost.

Let us concentrate our attention now on just one issue—do we want to continue learning about the problems of civil rights facing our country and do the best we can to solve them? If we do, as I believe we must, then we should give the Commission a sure path for continued progress and not send it down another dead end street.

This is a difficult time for freedom throughout the world. Our own Nation is the leader of the forces of freedom. We deserve this leadership because of our proud heritage as well as our strength. But that heritage must be maintained and passed on to future generations enriched and ennobled. That strength must be a moral strength as well as a military strength. We owe it first of all to ourselves as Americans to pursue every measure which will bring the ideals of our system close to reality. But we also are called upon as the leader of the free world to present an untainted image of America as a land which meets its responsibilities at home.

This is not a time for reluctant gestures. We must not appear to be throwing scraps to a beggar. Rather we should make it clear that we warmly embrace this Commission, that we believe in its work, that we want to help it achieve its objectives, that its cause is our cause. The Civil Rights Commission can point the way toward unparalleled progress in the fight for freedom and equal justice. Its indefinite extension will be a vote of confidence in its work and a symbol of our determination to adopt the practical steps needed to give life and reality to our Nation's righteous spirit and proud intentions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are considering today whether or not the Senate should tack an amendment onto a private bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year. I wish to state my objections to this extension.

The Civil Rights Commission has been extended at the end of each 2 years since its establishment. Those of us who opposed establishing this Commission did so primarily because of grave misgivings as to its usefulness. We felt then—and we feel now—that the Commission was, at best, an unnecessary adjunct to an already one-sided arsenal aimed at the South. We felt then and we know today that this Commission has served no useful purpose save to agitate and inflame.

My conviction as to the Commission's uselessness has been strengthened each time it has issued a report and each time Congress has considered extending the Commission's life.

Today, I believe more strongly than ever that the Commission serves no worthwhile purpose and that it should be allowed to expire.

Approximately 6 years ago, at President Eisenhower's recommendation and over the strong objections of many Senators—and I was one of them—the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1957 was enacted.

In it, the Commission was established to study civil rights for 2 years, report to Congress, and then expire. But instead of letting it expire, Congress has extended its life twice. Now we are asked to extend it again for 1 year. Everyone knows that this move currently before us is but a preamble to efforts to extend it forever.

When I appeared before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee on May 23, 1963, to testify against extension of the Commission, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] made the following observation:

> If I might interrupt you here at this point, a witness yesterday recommended that the life of the Commission be extended forever and I asked him if he were willing to have all the other officials of the United States continue in office on the same terms and he said "No."

I told Senator ERVIN then that I thought the eagerness on the part of some people to make the Commission permanent indicated their failure really to think things through.

We now have an opportunity to accomplish something truly constructive. By refusing to amend this private relief bill and thereby rejecting the effort being made to extend the Commission, we can discontinue a wasteful expenditure of public funds; and we can remove from the American scene some degree of the agitation affecting relations between the races. The Commission is but a merchant of discord in a market where harmony is in exceedingly short supply. Following the law of supply and demand, desire for harmony in the market of racial relations should be exceedingly high. Let us express this desire by retiring this merchant of discord from the marketplace.

Before we ever had a Civil Rights Commission, the Department of Justice had already been given authority in the field of racial relations.

Furthermore, I am reliably informed that the Justice Department still has this authority.

Congress authorized the Attorney General to establish in the Department of Justice a Civil Rights Division and it is functioning and functioning in large part under four titles of the United States Code enacted to protect the rights of all citizens regardless of race or color.

During the May 23, 1963, hearings on extending the life of the Commission, Senator ERVIN and I discussed these titles. Senator ERVIN noted that:

> We have a statute embodied in title 18, section 241 of the United States Code which provides that if two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured they shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

At this point, I call the Senate's attention to title 18, section 242 of the United States Code. It reads as follows:

> Whoever, under color of any law, statute, regulation, or custom willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such an inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for 1 year, or both.

In my opinion these two statutes provide more than sufficient criminal punishment which can be applied against any State or local official or any person party to a conspiracy which has within its object the denial or taking away of any constitutional right belonging to any citizen.

These statutes provide the orderly system of protection of the rights of citizens that was contemplated by the writers of our Constitution.

There is still more protection on the statute books for all of our citizens.

Title 42, section 1983 and title 42, section 1985, subsection 3, provide that persons whose civil rights have been violated can bring civil actions—either actions of law or suits in equity—to recover damages. Moreover, they can bring civil actions to prevent any anticipated denial of any right of any citizen guaranteed by the laws of the United States and the Constitution.

I firmly believe these statutes constitute enough law to provide punishment for any person who denies any U.S. citizen, regardless of race or color, of any right secured to him under the Constitution and the statutes.

Furthermore, there is no necessity whatsoever for passing any more laws to insure full protection of the constitutional rights of all our people, as the Commission advocates.

The Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has been active in another area. It has been trying to bring races together where there is racial disturbance, trying, in many instances, to establish or reestablish communication and we know that in a good many instances it has been effective.

So, Mr. President, we have two civil rights groups in operation. It might be said, however, that one of them is on the operating table at this moment. I contend that two are too many. So let us get rid of one of them, specifically the Civil Rights Commission.

Why should Congress appropriate nearly $1 million yearly to be spent by an agency which, in effect, duplicates the responsibilities already delegated by Congress to the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department?

Mr. President, at this point, I call attention to a 1958 through 1962 comparison of the budgets of the Civil Rights Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

It is as follows:

Fiscal year	Civil Rights Commission	Civil Rights Division
1958		[1] 148,000
1959	$777,000	487,850 [2] 40,130
1960	[3] 850,000	517,000
1961	[4] 888,000	689,000
1962	[5] 950,000	768,000

[1] Still part of Criminal Division.
[2] A pay increase.
[3] Public Law 86-678.
[4] Public Law 87-264.
[5] Public Law 87-843.

Mr. President, do we need two civil rights divisions in order to placate a certain element in our society which seems to thrive on racial strife and unrest?

What has the Civil Rights Commission accomplished in the field of race relations?

Instead of creating a stable environment for communication between the races, the Commission has created a volatile situation which defeats the very goals which the Commission professes to seek. The situation grows more volatile each day.

For all the Commission's declarations of high principle and purpose, we who fought it cautioned that its inevitable results would constitute a threat to the Constitution of the United States.

With regard to the Commission's massive assault on the Constitution, I have followed generally its recommendations each time it has issued a report, and I think many of the reports show a lack of clear thinking and clear appreciation of the kind of government that we have, that is, the three branches of government that are coordinate, but separate; and the dual system of government that we have as between the Federal Government and the State governments.

Despite our warning about the Commission's threat to the Constitution, the Commission has been allowed to stumble forward on shaky legs, seeking to change the Constitution on shaky evidence. The Commission's actions have vindicated our judgment.

We have witnessed the Commission's attempts to extend even the great powers granted it by the Congress so as to have sovereign States knuckle under to preconceived notions of the Commission in respect to administration of State laws.

We suspected at the outset that the activity of this Commission would serve as nothing more than a means by which those happily isolated from the real problems of racial relations might experiment with their own pet theories.

By its own action, this Commission has proved to be a disruptive force in the very area for which it was proposed to be constructive.

Accordingly, I will vote against its continuation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 30, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dr. William Neill Hubbard, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for the term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1967.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Dr. Robert S. Morison, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1966, vice Conrad A. Elvehjem, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

First lieutenant to captain

Line of the Air Force

Aaron, George B., 62233A.
Abell, Maurice A., 65834A.
Achee, Patrick G., 58558A.
Acheson, Herbert H., 58499A.
Ackley, Delbert R., 62209A.
Adams, Thomas R., 65899A.
Adamson, Cecil L., 54854A.
Addison, Grafton D. Jr., 65831A.
Agar, James R., 58630A.
Aho, Arthur C., Jr., 51427A.
Ahrens, Arthur H., Jr., 29919A.
Akers, Ronald L., 66150A.
Albertson, Robert L., 29920A.
Albrecht, John R., 58594A.
Aldrich, Robert J., Jr., 50105A.
Alexander, Jack L., 66147A.
Alexander, John C., 65835A.
Alkire, Melvin G., 29922A.
Allen, Harlan G., Jr., 29923A.
Allen, Jimmy W., 65729A.
Allen, Robert W., 54819A.
Allgood, Wiley A., Jr., 58670A.
Allington, Maynard F., 50071A.
Alonso, Ramon E., 54815A.
Altenburg, Arthur J., 29924A.
Alter, Norman B., 58283A.

Althouse, Clyde R., 65825A.
Alves, Moses L., 66258A.
Amacker, Jefferson Z., Jr., 29925A.
Ambers, Leonard V., 71515A.
Ames, Ivan G., 50082A.
Anaclerio, Michael, 66114A.
Anatrella, Louis P., 66198A.
Anderson, Alan H., 50131A.
Anderson, Arthur D., 58291A.
Anderson, Floyd R., 50075A.
Anderson, Gerald M., 29926A.
Anderson, Jack E., 58811A.
Anderson, John, Jr., 65291A.
Anderson, John S., 58707A.
Anderson, Lagrande K., 65428A.
Anderson, Melvin J., 58332A.
Anderson, Philip J., 32537A.
Andre, Howard V., Jr., 29927A.
Andrews, Harry J., 29929A.
Andrews, John F., 54723A.
Anelli, John W., 66197A.
Anthony, Donald B., 65773A.
Anton, Robert E., 50130A.
Arbuthnot, Alfred H., 66051A.
Arceneaux, Francis X., 66329A.
Archie, Charles E., 58285A.
Armitage, Merlin E., 61591A.
Armstrong, Frederic C., 65789A.
Arndt, Fredirick W., 58392A.
Arnold, Lawrence D., 58416A.
Ashley, Donald L., 58510A.
Attarian, Peter J., 58789A.
Ausman, Neal E., Jr., 29932A.
Autery, Clarence R., 50221A.
Avrit, Robert R., 65837A.
Baca, Manuel J., Jr., 29933A.
Bachman, Ronald L., 66227A.
Backhaus, George J., 66202A.
Bailey, Bruce M., 58589A.
Baird, Kenneth R., 71182A.
Baisden, Kenneth W., 62180A.
Baker, Duane A., 62159A.
Baker, Robert L., 32295A.
Bale, William F., 66156A.
Balent, John D., 29934A.
Ball, Bobby T., 65798A.
Ball, James P., 65902A.
Ball, Thomas V., 70939A.
Ballot, Charles J., Jr., 58605A.
Balo, Ronald L., 58236A.
Balthazar, Lantz A., 58292A.
Bamert, Joseph C., Jr., 32525A.
Banaszak, Jerome J., 50174A.
Banholzer, Alfred E., 2d, 54825A.
Banner, Hastings W., 50976A.
Bannon, Paul W., 61529A.
Barbel, Richard C., 65887A.
Barikmo, Norman M., 32523A.
Barlow, Robert C., 32506A.
Barnard, Michael W., 71184A.
Barnes, Donald W., 71185A.
Barnes, William A., 66274A.
Barney, Bruce A., 66288A.
Barnhill, Gary D., 71186A.
Barnhouse, Verdo R., Jr., 54722A.
Barr, Larry R., 71187A.
Barrett, Archie D., 29935A.
Barrett, John C., 61531A.
Barrett, Russell W., 66282A.
Barry, Daniel P., 58367A.
Bartholomew, Charles W., 50176A.
Bartholomew, Frank C., 66050A.
Bartlett, Ronald A., 58666A.
Bass, Stanley A., 29936A.
Bateman, Richard W., 50222A.
Bateman, Robert P., 29937A.
Bates, Dean E., 29938A.
Bates, Neil G., 29939A.
Battaglia, Philip J., 65873A.
Batts, James S., 58651A.
Batz, Thomas E., 66054A.
Bauknecht, Charles A., 29940A.
Baum, Richard G., 29941A.
Baumann, Paul A., 61543A.
Baumann, Paul K., 66286A.
Baumann, Philipp H., 58396A.
Bays, Brooks G., 29942A.
Beagle, Charles B., 62277A.
Beale, Robert E., 58514A.
Beard, John R., 65889A.
Beatty, Kenneth S., 66222A.
Becker, Marshall K., 62065A.
Beckett, Ronald C., 54821A.
Beckham, Donald D., 66112A.
Bedford, Gary W., 58469A.
Beers, Alva E., 58472A.
Began, Robert J., 29944A.
Beier, Robert J., 62202A.
Beimforde, Gene E., 29945A.
Belcher, Ronald H., 62239A.
Bell, Billy N., 66097A.
Bell, John D., 58290A.
Benjamin, Arthur J., 58278A.
Bennett, Richard L., 58747A.
Bennett, William T., Jr., 58638A.
Benoit, Harold H., 66141A.
Benson, Richard L., 58701A.
Bentson, Rodney E., 61507A.
Bentz, Glen A., 58804A.
Bergstrom, Roy E., 50161A.
Bernasconi, Ronald P., 50134A.
Bernd, David P., 29947A.
Berry, Millard F., Jr., 65243A.
Berry, Stanley D., 65854A.
Berthold, Hubert M., 58479A.
Besh, Ted S., Jr., 62206A.
Betcher, Raymond R., Jr., 29948A.
Beyer, Douglas A., 66086A.
Bice, Don L. F., 61517A.
Biehn, Donald R., 58571A.
Bigelow, Daniel J., 54980A.
Billman, Charles M., Jr., 48477A.
Birkelo, Harry G., 65804A.
Bishop, Erastus N., 62305A.
Bishop, Richard F., 58427A.
Bishop, Ronald J. B., Jr., 29950A.
Bithell, Wayne, 62266A.
Bjerknes, Vilhelm, 65732A.
Bjornson, Loren F., 61469A.
Black, Thomas S., 65783A.
Blair, Paul E., 62077A.
Blanch, Claude C., 62263A.
Blanchfield, Robert A., 66161A.
Blanton, William I., Jr., 58333A.
Blinn, Donald E., 62278A.
Blom, Roger L., 66145A.
Bloom, Charles W., Jr., 66190A.
Blough, Carl W., 62082A.
Boatwright, Charles A., 58388A.
Bodeen, Charles A., 58234A.
Boggs, James A., 66217A.
Boggs, William R., 65772A.
Bolgren, Gerald W., 65800A.
Bond, Ronald A., 65907A.
Bone, Larry I., 66271A.
Bonnette, John C., 62228A.
Boone, Daniel W., 50110A.
Boone, Robert R., 65814A.
Boothe, Kenneth W., 58791A.
Borie, Charles E., 62489A.
Boss, Ronald G., 58395A.
Bossier, Malcolm O., Jr., 66085A.
Boucher, Raymond E., 66256A.
Bourgeois, Gerald F., 62295A.
Bowles, Neil H., 58317A.
Bowman, Hal K., 65596A.
Bowman, Robert G., 58582A.
Boyd, Clifton E., 62080A.
Boyd, John T., 58682A.
Boykin, Rich T., Jr., 71521A.
Bozeman, Gerald E., 62271A.
Bradley, Edgar A., 62151A.
Bradley, Martin G., 29953A.
Bradley, Mitchell H., 62164A.
Bradley, Olin H., 61515A.
Braman, Stanley W., 58410A.
Branan, Carl K., 58590A.
Branby, Harlan E., 61503A.
Branch, Leonard J., 66344A.
Brandenburg, Lowell E., 58551A.
Branham, Ruel K., 71657A.
Brant, Raymond F., 58422A.
Braue, Harold L., 66281A.
Braun, Cecil O., 58640A.
Breaud, Alfred A., Jr., 58304A.
Breedlove, William O., 3d, 32533A.
Breen, Andrew J., 58267A.
Brehm, Richard L., 66236A.
Brennan, Thomas J., 51455A.
Brenner, David G., 58657A.
Brestel, Max C., 58721A.
Brewer, Gardner, 29954A.
Brewer, George A., 3d, 66331A.
Brewton, Henry J., 3d, 50974A.
Brininstool, Edward P., 58562A.
Bristow, John L., 65360A.
Britos, Peter J., 54974A.
Brodhecker, Thomas A., 54781A.
Brooks, Wiley S., Jr., 58253A.
Brooks, William W., 71112A.
Broske, Bernard J., 62249A.
Broussard, Ray E., 66142A.
Brown, Billy J., 69722A.
Brown, Charles L., 66074A.
Brown, Clarence E., Jr., 61450A.
Brown, Donald E., 58300A.
Brown, Harry W., 65893A.
Brown, Robert M., 29956A.
Brown, Troy M., 50160A.
Broz, Charles W., 65846A.
Brunstad, George E., 54791A.
Bryan, Kenneth, 29957A.
Buchanan, Frank A., 58238A.
Buckland, Frank P., Jr., 66186A.
Buglewicz, Francis J., Jr., 58257A.
Buhrman, William F., 71199A.
Bunch, Kenneth J., 51546A.
Bunten, Laurie A., 51486A.
Buoni, Frederick B., 62173A.
Burch, Bruce, 58229A.
Burch, Truman A., Jr., 58662A.
Burck, Raynova B., 58334A.
Burdick, Martin M., 32237A.
Burleson, Kerry E., 58714A.
Burner, Lee, 29959A.
Burnthorne, Bryan R., 61555A.
Burress, William R., Jr., 62283A.
Bush, Clarence H., Jr., 58428A.
Bushwar, Oscar M., 71200A.
Bussell, Gerald Q., 58692A.
Bustle, Lawrence E., Jr., 29960A.
Butkewicz, Peter J., 54987A.
Butler, William N., 71201A.
Butschek, Robert J., 58411A.
Butterfield, Norman A., 50135A.
Byam, Richard E., 58376A.
Byrd, William C., 66172A.
Cadieux, Ronald A., 54971A.
Cain, Thomas G., 32296A.
Calkin, Maynard S., Jr., 58724A.
Callis, David M., 58731A.
Calvert, Donald R., 32516A.
Campbell, Bart C., 29961A.
Campbell, Edward F., 61560A.
Campbell, William F., Jr., 29962A.
Cannell, Leonard R., 66167A.
Cannon, Daniel P., 54720A.
Cannon, John W., 66243A.
Cannon, Matthew M., 29963A.
Cantarano, Thomas F., 50111A.
Cantrell, Edwin B., 3d, 65904A.
Carleton, Joseph M., Jr., 71203A.
Carlin, Daniel S., 65850A.
Carlson, Jack W., 48551A.
Carnochan, John A. F., 58696A.
Carpenter, Bruce H., Jr., 66106A.
Carr, Wayne A., 69721A.
Carroll, Gary K., 50206A.
Carroll, Robert D., 65826A.
Carskadden, Thomas H., 54841A.
Carson, Harold E., Jr., 62185A.
Carson, John B., 61481A.
Carter, Donald M., 62275A.
Carter, James A., 54640A.
Carter, William T., 29964A.
Cass, George E., 66166A.
Cassell, Gerald G., 66173A.
Castleberry, Allan R., 61499A.
Centofanti, Joseph J., 62115A.
Cerisano, Vincent P., 58383A.
Chambers, William R., 65770A.
Champlain, John D., 50107A.
Chance, Victor P., 54712A.
Chaney, Clyde, 29965A.
Channell, Gerald A., 62265A.
Chansler, William A., 66298A.
Chapin, Charles T., 58533A.
Chapman, Willard T., 51435A.
Chase, Arthur L., 58777A.
Chase, Franklin L., 65736A.
Chase, Paul N., 29966A.
Chason, Lloyd R., 54986A.
Chavez, Gabriel V., 58230A.
Chilbert, Dominic F., 71206A.

Chilcott, Thomas S., 71149A.
Ching, Norman Y. S., 61535A.
Choate, Robert N., 65404A.
Christensen, Gary W., 62187A.
Christensen, Merton J., 58601A.
Christensen, Neal F., 62197A.
Christensen, Richard W., 29967A.
Christiansen, Robert P., 29968A.
Christie, Vernon W., Jr., 66263A.
Christman, Donald O., 58783A.
Christy, Frank J., 62284A.
Church, Larry D., 61557A.
Ciambrone, Thomas W., 58397A.
Cilek, George R., 58546A.
Clair, Carl F., 58746A.
Clark, Charles R., 61488A.
Clark, Chester G., 62231A.
Clark, Don A., 29970A.
Clark, Edwin H., 62241A.
Clark, Frank R., 4th, 62191A.
Clark, Franklin D., 62086A.
Clark, Gaylord W., 58335A.
Clark, Marvin D., 66323A.
Clark, Phillip D., 66339A.
Clark, Robert N., 61451A.
Clark, Thomas S., Jr., 58321A.
Clark, William R., 29971A.
Clarke, David K., 51429A.
Clarke, Herbert F., 58660A.
Clarke, William D., 3d., 58591A.
Clay, Wayne J., 58429A.
Claymore, Paul T., 50166A.
Cleary, Patrick J., 66120A.
Clements, Douglas M., 62129A.
Clendennen, Darby L., 51438A.
Clover, Craig V., 54778A.
Coats, George E., 66259A.
Cobeil, Earl G., 61453A.
Cochrane, John H., 29972A.
Coffey, Robert T., 66203A.
Cohen, Donald A., 66092A.
Coker, Walter, J., 3d, 58786A.
Coldwater, Robert E., 62253A.
Cole, Alan R., 32241A.
Cole, Eugene W., 65752A.
Collipi, Thomas C., 71662A.
Colman, Robert D., 50211A.
Colton, Thomas A., 66264A.
Colyer, James A., 48556A.
Combs, Kenneth O., 50159A.
Comeaux, Paul C., 66143A.
Cone, Ronald L., 58779A.
Conn, Bryan R., 50173A.
Connett, David C., 58793A.
Connolly, Michael F., 71208A.
Conover, Laurence W., 66052A.
Conroy, James E., 65627A.
Cook, George E., 58754A.
Cook, John H., 51489A.
Cook, Tom R., 58621A.
Cooke, Lowell T., 66174A.
Cool, Gary D., 61590A.
Cooley, Anthon E., 54713A.
Cooney, Joseph E., 66278A.
Cooper, George D., 58446A.
Cooper, Sheldon H., 65867A.
Copple, Charles M., 66137A.
Corder, Charles V., Jr., 50137A.
Cordero, William E., 71664A.
Corley, Parris L., 50973A.
Cormier, Johnny E., 61518A.
Corser, James B., 3d, 66328A.
Coss, Donald L., 58430A.
Costas, William T., 58269A.
Costello, Raymond P., 65802A.
Cothran, Thurm D., Jr., 62280A.
Coursen, Franklin H., 61564A.
Couture, Donald J., 29974A.
Couture, Marcel A., 65810A.
Cowles, John H., 61482A.
Cox, Hugh L., 3d, 58492A.
Cox, James W., 58467A.
Cox, Mark W., 65861A.
Cox, Thomas A., 32244A.
Coyle, Harold S., Jr., 29975A.
Craft, Richard L., 66324A.
Crawford, Charles B., 58447A.
Crawford, Harold R., 66214A.
Creppel, Jacques J., 62156A.
Crist, Robert B., 50208A.
Critchley, Harry R., Jr., 61448A.
Crochet, Alex P., Jr., 66082A.
Crochet, Calvin E., 71211A.
Crook, Richardson H., 58545A.
Cross, Charles A., 58541A.
Crouch, Darrell P., 54822A.
Croxton, Donovan C., 58722A.
Crum, Fred B., 54705A.
Crumroy, Otto F., Jr., 58294A.
Cudahy, George F., 29977A.
Cudmore, William T., 29978A.
Cullom, Richard W., 58336A.
Cummings, Gerald W., 50210A.
Cummings, Richard L., 58047A.
Cunningham, William F., Jr., 66312A.
Cuny, Leroy G., 58364A.
Cushenberry, Anthony S., 58776A.
Custer, Gomer C., 62234A.
Cutler, Harold G., 58794A.
Cyrus, Jack R., 58552A.
Dabbs, Travis D., 71667A.
Dahl, Sigvard, Jr., 50085A.
Dahnke, Roy S., 29979A.
Dailey, Boyd L., 58607A.
Dale, Lucian J., Jr., 66073A.
Daley, Robert F., 58622A.
Dalton, Donald J., 66012A.
Daniels, Preston J., 54837A.
Darcey, Edward H., 65746A.
Davenport, Ronald L., 58812A.
Davey, Keith E., 32555A.
Davey, Thomas J., Jr., 65824A.
Davidson, Alfred H., 3d, 29980A.
Davis, Donald H., 29981A.
Davis, Duane M., 66069A.
Davis, Harland M., Jr., 50093A.
Davis, James E., 58431A.
Davis, Jon L., 66276A.
Davis, Richard G., Jr., 66107A.
Davis, Samuel J., 2d, 65759A.
Day, John R., 62250A.
Daye, Jerry G., 58507A.
Dayton, Thomas E., 29982A.
Deal, Kenneth L., 61562A.
Deans, William R., 66293A.
Debolt, James G., 65884A.
Decamp, Dion E., 58592A.
Deering, Philip A., 50224A.
Dees, Buddy E., 65820A.
Defer, Richard H., 66221A.
Dekeyser, Bernard R., 32300A.
Delano, Lyle M., 58536A.
Delashaw, Thomas B., 3d, 66333A.
Deloach, William A., Jr., 62160A.
Demchuk, Sergi L., 58448A.
Demichieli, Lino F., 61588A.
Demott, Lucian K., 29985A.
Dempsey, George F., 29986A.
Denard, James M., Jr., 54804A.
Denham, John H., 66306A.
Denison, Harold G., 32515A.
Dennis, Joseph K., 61572A.
Denton, Murray B., 50091A.
Depoorter, Win E., 61513A.
Derrick, Elbert D., Jr., 61493A.
Derrick, Thales A., 50114A.
Desmond, William B., Jr., 65900A.
Desola, John R., 29987A.
Devito, Peter A., 29988A.
Devoe, Frederic A., Jr., 61478A.
Diangelo, Henry J., 50115A.
Diaz, Luis V., 65832A.
Dice, Carl R., 50106A.
Dickens, Milford L., 54799A.
Dickensheets, Richard E., 54691A.
Dickson, William E., Jr., 32311A.
Diffenderfer, David A., 62214A.
Dillion, Ralph I., 71215A.
Dillman, Laurie E., 54721A.
Dillon, David C., 51502A.
Dillon, Richard T., 51550A.
Dimond, Alvin J., 66230A.
Disteldorf, Bernard N., 58260A.
Divens, Donald F., 54771A.
Dixon, Gerald, 58386A.
Dixon, Walter J., 66309A.
Doby, Herb, 29991A.
Dolan, William G., Jr., 29993A.
Dolby, Robert C., 62279A.
Dondero, David S., 32550A.
Donley, Jack E., 65898A.
Dorazio, Silvio L., 50178A.
Dorman, Darrel K., 66294A.
Dougherty, Thomas H., 29994A.
Douglas, Arthur E., 66096A.
Douglas, McCleary A., 62262A.
Dowell, Michael T., 62130A.
Downey, Laurence R., 62256A.
Downing, Wayne E., 62219A.
Doyle, Edward P., 29995A.
Dressel, Ronald C., 29996A.
Drew, Joseph C., 66209A.
Drumheller, Ernes C., 65469A.
Dubiel, Joseph J., 61561A.
Duboise, Donald E., 51490A.
Dubreuil, Elliott J., 58774A.
Ducote, Richard J., 29997A.
Duffin, Rey L., 65857A.
Dufresne, Ronald C., 58366A.
Duke, Charles M., Jr., 29999A.
Duncan, Tommy L., 66098A.
Dundervill, Robert F., Jr., 30000A.
Dunham, Robert A., 63401A.
Dunham, Robert L., 61434A.
Dunlosky, Anthony W., Jr., 30001A.
Dunn, Claude G., 61485A.
Durivage, Henry J., 58712A.
Dutt, Wendell A., 66130A.
Dwyer, Gerald T., 30003A.
Dwyer, James P., 62207A.
Dwyer, Paul H., 58780A.
Dyer, Delmar R., Jr., 58277A.
Dyke, Frank P., 66135A.
Dyke, Sylvia A., 66160W.
Earle, Douglas S., 62222A.
Eary, Verla O., Jr., 58298A.
Easthom, James M., 61595A.
Ebert, Hugh D., Jr., 65880A.
Edgerly, Robert, 65232A.
Edinger, Robert G., 66255A.
Edler, Allan L., 66237A.
Edstrom, John K., 61459A.
Edwards, Donald H., 32540A.
Edwards, John R., 66337A.
Edwards, Roger S., 50171A.
Ehrenfried, Charles E., 62184A.
Einsel, Willis E., 50149A.
Einstein, Ann I., 66087W.
Eknayan, Armand, 58572A.
Elder, Robert E., 66251A.
Eldridge, George E., 61486A.
Eliason, Norrell B., 66201A.
Eller, James M., 62248A.
Ellingson, Richard K., 58314A.
Ellington, John D., 30005A.
Ellis, George J., Jr., 61545A.
Ellis, William E., 58432A.
Ellison, Arthur B., 30006A.
Elsby, C. Neale, 32239A.
Ely, Arben R., Jr., 66169A.
Engebretson, Roger W., 62124A.
Engel, Carl R., 65890A.
Engel, Robert H., 58378A.
English, Delmar L., 62098A.
Ennever, Robert O., Jr., 58259A.
Epifani, Louis R., 65764A.
Erhart, Robert J., 65892A.
Erni, Charles A., 54833A.
Essmeier, Charles T., 65730A.
Evans, Donald F., 71531A.
Evans, Donald S., 66192A.
Evans, Ralph B., 58751A.
Everley, Carl B., 65476A.
Evgenides, Constantine N., 61552A.
Ewald, Clarence J., 62095A.
Ewing, Robert G., 61439A.
Fabyanic, Thomas A., 65864A.
Fake, Mary L., 58597W.
Fanelli, William B., 58675A.
Fant, Rodney E., 51437A.
Farrar, Harry J., 54829A.
Farrington, Dennis, 66103A.
Farris, Jack K., 30007A.
Farthing, Fred G., Jr., 61554A.
Fawcett, Robert G., 65234A.
Fay, Elvir A., 70996A.
Featherstone, John K., 71223A.
Feddern, Louis F., 61533A.
Federici, Fred J., Jr., 30008A.
Fellows, Charles C., 65738A.
Fenstermacher, Gene, 58433A.
Ferguson, William J., Jr., 65792A.
Ferrell, Raymond L., 54703A.
Ferrell, Richard O., 65888A.
Fessler, George R., Jr., 58380A.

Field, James L., 65821A.
Field, Lawrence H., 58268A.
Field, Robert W., 61465A.
Finch, Lawrence E., 61575A.
Findlay, Eugene H., 66284A.
Fink, Barry N., 30009A.
Finuf, Edward V., 65728A.
Fischer, Lowell W., 71670A.
Fischer, Wayne R., 61479A.
Fiscus, John E., 32289A.
Fisher, Donald H., 30010A.
Fitzgerald, Byron S., 30011A.
Fitzgerald, Donald N., 65760A.
Flagg, Richard A., Jr., 61475A.
Fleckenstein, John F., 50212A.
Fleming, Leon P., 65819A.
Fletcher, Carlos E., 66345A.
Fletcher, Gailon K., 58501A.
Flora, Earl L., 61584A.
Flora, Roger T., 30012A.
Flowers, Kenneth H., 58693A.
Fluhr, James F., 58646A.
Fobair, Roscoe H., 66079A.
Fontenot, Burton F., 65863A.
Foote, John A., Jr., 66066A.
Foray, John, 66011A.
Ford, Joseph S., 2d, 62110A.
Ford, Laymond N., 58691A.
Ford, Richard T., 58445A.
Forrest, John G., Jr., 62134A.
Forsyth, Milton D., Jr., 30013A.
Fortson, Eugene T., 61470A.
Fosse, James M., 66346A.
Foster, James P., Jr., 65571A.
Foster, William H., Jr., 30014A.
Fox, Charles R., 58048A.
Fox, Donald J., 65731A.
Fox, John F. C., 58608A.
Franco, Joseph M., Jr., 50153A.
Franell, Joseph E., Jr., 61519A.
Frank, Deitrich E., 51439A.
Franklin, Maury A., 66060A.
Franz, Paul B., 54843A.
Frasier, Robert J., 66262A.
Freathy, Frederick C., Jr., 30015A.
Fred, Richard E., 66184A.
Freed, Darryl W., 58375A.
Freeland, Edward L., 66170A.
Freeman, Dan W., 62089A.
Freeman, David E., 66325A.
Freeman, Robert D., 30016A.
Friedman, Allan M., 62165A.
Frische, Norbert W., 50154A.
Frizzell, Eustace W., 65361A.
Fruehauf, Benjamin F., Jr., 61452A.
Fry, Robert S., Jr., 58609A.
Fujimoto, Leslie I., 62216A.
Fuller, Glenn L., 58795A.
Fuller, Richard E., 58548A.
Fullwood, Robert G., 58250A.
Funkhauser, John L., 30017A.
Gaad, Robert F., 3d, 30018A.
Gaffney, Robert F., 62167A.
Galbraith, Buren G., 50162A.
Galbraith, James L., 61455A.
Gallup, Robert D., 58742A.
Gammons, Norman E., 30020A.
Gano, Donald W., 65774A.
Gant, William D., 65422A.
Gapp, Frank J. E., 65838A.
Garber, James F., 3d, 48482A.
Gardella, Edward A., 65134A.
Gardner, Gerald A., 62308A.
Gardner, Raymond L., 58709A.
Gardner, Robert F., 62166A.
Gardner, Ronald E., 61583A.
Gareiss, Kurt W., 30021A.
Garpstas, John F., 65605A.
Garvin, Eleanor L., 65721W.
Gasho, James B., Jr., 30022A.
Gasior, Kenneth V., 58284A.
Gates, Leo V., 2d, 32517A.
Gauntt, Turner M., Jr., 30023A.
Gauthier, Ralph A., 58813A.
Gaylord, Merlin J., 62195A.
Gebhardt, Kenneth N., 66347A.
Geddes, James D., 58739A.
Gee, Edward L., 30024A.
Geick, Larry L., 58480A.
Geiger, Francis E., 58782A.
Geiger, Oswald T., Jr., 61461A.
Geist, Thomas J., 65198A.
Glenn, Clayton C., 65522A.
Gentry, Charles W., 58337A.
Gentry, Jerauld R., 30025A.
Genua, Robert L., 65868A.
Gerding, Jay D., 65767A.
Gerhardt, Richard C., 62150A.
Gericke, William A., Jr., 50179A.
Gerlitz, Gary H., 61586A.
Germann, David B., 65809A.
Gerner, Francis J., 66046A.
Gholson, Lee W., 61514A.
Gibbs, David P., Jr., 30026A.
Gibson, Charles H., 66210A.
Gierhart, Loran W., 30028A.
Gift, Ivan J., 61580A.
Gilbert, Billy B., 65724A.
Gilbert, Harvey B., Jr., 32240A.
Gilbert, Stanley M., 54783A.
Gilbert, Stephen W., 58357A.
Gilbreath, James B., 62230A.
Giles, Warner, 66336A.
Gillespie, Fred D., 65741A.
Gillette, George P., Jr., 66133A.
Gilliland, James N., 61528A.
Gillis, Richard F., 66342A.
Gilstrap, John W., Jr., 30029A.
Gingrich, Franklin J., Jr., 58642A.
Gionis, Nicholas G., 30030A.
Gladis, Donald C., 65779A.
Glass, Carter M., 30031A.
Glazier, Dean H., 58631A.
Gleason, John T., Jr., 30032A.
Gleneck, Norman T., 30033A.
Glyphis, Benedict E., 30034A.
Gober, Edmund S., 58434A.
Gober, Paul D., 30035A.
Gochnauer, James R., 65270A.
Godfrey, Vernon L., 66322A.
Godwin, John B., Jr., 54973A.
Goff, Ewing P., 58658A.
Goggins, William B., Jr., 30036A.
Goldberg, Edward H., 3d, 62138A.
Golightly, Robert D., 58255A.
Golob, David R., 58625A.
Gomez, Ben I., 62158A.
Gondran, Gerald J., 65905A.
Gonzales, Conrad C., 50157A.
Good, Benjamin F., 63675A.
Goodall, Harry A., 62300A.
Gooderham, James R., 61520A.
Goodfellow, James F., 65161A.
Goodnight, James L., 66140A.
Goodrich, Jerome C., 65218A.
Goodwin, Flay O., Jr., 30037A.
Goodwin, Reginald S., Jr., 32543A.
Goodwin, Thomas P., Jr., 58762A.
Gookin, Richard B., 62286A.
Gopsill, Kenneth M., Jr., 51442A.
Gordon, Kendall E., 65891A.
Gorgas, William S., 65399A.
Gorter, Robert, 50083A.
Gosnell, Bruce A., 61462A.
Goss, Eugene T., Jr., 65272A.
Gottlieb, Lawrence K., 66162A.
Goubert, Peter A., 65765A.
Goudy, Dennis L., 50124A.
Gowen, Richard J., 32534A.
Grace, Joe B., 65342A.
Graham, Bruce M., Jr., 54858A.
Graham, James L., 65657A.
Grant, Dow B., 58521A.
Gravitte, Connie M., 65264A.
Gray, Donald L., 58581A.
Gray, John A., 66353A.
Gray, Joseph A., 61592A.
Green, Bruce A., 32290A.
Green, Charles K., 58455A.
Green, Stephen D., 65801A.
Green, Thomas C., 58633A.
Greenan, Robert E., 65367A.
Greene, Abbott O., 65675A.
Greenhalge, Kenneth E., 65181A.
Greenwood, Charles D., 65448A.
Greer, Lee V., 58671A.
Gregorios, Basil D., 62188A.
Gregory, Leland H., Jr., 65292A.
Gresham, Darrel R., 58477A.
Greshel, James T., 61568A.
Grieger, Donald L., 54777A.
Griffies, William H., 65569A.
Griffin, Donald G., 61593A.
Griffin, William J., 61578A.
Grim, Harry J., 50175A.
Grissman, Robert J., 58716A.
Groeninger, Donald P., 66075A.
Grotte, Richard A., 61495A.
Groves, James T., 3d, 61516A.
Groves, Louise L., 62105W.
Grubb, Roderic R., 65508A.
Gruber, George T., 62200A.
Gryder, Robert J., 65141A.
Grygotis, Joseph E., Jr., 65350A.
Gude, William W., 30038A.
Guest, Tommy D., 58577A.
Gullick, Thomas E., 66175A.
Gustafson, Freddie A., 61556A.
Gustafson, Leighton E., 58248A.
Gutchess, Robert, 32297A.
Guthals, Wesley J., 65507A.
Guthrie, Gerald D., 65170A.
Haag, James I., 54763A.
Haber, Frederich J., 65317A.
Hable, Richard G., 66158A.
Hackman, Richard A., 65626A.
Hackney, Hunter F., 65287A.
Hadl, Frank M., Jr., 65225A.
Haerle, Peter J., 58768A.
Haertel, Hermann, 51456A.
Hagen, James F., 32522A.
Haight, Lawrence D., 62258A.
Halachis, John, 62179A.
Hale, Alan B., 32524A.
Haliday, James T., 51426A.
Hall, Charles R., 58550A.
Hall, James F., 57298A.
Hall, Keith N., 61501A.
Hall, Michael D., 58759A.
Hall, Robert N., 71231A.
Hally, Thomas J., 66285A.
Halsey, Samuel A., Jr., 65662A.
Hamilton, William M., 65283A.
Hamm, William P., 30040A.
Hammond, Claude G., Jr., 30041A.
Hammond, George R., 66153A.
Hamrick, Paul A., 58327A.
Hancher, Fred, 65480A.
Hand, Norbert R., Jr., 54738A.
Hanford, John O., 30042A.
Hankins, Donald J., 58665A.
Hanlon, David E., 58393A.
Hanna, Joseph W., 32238A.
Hanner, Ronald V., 65254A.
Hanrahan, Edward B., 65534A.
Hansborough, John W., Jr., 30043A.
Hansen, Ernest L., 54730A.
Hargis, Jerry W., 65162A.
Hargrove, Willis L., 58790A.
Harlan, Maurice R., 65200A.
Harlow, Giles D., Jr., 30046A.
Harmon, Kenneth T., 66275A.
Harms, William R., 71540A.
Harner, Ronald L., 66129A.
Harp, Kelly M., 30047A.
Harper, James W., Jr., 66111A.
Harrington, Cyrus R., Jr., 50225A.
Harrington, Robert N., 65775A.
Harris, Eddie W., 66321A.
Harris, Elmer R., 30048A.
Harris, George E., Jr., 62303A.
Harris, Harry G., 58648A.
Harris, James K., 54726A.
Harris, Richard G., 65674A.
Harris, Robert D., 58788A.
Harrison, Corbet L., 58610A.
Harry, Lee R., 65186A.
Hartke, Richard H., 58361A.
Hartman, Delano W., 62072A.
Hartman, Nathan, 62104A.
Harvey, Thomas E., 29904A.
Harwell, William P., 51440A.
Hatch, Louis G., 65901A.
Haupt, Howard F., 2d, 30050A.
Hausmann, Frank W., 65580A.
Hawkins, Benjamin R., 65477A.
Hawkins, Douglas W., 65649A.
Hawkins, James R., 62294A.
Hayes, Charles F., 62152A.
Hayes, Charles K., Jr., 65131A.
Haynes, James E., Jr., 58288A.
Haynes, William J., 62292A.
Hazelrigs, Maurice L., 30051A.

Head, William, 65669A.
Hearn, Norman E., 32232A.
Heath, Mark C., Jr., 30052A.
Heathcote, James A., 65502A.
Heckler, Archibald J., Jr., 30053A.
Hedge, Richard W., 62220A.
Heidlebaugh, Gary I., 58420A.
Heilala, Gary A., 48540A.
Heim, Noel A., 58265A.
Helinski, Florian D., 65359A.
Hellings, Frazier J., 58242A.
Helm, Jack, 66176A.
Helm, Merritt M., Jr., 65216A.
Helvie, Gail D., 51431A.
Hemingway, Donald P., 65450A.
Hemphill, Dewey K., 71673A.
Henderson, Billy R., 65696A.
Henderson, Bobby L., 65632A.
Henderson, Jesse J., 58584A.
Henderson, Lowell A., 58718A.
Henderson, Ronald F., 50150A.
Hendricks, Roy J., 65791A.
Hendrickson, Dale R., 66314A.
Hendrix, Jack L., 58694A.
Henjum, Joseph, Jr., 65678A.
Henkin, Ernest, 58708A.
Henry, Eugene M., 54770A.
Henry, Reynold N., 65376A.
Henry, Robert L., 65749A.
Hensel, Robert E., 65906A.
Henson, William E., 65635A.
Herbes, Robert A., 65611A.
Herculson, Robert J., Jr., 58764A.
Herman, Roy E., 58508A.
Hermanson, Robert F., 58653A.
Herring, John C., 61474A.
Herrmann, Armin F., Jr., 65302A.
Hershon, Alan B., 62192A.
Herzik, Jack E., 69724A.
Heske, William J., 30054A.
Hess, Stanley R., 62227A.
Hesse, Jack E., Jr., 30055A.
Hesse, Kenneth R., 54779A.
Hesse, Roderick L., 65153A.
Heston, Earl T., 65258A.
Hetherington, Robert B., 62128A.
Heverly, Robert E., 58761A.
Hickey, Thomas J., 61576A.
Hickman, Vincent J., 58450A.
Hickok, Robert L., 66134A.
Hicks, Robert W., 65285A.
Higgins, Norman A., 62112A.
High, John M., 3d, 66308A.
Hightower, Jane H., 61496W.
Hilgenberg, Gerald T., 65282A.
Hilgenberg, John F., 65715A.
Hill, Charles E., 65160A.
Hill, Cleo L., Jr., 71240A.
Hill, James T., 58488A.
Hill, Loyd V., 65519A.
Hill, Thomas D., 48555A.
Hill, William B., 58232A.
Hillyer, George W., 3d, 61471A.
Hinderliter, Stephen B., 61454A.
Hindman, Charles U., 30056A.
Hines, John W., 65875A.
Hinken, David F., 65358A.
Hinson, Travis L., 65486A.
Hintgen, Roland L., 66063A.
Hirst, Donald L., 30057A.
Hiskey, Bernell L., 65845A.
Hixson, Allen D., 62238A.
Hobbs, Terrence E., 30058A.
Hocker, Ronald A., 32306A.
Hockett, George R., 66188A.
Hockney, James N., 30059A.
Hodge, William E., 30060A.
Hodges, Bob P., 62175A.
Hodges, Seth B., 65372A.
Hodgins, Frederick J., 65911A.
Hodgson, Jerry D., 51541A.
Hoenig, William B., Jr., 65598A.
Hoffhien, Nils R., 65520A.
Hoffman, Joseph C., 66122A.
Hogendorf, Heinrich F., 58349A.
Hogg, Walter L., 30061A.
Hoke, George J., Jr., 32530A.
Holderbach, Alfred T. R., 58246A.
Holland, Curtis W., 65517A.
Hollarn, Thomas J., 50145A.
Hollingsworth, Joe P., 69702A.
Holman, Orville E., Jr., 54780A.
Holmes, James E., 50138A.
Holmquist, Richard A., 71242A.
Holt, Leigh M., 66109A.
Holt, Raymond J., 62244A.
Honan, Martin F., Jr., 58699A.
Hood, Robert N., 62066A.
Hooker, Charles W., 58362A.
Hopkins, David D., 65682A.
Hopper, John P., 58688A.
Hopper, Richard W., 62162A.
Hopson, James F., 65303A.
Horn, James R., 66232A.
Horne, Keith G., 65279A.
Horney, Warren R., 54748A.
Horvath, Joseph L., 58503A.
Hosea, William H., 62221A.
Hostvedt, David H., 65639A.
Hotchkiss, Clayton E., 65304A.
Houck, Fern L., 65224A.
Hough, Robert J., 65787A.
Houldsworth, Donald C., 61468A.
Hover, Robert C., 66287A.
Hovingh, James G., 66177A.
Howard, Donald P., 71244A.
Howe, Orrin K., Jr., 65133A.
Howell, Douglas W., Jr., 30064A.
Hoy, Walter S., 58487A.
Hubbard, Lawrence R., 65386A.
Hubert, David C., 71245A.
Hudgens, Hoyt M., 65163A.
Huffaker, Stephen L., 61498A.
Hughes, Harley A., 58684A.
Hughes, Harold B., 58685A.
Hughes, Harold M., 65202A.
Hughes, John D., 58554A.
Hughes, Larry B., 54774A.
Hugo, Walter D., Jr., 58176A.
Huguley, Donald L., 30065A.
Huie, Richard V., 30066A.
Hull, Chad T., 65280A.
Hulnick, Arthur S., 62174A.
Humphrey, Charles H., Jr., 32539A.
Humphries, Thomas G., 65273A.
Hunger, Francis D., 71248A.
Hunt, Thomas A., 65543A.
Hunter, Peter A., 65378A.
Hunter, William R., 62276A.
Huntley, David C., 66300A.
Hurlburt, Richard G., 30067A.
Hurn, William P., 58765A.
Hurst, Gerald B., 65559A.
Huss, Webb H., Jr., 61427A.
Ingle, Jack C., 65874A.
Ingram, Campbell B., 65646A.
Ivey, James C., Jr., 58482A.
Jackson, Clifford M., 58313A.
Jackson, Jerry D., 58258A.
Jackson, Orville H., Jr., 65680A.
Jackson, Rollin A., Jr., 65481A.
Jacoby, Jackie L., 66213A.
Jagrowski, Gerald L., 30068A.
Jaicks, Fredrick B., 61506A.
Jamieson, James R., 54690A.
Jamieson, Richard V., 58720A.
Janota, Paul, 51398A.
Jans, Orvel K., 54157A.
Jansen, Charles W., 65401A.
Janssen, Larry D., 65667A.
Jarrett, John W., 65796A.
Jefferson, Donald E., 58654A.
Jenerette, William D., Jr., 50084A.
Jenkins, Ernest L., Jr., 30069A.
Jenkins, Frank R., 58635A.
Jenkins, James R., 65325A.
Jennings, Charlie J., 58384A.
Jensen, Albert G., 65536A.
Jensen, Ronald J., 30071A.
Jensen, Stanley F., 30072A.
Jensen, Ted W., 62293A.
Jerman, Robert G., 51542A.
Jernigan, Edward E., 65135A.
Jessen, Richard H., 58235A.
John, Lemuel N., Jr., 65137A.
John, Lynn M., 65253A.
Johns, Clyde L., 58733A.
Johnson, Douglas A., 58677A.
Johnson, Edward H., 65219A.
Johnson, Ernest C., 58389A.
Johnson, Gary L., 61440A.
Johnson, Harold C., 62075A.
Johnson, James R., Jr., 65251A.
Johnson, Joe E., 71679A.
Johnson, John A., 65548A.
Johnson, John T., 65505A.
Johnson, Kenneth R., 71543A.
Johnson, Larry D., 58725A.
Johnson, Richard B., Jr., 65701A.
Johnson, Robert D., 65409A.
Johnson, Robert H., 58667A.
Johnson, Ronald K., 58655A.
Johnson, Stewart W., 61483A.
Johnson, Theodore E., 58264A.
Johnson, William F., 58518A.
Johnston, John E., 65494A.
Johnston, Roy C., 58583A.
Jones, Bobbie L., 65722A.
Jones, Charles W., 30075A.
Jones, Donald E., 30076A.
Jones, Donald L., 50079A.
Jones, Donald W., 65381A.
Jones, Edmund B., 50148A.
Jones, Edward F., 65312A.
Jones, Harold L., 65525A.
Jones, James T., 71254A.
Jones, Marvin L., 58502A.
Jones, Robert D., 66231A.
Jones, Robert L., Jr., 30077A.
Jones, Thomas N., 58254A.
Jones, Wayne W., 58560A.
Jones, Wilbur R., 65640A.
Jones, William A., 65433A.
Jorgensen, Robert L., 65816A.
Jorgensen, Wesley H., 62132A.
Jowers, William L., 66200A.
Jowett, Francis W., Jr., 50116A.
Junker, Joseph P., 30078A.
Kaa, William A., 58512A.
Kagarise, John D., 58414A.
Kahler, George E., 66187A.
Kaiser, Edward S., 65813A.
Kalbfleisch, Darrel K., 65512A.
Kaminski, Joseph J., 65228A.
Kandle, Charles K., 62123A.
Kane, Donald G., 58424A.
Karch, Clifford A., 65432A.
Karges, Donald D., 58498A.
Karlquist, Charles G., 58530A.
Karpen, Donald J., 66291A.
Karr, Donald R., 62257A.
Kast, Henry G., 54761A.
Kastenholz, Adolph, Jr., 65210A.
Kathcart, Rex, Jr., 66247A.
Kauffman, Robert J., 64289A.
Kavinsky, John E., Jr., 66067A.
Kazanjian, Ramon J., 62186A.
Keating, James H., Jr., 62291A.
Keating, Michael R., 30079A.
Keating, Robert J., 58513A.
Keeler, Harper B., 30080A.
Keenan, John H., Jr., 65776A.
Keffer, Tony W., 66216A.
Keller, Wendell R., 58358A.
Keller, William M., 71257A.
Kelley, Robert R., 65267A.
Kelley, Thomas R., 66195A.
Kellogg, Verna S., 2d, 58500W.
Kellokoski, David E., 66157A.
Kelly, Allan J., 58350A.
Kelly, Dana K., 58398A.
Kelly, Gary G., 65382A.
Kelly, John J., 30081A.
Kelly, Nolan R., 65910A.
Kelly, Robert B., 62190A.
Kelm, James E., 54316A.
Kelsey, David S., 61511A.
Kenagy, Lloyd N., 61566A.
Kendall, Robert N., Jr., 65740A.
Kennedy, George J., Jr., 62147A.
Kennedy, Leland T., 65194A.
Kennedy, Richard E., 62155A.
Kennedy, Stanley O., 65603A.
Kennedy, William C., 58045A.
Kenney, Jack W., 62099A.
Kerr, John W., 58611A.
Kerr, Robert R., Jr., 54823A.
Kerrigan, Vincent M., 30082A.
Keyes, Bert R., Jr., 66250A.
Kibbey, Richard A., 58689A.
Kidd, Clifford S., 3d, 54806A.

Kidwell, Howard W., 66330A.
Kiefel, Ernst P., Jr., 65862A.
Kilbourne, Jimmy W., 65288A.
Kimball, Harry H., 65369A.
Kincaid, Don B., 65683A.
Kinder, Charles R., 65128A.
King, Jack E., 58773A.
King, Norwood J., 65346A.
Kingry, Sidney K., 66233A.
Kingston, Thomas F., 3d, 66268A.
Kinney, Raymond C., 71259A.
Kinnunen, Clifford A., 50125A.
Kiplinger, Keith E., 32508A.
Kirk, Joe R., 58476A.
Kirk, Leon S., 50088A.
Kirkland, Galen R., 58160A.
Kirkpatrick, Richard C., 65803A.
Kirmss, Frank, Jr., 51428A.
Kirnberger, Richard J., 54754A.
Kirste, Milton R., 65281A.
Kittinger, James D., 58555A.
Kjeldgaard, Louis D., 58639A.
Kleperis, John V., 58531A.
Klump, George K., 65799A.
Kmetz, Warren W., 50074A.
Knight, James F., 30083A.
Knutson, Dennis G., 71766A.
Knutzen, William A., 65671A.
Koelling, Richard W., 65656A.
Koenig, Donald F., 54740A.
Koerner, William L., 58769A.
Koestner, James E., 65564A.
Kohlhaas, Richard L., 61589A.
Kohut, Joseph, 58319A.
Kolacz, Paul A., 50207A.
Konyn, Bernard J., 65700A.
Koppenhaver, Donald N., 58484A.
Koski, Ramon R., 65398A.
Kovacs, John A., 58719A.
Kovacs, Stephen F., 66292A.
Krafft, Gottfried H. G., 30086A.
Kranz, John S., 58649A.
Kraus, Edwin J., 65314A.
Kreger, Kenneth W., 61490A.
Krejci, James J., 54753A.
Kressin, Lorrell A., 65735A.
Kroening, Harry J., 62067A.
Krone, Norris J., Jr., 65365A.
Kroppach, James R., 51484A.
Krull, Larry D., 50128A.
Kruller, Adrian W., 62121A.
Krupinski, Joseph A., 65151A.
Ksycewski, Joseph C., 30087A.
Kubala, Ferdinand J., 65641A.
Kuhl, Robert G., 65711A.
Kuhns, Thomas J., 50089A.
Kunz, Donald A., 62068A.
Kunz, Ronald R., 65298A.
Kuplins, Arnis J., 66099A.
Kurrus, Elmer E., Jr., 65418A.
Kutulas, John E., 54807A.
Kutyna, Donald J., 30088A.
Kuzmeski, Philip J., 66193A.
Kyne, Charles K., Jr., 69801A.
Labonte, Richard L., 66080A.
Labrake, Donald F., 60955A.
Lacasse, Joseph W., 50121A.
Lace, William H., 62161A.
Laehr, Arthur E., 62213A.
Lafollette, Harvey W., 62237A.
Lafollette, William R., 62307A.
Lally, Richard H., 30089A.
Lamb, Amherst R., 30090A.
Lambert, Luther E., 32310A.
Lammers, Kurt M., 54851A.
Landers, Bobbie J., 32303A.
Langmead, Thomas T., 62215A.
Lannon, Cormac M., 30091A.
Lapierre, Edward A., 54746A.
Lapp, Martin F., 61444A.
Laquey, Allan R., 66315A.
Larson, Eugene L., 30092A.
Lasiter, Carl W., 66064A.
Latham, Patricia D., 61521W.
Latus, Michael B., 61442A.
Laughary, Dorris E., 65849A.
Laur, William A., 58338A.
Lavis, Michael P., 58579A.
Lawson, Charles W., 61587A.
Lawton, Timothy G., 30094A.
Leach, Harold D., 66228A.
Leatherwood, Albert B., Jr., 66244A.
Leblanc, Lynn L., 58527A.
Leclerc, Richard D., 66253A.
Lee, Norman W., Jr., 66152A.
Leet, Albert C., 58702A.
Legate, Gail L., 32510A.
Lehigh, Donald L., 71265A.
Lehman, Charles A., 61460A.
Lehman, Hilbert C., 30095A.
Lemanowicz, Thomas E., 66351A.
Lennox, John F., 62107A.
Lenz, William A., 66070A.
Leonard, Carl R., 61487A.
Leppert, Milton H., 58368A.
Lerner, Maynard G., 62242A.
Lesser, John, Jr., 61502A.
Leverette, Robert R., 61508A.
Levis, John A., 62131A.
Lewand, Marc E., 58748A.
Lewark, William H., Jr., 50169A.
Lewis, Billy J., 58339A.
Lewis, Roger C., 62226A.
Lewis, Victor L., 66116A.
Ley, Roger P., 32298A.
Liberatori, Francis J., 62069A.
Lifsey, Truman W., 51487A.
Linder, Ronald G., 30097A.
Lindley, Ernest K., 66296A.
Lindquist, Jay D., 30098A.
Lineberger, Harold B., 50223A.
Lingo, Brooks E., 58700A.
Linihan, William E., 2d, 65352A.
Lininger, Ronald L., 62169A.
Lippemeier, Robert G., 58297A.
Litalien, Maurice J., 54859A.
Little, Charles P., 50117A.
Litzler, Albert F., Jr., 66119A.
Livenspargar, George E., 66154A.
Llewellyn, Arden C., Jr., 30099A.
Lobuglio, Richard J., 50972A.
Lofgren, John R. A., 50097A.
Logan, Albert L., 54847A.
Logeais, Donald A., 58664A.
Long, Joseph F., 65195A.
Long, Steven W., Jr., 58496A.
Long, William G., 3d, 66249A
Lord, Ronald H., 51548A.
Lott, Dorman H., 61544A.
Lott, Quitman W., 58612A.
Lovelace, Charles K., 50142A.
Lowe, Theodore F., Jr., 66226A.
Lowry, John R., 58491A.
Lowry, Stanley M., 51454A.
Loy, Ronald L., 63042A.
Lucas, Billy D., 61048A.
Lucas, Ray E., 30100A.
Luetgens, Robert E., 62133A.
Luethke, Fred W., Jr., 32309A.
Lukstat, Richard H., 50193A.
Lumry, Kenneth R., 65769A.
Lupenski, Alex P., 65793A.
Lusk, Wilbur C., 54796A.
Lyall, Donald B., 66047A.
Lynch, Curtis R., 58325A.
Lynch, John J., 66273A.
Lynde, Nelson M., 3d, 30101A.
Lyon, Donavan L., 58463A.
Macchi, Peter J., 58532A.
Macentee, Andrew B., 65858A.
Macintosh, Robert M., Jr., 51488A.
Mack, Joseph B., Jr., 30102A.
Madden, Florence G., 54735W.
Madden, Neil B., 58627A.
Madison, Joseph B. H., 30103A.
Madison, Leland P., 58678A.
Magleby, Carvel V., 62079A.
Magner, Arthur L., 62252A.
Magnuson, Harold R., 58529A.
Maheu, Robert F., 50090A.
Mahoney, John D., 65762A.
Malahy, Vernon M., Jr., 32545A.
Mallette, Elmer, Jr., 66178A.
Malloy, William M., 50099A.
Malynn, Edward E., 30105A.
Manhart, Hershel W., 65753A.
Manning, Frank M., 66218A.
Manning, John M., 66189A.
Mapes, Claude P., 66307A.
Marcum, Lawrence F., 65860A.
Margenthaler, Charles R., 62119A.
Markham, Robert F., 30106A.
Marks, Donald L., 66225A.
Marks, Morton H., 30107A.
Markwood, Calvin H., 32528A.
Marples, Robert D., 58679A.
Marshall, Patrick G., 62296A.
Martin, Billy, Jr., 58522A.
Martin, James R., 65686A.
Martin, Jimmie D., 66095A.
Martin, Joseph G., 58302A.
Martin, Paul H., 62281A.
Martinson, Otto B., Jr., 54838A.
Martucci, Louis M., 58251A.
Marvin, Addison L., Jr., 65876A.
Massar, Cyril L. J., 30109A.
Mathias, Richard J., Jr., 71558A.
Mathieson William J., 58743A.
Matthews, John A., 66290A.
Matthys, Leroy D., 66245A.
Maves, Roger E., 58340A.
Mavrotheris, Nicholas A., 29158A.
May, Hollis B., Jr., 58796A.
May, Robert E., 65719A.
Mayo, Robert E., 50146A.
Mays, Melvin W., 58805A.
Mazik, Robert A., 30111A.
McBride, Charles W., 65815A.
McCallson, Gaylord A., 50229A.
McCannon, Russell E., 66272A.
McCarthy, James P., 62273A.
McCarty, Donald R., 65852A.
McCausland, Charles, 58588A.
McCausland, Roger W., 58704A.
McClanahan, John W., 30112A.
McClaren, Kenneth R., 58603A.
McClintock, Russell J., 61437A.
McCluney, Cliff A., Jr., 58495A.
McCormick, Dennis A., 30113A.
McCormick, Donald K., 54739A.
McCoy, Donald G., 30114A.
McCoy, John F., 58442A.
McCoy, Raymond S., 62076A.
McCoy, Robert P., 30115A.
McCracken, Hugh D., Jr., 66283A.
McDaniel, George B., 62236A.
McDermith, Clark M., 71560A.
McDonald, Charles C., 61574A.
McDonald, Ronald D., Jr., 58737A.
McDonald, Walter R., 58494A.
McDonough, Peter J., 66343A.
McElroy, Joseph H., Jr., 58568A.
McFadden, Richard A., Jr., 71561A.
McFeron, Ernest, 66049A.
McGhee, Bernice, 66338W.
McGill, Robert, 71271A.
McGovern, William F., 58316A.
McGraw, Jessie M., 66089W.
McGrew, Ralph L., 58228A.
McIndoo, Philip L., 66212A.
McIntyre, Owen O., 30118A.
McKean, John S., 30119A.
McKemie, George W., 30120A.
McKenney, John S., 62172A.
McKeown, Frank J., 58585A.
McKinney, Carl A., Jr., 58810A.
McKinzie, John W., 32521A.
McKoy, William G., Jr., 50189A.
McLaurin, Floyd A., 50194A.
McLean, Rodney W., 65840A.
McMahon, Bernard E., 62290A.
McMahon, Robert J., 30121A.
McMahon, Thomas V., 30122A.
McMahon, William W., 30123A.
McMillian, James C., 3d, 54714A.
McMullin, Robert L., 58643A.
McMurray, Charles A., Jr., 65865A.
McNeil, Lawrence F., 30124A.
McNeill, Frederick W., 32293A.
McPeak, Merrill A., 58758A.
McPherson, Dale R., 65575A.
McSpadden, John D., Jr., 30125A.
McWhorter, James K., 66144A.
Mead, Charles S., 62103A.
Means, Lawrence C., 58256A.
Meek, Forrest P., 66179A.
Meiler, Eugene A., 61530A.
Melancon, Clyde J., 66136A.
Melichar, Joseph F., 58372A.
Mellon, William L., Jr., 61526A.
Melly, Thomas S., 58517A.
Menees, James S., Jr., 66299A.
Menefee, Clayton L., 61510A.
Merck, Edward M., 66265A.

Meredith, Ernest R., 54750A.
Merrihew, Gary R., 58647A.
Merritt, Norman L., 65870A.
Merritt, Willis H., Jr., 65805A.
Mestemacher, James L., 54692A.
Metz, Richard S., 71687A.
Metzger, Alfred W., Jr., 64291A.
Meyer, David W., 58703A.
Meyer, John N., 65881A.
Meyer, Richard O., 61541A.
Meyerholt, William H., 30127A.
Meyers, Jerome A., 30128A.
Michel, Donald D., 58549A.
Mihelcic, Henry M., 32518A.
Milam, Bobby L., 71688A.
Miles, Richard J., 58310A.
Miles, Victor J., Jr., 48547A.
Millar, Douglas L., 66204A.
Miller, Donald L., 30129A.
Miller, Donald L., 58624A.
Miller, Ernest T., Jr., 54803A.
Miller, George H., 65878A.
Miller, Jerry P., 54795A.
Miller, John J., 62181A.
Miller, Rene J., Jr., 58401A.
Miller, Stanley J., 61553A.
Miller, William R., 54695A.
Milligan, Alexander M., 4th, 62210A.
Milliken, Donald J., 66065A.
Mills, Darrel L., 54749A.
Miner, Norman E., Jr., 30130A.
Minko, Michael E., 62264A.
Misenheimer, Philip L., 51432A.
Mitchell, Bruce K., 61547A.
Mize, Oran D., 65855A.
Mizner, James J., 65788A.
Moffatt, Jack F., 65751A.
Mog, Willis L., 70997A.
Mohler, Harlan J., 58415A.
Mohn, William T., Jr., 30131A.
Mohr, William F., Jr., 54981A.
Molina, Leopoldo, 58423A.
Mollicone, Richard A., 30132A.
Molnar, Barry A., 65811A.
Montgomery, Glen D., 32233A.
Monto, Olgert V., 30133A.
Moomau, Fred T., Jr., 65754A.
Moore, Billy L., 54976A.
Moore, Donald L., 54969A.
Moore, Donald L., 50168A.
Moore, Hubert C., 65717A.
Moore, Richard A., 71787A.
Moore, Robert G., 66121A.
Mooring, James W., 30134A.
Mooy, Olin R., 58413A.
Moran, Carroll G., 58462A.
Morch, Herbert O., 58475A.
Morelle, Frederic T., 32299A.
Morey, William F., 66223A.
Morgan, Arvel R., 61449A.
Morgan, Dale H., 71691A.
Morgan, Harold W., Jr., 62235A.
Morgan, Leonard W., 58726A.
Morgan, Robert W., 58341A.
Morgan, William H., 58237A.
Morozzo, Robert E., 65827A.
Morphew, Elery P., 58363A.
Morris, Charles M., 62193A.
Morris, David B., 58523A.
Morris, Don L., 32302A.
Morris, Krendall E., 58239A.
Morris, Robert K., 54985A.
Morrison, Billie E., 64290A.
Morrissey, Robert D., 32557A.
Morrow, John C., 62111A.
Morrow, Robert B., Jr., 30135A.
Morthland, Samuel, 30136A.
Morton, Allan W., 54788A.
Morton, Lajuana J., 58318W.
Moser, Richard E., 58553A.
Mountcastle, Russell C., Jr., 62299A.
Mouton, Gerald L., 61539A.
Mowbray, Joe A., 65885A.
Moyer, Donald L., 58369A.
Muckelbauer, Robert R., 61546A.
Muesegaes, Frederick G., 32304A.
Mullins, William H. L., 30138A.
Mullis, Harvey D., 2d, 69703A.
Murphy, Dean M., 61494A.
Murphy, James R., 30139A.
Murphy, Lawrence J., 30140A.
Murphy, William J., 30141A.
Murray, Donald A., 65903A.
Murray, Jack R., 58713A.
Murray, Michael P., Jr., 65871A.
Murray, Reginald A., 61532A.
Murton, Dana K., 66164A.
Mustico, Richard J., 51559A.
Myer, Jonathan, 58309A.
Myers, Clarence C., Jr., 66180A.
Myers, Eugene G., 62087A.
Myers, James T., 58252A.
Nail, John D., Jr., 58279A.
Nall, Luther M., 71565A.
Nash, Charles M., Jr., 65620A.
Neal, Donald W., 61581A.
Neal, Gene E., 65538A.
Neal, Thomas A., 62196A.
Nedbalek, Leon C., 50172A.
Neff, Donald L., 62243A.
Neher, Harold V. J., 62093A.
Nelson, Charles C., Jr., 58797A.
Nelson, Eric B., 48541A.
Nelson, Fred R., 58511A.
Nelson, Harold, Jr., 61505A.
Nelson, Jimmie H., 58732A.
Nesbitt, Duane H., 65914A.
Neville, William D., 58629A.
Newburger, Gerald A., 58306A.
Newman, John D., 30142A.
Newman, Roy I., Jr., 65143A.
Newsome, John W., 58659A.
Newton, Jerome L., 61457A.
Nicholas, Donald G., 58668A.
Nicholas, George R., 58342A.
Nichols, Brady W., 65529A.
Nicolai, Leland M., 50102A.
Nielson, Merrill G., 62141A.
Niemeyer, James E., 66340A.
Nikkola, Edward F., 30143A.
Nimmo, Edward H., 62149A.
Nisley, Kermit J., Jr., 58399A.
Noble, James H., 65310A.
Norberg, Michael E., 65193A.
Nordin, Frederick R., 51433A.
Norman, Robert A., 58641A.
Norwood, Charles E., 65785A.
Novak, Donald P., 54767A.
Nowacki, William F., 62211A.
Nowotny, Albert J., 48557A.
Nycum, William G., 71283A.
Nygaard, George M., 58464A.
Nystuen, Benjamin B., 54846A.
Oberg, Duane C., 66260A.
Oberst, John R., 65742A.
O'Brien, Robert J., Jr., 62126A.
O'Connor, George P., Jr., 58261A.
O'Connor, John H., Jr., 29903A.
Odle, Max L., 58547A.
Officer, Upton D., 54845A.
Offill, Phillip W., 58686A.
Ogas, John B., 30144A.
O'Grady, John W., 30145A.
Ohlemeier, Rex P., 61484A.
Oken, Arthur J., 65619A.
Oldfield, Wayne H., 30146A.
Oldnettle, Eldon F., 62301A.
Olmstead, Freeman B., 54818A.
Olmsted, Terry F., 61435A.
Olsen, Paul O., 30147A.
Olsen, Thomas R., 61438A.
Olson, Gerald R., 66316A.
Olson, Wayne A., 66117A.
Olvera, Jose J., 30148A.
O'Malley, Thomas E., 61446A.
O'Neil, Joseph W., 30149A.
Orndorff, John W., 65828A.
Orsini, Richard A., 54760A.
Oshiro, John K., 58263A.
Osley, Ronald P., 58241A.
Osuchowski, Edward A., Jr., 71284A.
Oswald, Lamont J., 54809A.
Overlock, John F., 32520A.
Ownbey, C. Jimmie, 65763A.
Ownbey, Marvin H., 66090A.
Pace, David H., 58468A.
Padgett, James M., 71285A.
Padgett, James P., 71286A.
Pagani, Albert L., 30150A.
Page, William F. H., 30151A.
Paiva, Virgil J., 65790A.
Palanek, Edward J., 30152A.
Paliszewski, Ernest B., 58320A.
Palka, Joseph F., 58727A.
Palmer, Harry E., Jr., 71287A.
Pamplin, Raymond M., 62163A.
Papaccio, Philip N., 30153A.
Paparozzi, Frank A., Jr., 65758A.
Parent, Michael G., 54756A.
Parker, Bruce M., 58741A.
Parker, Joseph A., Jr., 58705A.
Parkinson, Bradford W., 30154A.
Parks, Howard F., 65794A.
Parrish, Roger K., 58680A.
Partridge, Thomas H., 65848A.
Pastorius, Alan S., 50109A.
Patch, Donald C., 32301A.
Patrick, Robert B., 30155A.
Patterson, Don A., 58351A.
Patterson, Douglas, 30156A.
Patton, David D., 65720A.
Patty, Robert J., 66072A.
Paul, Herbert D., 61500A.
Paul, Richard D., 66267A.
Pavik, Junior A., 54375A.
Paxson, James B., Jr., 65912A.
Payne, Charles H., 71289A.
Peachey, Malcolm T., Jr., 65362A.
Peake, Oliver J., 30157A.
Pease, Ralph W., 66171A.
Peat, Randall D., 58322A.
Peck, David W., 50197A.
Pentz, Russell H., 51457A.
Perritano, Frank R., 54765A.
Perry, Ray A., 58352A.
Pestrichella, Alexander A., 65723A.
Peszynski, Paul R., 58538A.
Peters, Richard E., 57691A.
Peterson, Bruce J., 58573A.
Peterson, Dean C., 62125A.
Peterson, Don L., 66277A.
Peterson, Eldon L., 58619A.
Peterson, Fred H., 58736A.
Peterson, John W., 58645A.
Peterson, Robert L., 58674A.
Peterson, Ronald W., 30158A.
Petrik, William B., 62225A.
Petruno, Michael J., 30159A.
Pettit, Richard J., 62122A.
Petty, Fred A., 62117A.
Petty, Gerald L., 48544A.
Pharmer, Lamont H., 58734A.
Phelps, Harold A., Jr., 51551A.
Philips, Herbert L., 50122A.
Phillips, James L., 65309A.
Phillips, William F., 66102A.
Pichon, Kenneth W., 58343A.
Pickens, Jimmy B., 62251A.
Pierce, Myron S., Jr., 66126A.
Pierson, Richard A., 32308A.
Pine, David F., 62217A.
Pinjuv, Fred G., 66215A.
Pinkett, John R., 3d, 62176A.
Piper, Mahlon L., 54826A.
Piskos, George M., 66185A.
Pitts, William D., 62298A.
Pitzer, Lee R., 61473A.
Place, Stephen B., 30160A.
Platner, Bruce L., 65817A.
Platt, William P., 62106A.
Pleis, Roy F., 58598A.
Pocreva, Robert S., 62201A.
Poindexter, Harold R., 58539A.
Pokorny, Walter T., 61467A.
Polenske, Dale K., 58299A.
Polk, Jerry G., 58561A.
Pollock, Arnold H., 69759A.
Pomajevich, Robert J., 51500A.
Poole, Grover C., 58735A.
Poore, Richard T., 66332A.
Poorman, Donald L., 66077A.
Pope, William H., 30161A.
Porell, Alcide L., 62259A.
Porter, Eugene M., 58697A.
Porter, William D., 66220A.
Posey, Milton L., 50218A.
Potts, Peter T., 66319A.
Poulsen, Neils R., 50127A.
Powell, Furney, Jr., 32243A.
Pratt, Charles W., 66132A.
Pratt, Edward A., 58798A.
Prentis, Cecil G., 65856A.
Preston, Charles R., 58542A.

Preston, Raymond C., Jr., 54792A.
Price, Jerry O., 61458A.
Prichard, Leslie J., 30163A.
Prickett, Gary C., 69723A
Probst, Frederick N., Jr., 54689A.
Prochko, Robert J., 54758A.
Purdue, Joseph L., 54762A.
Putnam, Gerald W., 30164A.
Puzio, Frederick J., 62246A.
Pyle, George W., 65371A.
Quill, Edward B., Jr., 30165A.
Quinn, Thomas D., 58663A.
Rabe, Walter J., 30167A.
Ragan, Claude H., 65299A.
Ragsac, Albert, 54978A.
Ragsdale, Harry E., 58344A.
Ramberger, James H., 30168A.
Ramirez, Enrique H., 58623A.
Rapko, Michael, 54785A.
Rapp, Edward O., 58289A.
Rasmussen, Robert D., 51552A.
Ratcliff, Kenneth E., 71150A.
Ravetti, Louis R., 65747A.
Rawlings, Peter E., 54757A.
Ray, David P., 30169A.
Ray, Ronald G., 58243A.
Redd, Frank J., 30170A.
Redenbacher, Leon R., 58481A.
Redman, Allan R., 50080A.
Reed, Clyde W., 66261A.
Reed, David E., 66335A.
Reed, Gerald F., 65822A.
Reed, Lawrence L., 58489A.
Reep, Irvin E., 65766A.
Rees, William H., 54701A.
Reeves, Jack W., 54828A.
Regenhardt, John D., 30171A.
Reichert, Albert C., 66094A.
Reid, Robert D., 54794A.
Reigel, Donald E., 65883A.
Reilly, Leo B., Jr., 58613A.
Reiman, Roy H., 58282A.
Reinmiller, Ronald T., 54773A.
Remey, Robert A., 65895A.
Render, William E., 54734A.
Renshaw, Kenneth C., 66334A.
Rentner, Paul E., 61534A.
Repeta, Henry J., 65778A.
Retterbush, Gary L., 51599A.
Revelle, Jack B., 62168A.
Revisky, Robert J., 58280A.
Reyna, Jose G., 65726A.
Rhodes, Roger T., 65727A.
Rice, Bradley A., 51485A.
Rice, Herbert C., 30172A.
Richards, Gerald R., Jr., 65851A.
Richards, Jerry W., 62071A.
Richards, Kenneth J., 58287A.
Richards, William L., 58303A.
Richardson, Nathan T., Jr., 65665A.
Riddle, Owen W., 61537A.
Ridolfi, Richard R., 58781A.
Riebau, Walter R., 62304A.
Rieke, Don M., 58808A.
Riggs, Denton J., 62218A.
Riggs, James A., Jr., 58312A.
Riley, Leonard W., 3d, 58377A.
Rineheart, Benjamin J., 66266A.
Riner, James W., 70911A.
Ringler, William C., 30174A.
Rist, Harold D., 58435A.
Ritchie, Andrew S., 61538A.
Roath, William W., 50201A.
Robbins, Glen A., 66252A.
Roberts, Albert C., 50209A.
Roberts, Joe H., 66125A.
Roberts, Joseph W., 54715A.
Roberts, Kenneth V., 66138A.
Roberts, Philip T., 62267A.
Roberts, Raymond D., 71297A.
Robertson, Bill J., 54706A.
Robertson, Leon C., 66101A.
Robinson, James M., 50072A.
Roche, James E., 66269A.
Rodriguez, Robert, 30175A.
Roehm, Richard R., Jr., 62269A.
Rogers, Craven C., Jr., 30176A.
Rogers, Joe N., 54808A.
Roland, Carl J., 58456A.
Romig, Alan B., 51544A.
Rosenbaum, Warren F., 66208A.
Rosenberg, Robert A., 30178A.
Rosenglick, Marvin, 62302A.
Ross, Larry E., 66301A.
Rothman, Max, 54972A.
Rothwell, Roger D., 30180A.
Rounsaville, Glo L., 62153A.
Rowland, Donald D., 30181A.
Rowlands, Bruce H., 65866A.
Roysdon, Douglas A., 30182A.
Ruby, Earl C., Jr., 58356A.
Rucker, Dean A., 71298A.
Ruonala, John E., 58353A.
Ruple, Marion T., Jr., 61549A.
Rush, Thomas A., Jr., 30184A.
Russ, Robert M., 61472A.
Russell, James F., 30185A.
Russell, Robert R., 65417A.
Ruthman, Jerome E., 58710A.
Ryan, Glen A., 62108A.
Ryan, Robert E., 65786A.
Sahm, Menno J., 61497A.
Salaz, Fernando, Jr., 65784A.
Samborsky, Joseph M., 30187A.
Sammet, Peter H., 61559A.
Samson, Walter R., 61480A.
Sanders, James B., Jr., 58382A.
Sanders, Neil D., 62182A.
Sanders, Walter H., 58471A.
Sands, David A., 66155A.
Sands, Earl E., 61540A.
Sapp, Orrin L., 66148A.
Sargent, Gordon S., 50151A.
Savelle, Clarence J., 62274A.
Savickas, Donald V., 58272A.
Saylor, Arthur W., 61441A.
Sayre, Peter T., 61567A.
Scarbrough, Robert O., 54801A.
Scarff, James P., Jr., 62268A.
Schaare, Elmo T., 65587A.
Schafer, John V., Jr., 30188A.
Scheer, Roger P., 54800A.
Scheerer, Paul H., Jr., 61466A.
Schesser, William E., 58301A.
Schettler, Luttrell, 58617A.
Schiefelbein, Gordon W., 58799A.
Schmidt, Francis J., 58390A.
Schmidt, Frank J., Jr., 66100A.
Schmitendorf, James A., 65504A.
Schneider, Raymond A., 58270A.
Schneider, Stanley P., 61536A.
Schneider, Wayne K., 58767A.
Schnell, Walter A., 66059A.
Schoech, Howard A., 65557A.
Scholz, James J., 71300A.
Scholz, Joachim E., 51441A.
Schram, Robert F., 58330A.
Schroeder, Lawrence J., 54769A.
Schuessler, Patricia A., 54834W.
Schultis, Estel J., 62287A.
Schultz, Sterling E., 62178A.
Schumaker, Karl H., 65797A.
Schurr, Roger D., 48537A.
Schwab, Leonard D., 62101A.
Schwartz, William T., 66048A.
Schwartzman, Larry, 32519A.
Schwehm, Paul J., 30189A.
Scott, Charles D., 65286A.
Scott, John L., 62148A.
Scott, John L., 58600A.
Scott, Richard T., 65148A.
Scott, William R., Jr., 65308A.
Scow, Roger D., 66124A.
Scrivano, Peter J., 65847A.
Scronce, Nicholas E., 65894A.
Seamands, Donald L., 65138A.
Seaton, John D., 65823A.
Seats, John H., 65745A.
Seaver, David M., 65271A.
Seay, James T., 65300A.
Sebree, Franklin L., 65624A.
Seck, Charles W., 61573A.
Sedano, John M., 30190A.
Segrest, Claude H., Jr., 58570A.
Seh, Robert H., Jr., 58379A.
Seifert, William K., 58504A.
Seigal, John W., 54731A.
Seigler, Thomas G., 58286A.
Seinwill, Ronald W., 66311A.
Seits, Edward F., 66151A.
Self, Loy D., 58490A.
Semans, Michael F., 62097A.
Senac, Ronald C., 62157A.
Setnicky, John E., 30191A.
Sevebeck, James B., 58354A.
Shackelford, Billy F., 58564A.
Shanahan, Robert J., 65419A.
Shannon, Donald H., 62289A.
Sharkey, Raymond P., 65638A.
Sharp, James C., 58690A.
Sharp, John M., Jr., 54824A.
Sharpe, Charles B., 65829A.
Shearer, Edwin H., 2d, 66229A.
Sheats, Benton E., 58311A.
Sheely, William C., Jr., 54820A.
Shelton, Franklin D., 65278A.
Shelton, Richard L., 61548A.
Shelton, Thomas E., 62170A.
Shepherd, Glade E., 66206A.
Shepherd, Harry R., 65761A.
Shepherd, Hayward B., 66118A.
Shepherd, Ralph V., 61527A.
Sheppard, William E., 30193A.
Sherman, Donald H., 65411A.
Sherman, Vincent J., 66093A.
Shershun, Carroll S., 58800A.
Shickell, Keith D., 66123A.
Shinmori, Bill, 71302A.
Shipman, James E., 65188A.
Shipps, Gene E., 65576A.
Shirley, Carl S., 66076A.
Shockey, Samuel H., Jr., 58405A.
Shoemaker, Rollin R., 54768A.
Shoemaker, James A., 65438A.
Shortt, Oscar A., Jr., 65363A.
Showalter, Larry A., 58723A.
Shull, John A., 65843A.
Shuster, Steve, 58807A.
Shuttleworth, Jack M., 66254A.
Sibert, Robert C., 66181A.
Siburg, William E., Jr., 58534A.
Sickenberger, William L., 54693A.
Siderius, Jerome D., 62245A.
Silver, Edward D., 54816A.
Silvis, John W., 61316A.
Simmang, Robert A., Jr., 65511A.
Simmonds, Donald L., 58632A.
Simmons, Roger W., 62085A.
Simmons, Ross W., 62199A.
Simons, Richard W., 50086A.
Simpson, Janet R., 61492W.
Simpson, Ora L., Jr., 62096A.
Simpson, Robert L., Jr., 66091A.
Simpson, William H., 58345A.
Sinclair, Vivienne C., 66088W.
Sinnott, Gilbert J., 3d, 62074A.
Sirek, Ralph W., 62270A.
Sisson, Lyle A., Jr., 65872A.
Skuza, Kenneth M., 65379A.
Slack, Lyman A., Jr., 58249A.
Slaney, John H., 30194A.
Slauson, John P., 58394A.
Slauson, William J., 65859A.
Sloan, Harold J., 58801A.
Smart, David E., 58526A.
Smathers, Edwin D., Jr., 30196A.
Smiley, Kenneth S., Jr., 58452A.
Smiley, Wendell W., Jr., 30197A.
Smith, Allison F., 66246A.
Smith, Colin A., 58412A.
Smith, David A., 30198A.
Smith, Donald H., 71303A.
Smith, Earle K., Jr., 50140A.
Smith, Emmett E., 65384A.
Smith, Frederic H., 3d, 30199A.
Smith, Harold C., 58359A.
Smith, Horace D., 62083A.
Smith, Howard H., 71574A.
Smith, James E., 58266A.
Smith, Jedford E., 71575A.
Smith, Joseph P., Jr., 65190A.
Smith, Marvin L., 66104A.
Smith, Needham B., 65577A.
Smith, Paul B., Jr., 32234A.
Smith, Philip E., 50087A.
Smith, Richard I., 30200A.
Smith, Richard R., 65672A.
Smith, Richard W., 58695A.
Smith, Robert E., 66219A.
Smith, Thomas W., 65204A.
Smith, William A., 58281A.
Smith, William A., 66081A.
Smith, William L., 58346A.
Smyly, Duncan P., 30201A.
Smyser, Craig H., 30202A.

Snell, Willard H., Jr., 69658A.
Snide, Thomas W., 50975A.
Snovel, Edwin, 71304A.
Snow, William M., Jr., 30204A.
Snyder, Charles A., 65553A.
Snyder, Donald, 58470A.
Snyder, Paul T., 66199A.
Soare, Franklyn J., 65685A.
Solberg, Harold A., 71305A.
Sommers, David E., 65470A.
Songer, Hubert D., Jr., 66127A.
Soule, Ronald J., 65231A.
Sovereign, Allan F., 50076A.
Spackman, Richard H., 30205A.
Sparks, Billy R., 58673A.
Sparks, William L., 50164A.
Spath, Bernard A., Jr., 62229A.
Spearman, Jack L., 58669A.
Speerschneider, Lyle J., 54786A.
Speight, Will O., 65173A.
Spence, George D., 66302A.
Spendlove, Lyle B., 65915A.
Spezia, Jimmie V., 65406A.
Spiegel, Donald R., 50073A.
Spillman, George R., 65707A.
Spillman, Harry L., 58775A.
Spriggs, Duane G., 65836A.
Sprott, Arthur F., 65461A.
Sraders, Guntis, 65718A.
Stabenau, Hanns M., 61565A.
Stalker, Ronald R., 58587A.
Stall, Floyd M., 58802A.
Stallings, William T., 50220A.
Stanley, Darrell L., 66348A.
Stanley, J. T., 65144A.
Stanley, Lee R., 65159A.
Stark, James D., 50077A.
Starkey, Michael L., 62135A.
Starr, Leonard N., 65449A.
Staten, James D., 58365A.
St. Clair, Gilbert K., 50226A.
Stearns, Donald L., 66113A.
Stebbins, Roland A., 30206A.
Steen, Howard J., 58760A.
Stegall, Julius R., 65247A.
Stein, Robert G., 58425A.
Steiner, Richard L., 65408A.
Steinke, Shawn H., 30207A.
Stemler, Rodger L., 32549A.
Stephens, Glen, 66149A.
Stephenson, David R., 71309A.
Stephenson, Jack B., 65568A.
Stephenson, Ralph W., 30208A.
Sterrett, Charles R., 58752A.
Stevenson, John R., 61443A.
Stevenson, Richard A., 51434A.
Steves, John R., Jr., 32291A.
Stewart, George R., 58347A.
Stewart, Glen F., 62288A.
Stewart, John J., 30209A.
Stimac, Robert M., 32507A.
Stockton, Douglas W., 30210A.
Stone, Fred S., 71310A.
Stone, Joseph L., Jr., 66352A.
Stone, Richard, 32849A.
Stoob, John C., 54711A.
Stowell, Dibrell C., 48535A.
Strange, John E., Jr., 58575A.
Stratford, John J., Jr., 61522A.
Strayer, Jay M., 65501A.
Stricker, Billie G., 65499A.
Strickland, Reginald E., 54787A.
Strickland, Richard E., 65446A.
Stroh, Jerry D., 29769A.
Strome, Richard H., 65777A.
Strong, Dale L., 58785A.
Stroup, Floyd B., 54747A.
Stuart, Floyd R., 30211A.
Stuart, Robert S., 58440A.
Stuber, Carl D., 66159A.
Stuckey, Savery G., 32536A.
Stueber, Robert A., 65628A.
Stuntz, Jose E., 62205A.
Sturdevant, Robert H., 66110A.
Sturgess, Thomas W., 65165A.
Stute, Robert A., 66241A.
Stuteville, Joseph E., 58757A.
Suladie, Ronald E., 50092A.
Sullivan, Dennis J., 58604A.
Sullivan, Hiram R., 65757A.
Sullivan, Robert T., 58756A.
Sullivan, William B., 58436A.
Summers, Charles M., 50997A.
Surovic, Arthur F., 50230A.
Sutton, Glenn H., 58652A.
Swain, Earl L., 58231A.
Swainston, Richard C., 50204A.
Swanson, Edmund B., 65623A.
Swanson, Ralph J., 58766A.
Swanson, Richard H., 58809A.
Swanson, Robert G., 54979A.
Sweeney, James L., 50123A.
Swenson, Morris D., 61432A.
Swenson, William A., 61447A.
Swihura, Edward J., 58596A.
Swofford, Donald D., 32223A.
Swope, Charles F., 30217A.
Syracusa, Anthony S., 58385A.
Szabo, George J., 66211A.
Szemplinski, Henry F., 65601A.
Taddeo, John J., 62116A.
Takahashi, Richard T., 65510A.
Tamm, Jerrold N., 66280A.
Tannen, Peter D., 62120A.
Tanner, John B., 32527A.
Tarleton, Howard R., 65630A.
Tarvin, Albert L., 54744A.
Tatum, Cazzy C., Jr., 66235A.
Taylor, Alvin, Jr., 62203A.
Taylor, Charles B., 62142A.
Taylor, Clyde 3d, 58770A.
Taylor, David M., 65618A.
Taylor, Gary W., 62194A.
Taylor, Henry L., 58711A.
Taylor, Jerome T., 65451A.
Taylor, John R., 30218A.
Taylor, Vess J., 65668A.
Tebbs, Robert B., 69802A.
Tedeschi, James R., 54766A.
Tefft, Howard E., 54797A.
Terbet, Robert P., Jr., 50100A.
Terry, C. Morris, 50227A.
Terry, Condon H., 58569A.
Terry, Jack E., 66139A.
Tesh, Jimmy H., 65679A.
Thaler, Glen F., 71805A.
Tharp, Donald W., 50143A.
Theuer, Katharine D., 65725W.
Thoeny, Alan R., 30219A.
Thomas, David H., 2d, 48558A.
Thomas, Edgar F., 30220A.
Thomas, Frederick L., 30221A.
Thomas, George J., Jr., 30222A.
Thomas, James F., 62240A.
Thomas, John K., 66304A.
Thomas, Kenneth C., 65189A.
Thomas, Kenneth W., 71313A.
Thomas, Lawrence E., 62073A.
Thomas, Luther, 65462A.
Thomas, Nathan H., 54759A.
Thompson, Andrew C., Jr., 61523A.
Thompson, David W., 65455A.
Thompson, George E., 30224A.
Thompson, James D., 58348A.
Thompson, James M., 54812A.
Thompson, John A., Jr., 65212A.
Thompson, Leslie B., 58459A.
Thompson, Robert E., 66317A.
Thompson, Thomas B., 66083A.
Thomson, Willis M., 30225A.
Thornal, Leroy W., 50977A.
Thornberry, Ronald D., 66061A.
Thorne, Flint, 62189A.
Thornhill, John R., 50078A.
Thornton, Richard B., 54850A.
Thurman, Stephen P., 30226A.
Thurston, John R., 61476A.
Tibbetts, Larry N., 65625A.
Tidwell, Julius I., 62100A.
Tieber, Julius A., 3d, 30227A.
Tierney, Marion W., 65150A.
Tillman, Frederick J., 65886A.
Tillman, John B., 30228A.
Timblin, Gaylord L., 71314A.
Timmerman, Virginia M., 65830W.
Timothy, Thomas E., 30230A.
Tinsler, Hollis C., 66349A.
Tolbert, Jack F., 62177A.
Tolley, Charles P., 54737A.
Tomasino, Vito, 50098A.
Tomes, Jack H., 65155A.
Tomlinson, Albert S., 66009A.
Toner, Richard J., 30231A.
Tonini, Daryl E., 51458A.
Torres, Julio L., Jr., 30232A.
Torson, James J., 65319A.
Tortorete, Joseph, 50126A.
Townsend, Cecil R., 66078A.
Treece, James A., 71315A.
Trimble, Clifford J., 61524A.
Trimpert, Michael J., 30233A.
Tringali, Charles J., 58451A.
Tristam, Edward F., 65909A.
Tronier, Ronald B., 65743A.
Truelove, Hoyt B., 65694A.
Tucker, David L., 66238A.
Tudor, Ronald F., 66071A.
Turley, Mack C., 65755A.
Turner, Alexander P., Jr., 66115A.
Turner, Gene C., 66105A.
Turner, Jack A., 65349A.
Tuso, Joseph F., 61585A.
Tvardzik, Joseph M., 32242A.
Tweedie, Robert L., 65238A.
Twells, Ronald G., 32551A.
Tynan, John C., 58355A.
Uhl, Donald P., 58240A.
Underwood, Robert D., 62232A.
Uno, Peter K., 65734A.
Unrein, Philip J., 65156A.
Upton, William H., 66163A.
Urbanic, Frank A., Jr., 58461A.
Usher, Robert L., 29902A.
Utley, Noble L., 50081A.
Vallenari, Joseph L., 65659A.
Vallerie, Eugene M., 3d, 30234A.
Vanarsdale, Doyle L., 61464A.
Vanbrunt, Ralph S., 62154A.
Vanbuiten, Alan J., 58750A.
Vance, Ralph E., 65663A.
Vance, Wilson R., 61433A.
Vanduyn, Alfred V., Jr., 54707A.
Vanetti, Donald E. E., 65315A.
Vanhouten, George W., Jr., 66320A.
Vanhulla, Kenneth J., 54764A.
Vanliew, George E., 58803A.
Vanweele, Jan M., 61563A.
Vanwinkle, Wayne E., 65175A.
Vaughan, Robert B., 58637A.
Vazquez, Francisco, 58493A.
Venable, Thomas L., 65434A.
Verderber, Edward G., 65839A.
Visage, James R., 29248A.
Vittone, Joseph A., 32538A.
Vives, Peter, Jr., 65913A.
Von, Vernon M. H., 65169A.
Vonhake, Richard W., 50215A.
Vonthaden, William H., 65394A.
Voyiaziakis, Stanley, 58457A.
Vulkoff, R. Craig, 58535A.
Waddell, Dewey W., 54772A.
Wade, Roger O., Jr., 58233A.
Wadman, Robert S., 66305A.
Waggener, James S., Jr., 66224A.
Wagner, Edward M., 50112A.
Waite, Jordan C., 30237A.
Waite, Merrill J., 62145A.
Wakefield, Donald B., 65806A.
Walcott, Gordon M., 51491A.
Walker, David L., 3d, 58506A.
Walker, Gerald D., 58307A.
Walker, Kenneth E., 66297A.
Walker, Nathan L., 51543A.
Wall, Douglas O., 65833A.
Wall, Willie R., 62171A.
Wallace, Billy J., 66168A.
Wallace, Hillard J., 58013A.
Wallace, Kenneth H., 58328A.
Wallentine, Dale E., 62090A.
Waller, Benjamin E., 3d, 30238A.
Walls, Francis H., 58614A.
Walpole, Bernard L., 62127A.
Walsh, Robert M., 32531A.
Walter, Clair E., 58628A.
Walters, Frank P., 58636A.
Walters, Ralph D., 58245A.
Walton, Gary K., 58485A.
Wampler, James P., 58478A.
Wanamaker, James E., 50198A.
Ward, Bobby L., 62224A.
Ward, James E., 65593A.

Ward, Johnny M., 58687A.
Ward, Robert G., 58566A.
Ward, Wayne G., 66240A.
Wardell, Ronald S., 58391A.
Warner, Glen E., 30239A.
Warnick, Charles P., 65908A.
Warren, Robert J., 65306A.
Warren, William C., 61525A.
Washam, Billy M., 32554A.
Watcher, Peter, 30240A.
Watkins, Barry L., 62114A.
Watson, Gerald D., 65497A.
Watts, George O., 65405A.
Waymouth, Laurens S., 58409A.
Wayne, Edwin R., 65506A.
Weaver, Philip A., 65537A.
Weaver, Richard C., 65364A.
Webb, John A., 50219A.
Webb, William B., 30241A.
Weber, Theodore W., 61571A.
Webster, George L., 54704A.
Weed, Marvin J., 58437A.
Wehr, Richard A., 58331A.
Wehrle, Kermit L., 65687A.
Weichsel, Howard B., 71580A.
Weida, Ralph E., 65567A.
Weidenmiller, Nancy E., 61504W.
Weihl, Clinton G., 58650A.
Weimer, William C., 62183A.
Weiner, Sidney W., 65265A.
Weissmuller, Courtney E., 51545A.
Welch, Orlo D., 65716A.
Welch, Robert E., 58329A.
Welling, Gordon L., 65136A.
Wells, Frederick L., 30242A.
Wells, George C., 65485A.
Wells, Herschel O., 54857A.
Wells, Stanley H., 71317A.
Wells, William E., 61582A.
Wenger, Richard D., 65808A.
Wepfer, Gordon G., 58460A.
Wessel, Robert L., 30244A.
West, James M., 65329A.
West, Robert E., 62137A.
Westbrook, George W., 62285A.
Westenbarger, David P. J., 62088A.
Wester, Albert D., 58497A.
Wester, Donald E., 65269A.
Westmoreland, Barney, Jr., 54727A.
Weston, Walter F., 62081A.
Westwood, Edward C., 61456A.
Wetzl, Ralph F., 61579A.
Wheat, Anthony J., Jr., 54688A.
Wheeler, Charles E., 65781A.
Wheeler, Charles H., 30245A.
Whitcomb, Robert J., 58373A.
White, Donald D., 58466A.
White, Edward B., 62261A.
White, Herbert V., 54832A.
White, John F., 58273A.
White, Loyce L., 71319A.
White, Myron A., Jr., 58473A.
White, Richard T., 30246A.
White, Thomas R., 65383A.
Whited, Charles R., 66058A.
Whitehead, James T., Jr., 58644A.
Whitehead, Paul S., 61594A.
Whiteman, Gilbert L., 58615A.
Whiting, Edwin K., 30248A.
Whitsett, Charles E., Jr., 54849A.
Wicker, Charles E., 66056A.
Widicus, Frederick G., 65768A.
Wiedmaier, Marcel A., 54844A.
Weigers, Francis A., 54856A.
Weisenauer, Robert F., 30250A.
Wiggins, Frank S., 32226A.
Wigglesworth, Richard G., 58509A.
Wikle, Kenneth C., Jr., 71581A.
Wilby, Walter L., 65377A.
Wilcox, Robert E., 66182A.
Wilder, James M., Jr., 58524A.
Wiley, Thomas S., 50978A.
Wilkey, David O., 65844A.
Willes, Richard E., 30251A.
Williams, Allen J., 65841A.
Williams, Alma L., 65756A.
Williams, Bruce, 50163A.
Williams, Charles M., 58326A.
Williams, Chester Y., 65583A.
Williams, Dallas L., 65201A.
Williams, Donald E., 62297A.
Williams, Douglas L., 69760A.
Williams, Gorden E., 30252A.
Williams, John C., 51436A.
Williams, Morgan G., 58606A.
Williams, Thomas N., 61542A.
Williamson, Mahlon J., 65263A.
Williamson, Roger C., 30253A.
Willming, Edward A., 47797A.
Willson, Richard D., 54702A.
Wilson, Charles A., 58046A.
Wilson, Charles J., 32552A.
Wilson, David L., 51400A.
Wilson, Denzel G., 58308A.
Wilson, Duane R., 61577A.
Wilson, George R., 58293A.
Wilson, Robert C., 54745A.
Wilson, Ronald E., 66257A.
Wilson, William R., 65523A.
Wine, James C., 48548A.
Wingate, Dale E., 65244A.
Wingfield, Billy J., 65145A.
Winkler, Walter T., 58295A.
Winn, Bernard J., Jr., 66205A.
Winn, Ray J., 54729A.
Winn, Roger T., 65555A.
Winograd, Sanford M., 58426A.
Winquist, Charles J., 58763A.
Winterfield, Louis A., 71583A.
Winters, Robert W., Jr., 65549A.
Withers, William E., 58681A.
Witt, George C., Jr., 66146A.
Witte, Duane M., 61491A.
Wodarzak, George P., Jr., 66053A.
Wofford, Travis, 61477A.
Wolaver, John H., 58565A.
Wolfe, Lynn R., 70893A.
Wolford, George F., Jr., 65578A.
Wolinsky, Ivan L., 30255A.
Womack, John H., Jr., 65691A.
Womble, William O., 65140A.
Wood, David B., 71321A.
Wood, Fred D., Jr., 54811A.
Wood, Larry S., 65853A.
Wood, Stephen J., 54789A.
Wood, William C., 65426A.
Wood, William H., Jr., 66131A.
Wood, William M., 50170A.
Woodbury, Norman B., 50113A.
Woodfin, Scott D., 32529A.
Woodford, Robert W., 65896A.
Woodhead, James J., 65750A.
Woodroof, Elvin, Jr., 50108A.
Woods, James A., 30256A.
Woodward, Eldon D., 62102A.
Woody, Harland G., 70910A.
Wooten, John F., Jr., 65842A.
Worch, Peter R., 62109A.
Working, Raymond W., 58438A.
Worley, John N., 58247A.
Worn, Robert W., 66341A.
Worthington, Edward L., Jr., 58454A.
Wright, David I., 30258A.
Wright James H., 3d, 66242A.
Wright, John H. S., 66057A.
Wright, Richard D., 65221A.
Wright, William E., 54719A.
Wucher, Jerome M., 66350A.
Wyse, David L., 65879A.
Yackiel, Thomas F., 58262A.
Yamamoto, George N., 65771A.
Yancey, Kenneth E., Jr., 65191A.
Yarrish, Joseph, 58616A.
Yaryan, John S., Jr., 58620A.
Yingling, William A., 54977A.
Yochem, Ronald J., 65818A.
Yochum, Henry M., 2d, 62223A.
Yoshizawa, Tadashi, 65795A.
Young, Howard D., 66303A.
Young, Perry R., 65420A.
Young, Reid C., 66326A.
Youngstedt, Gene L., 65566A.
Yount, John F., 66128A.
Yukinaga, George B., 65579A.
Yunker, Marie D., 65650W.
Yurcek, Charles J., 62118A.
Zahn, Harry F., 3d, 62070A.
Zeberlein, James W., 30260A.
Zempel, William K., 58528A.
Ziegler, Donald A., 65869A.
Ziegler, Robert S., 66270A.
Zielke, Eugene C., 54708A.
Ziernicki, Robert S., 58520A.
Zigelhofer, George N., 32305A.
Zimmer, James W., 30261A.
Zirkle, William S., 58458A.
Zock, Richard, 66055A.
Zurschmit, Donald K., 66183A.

Chaplain Corps

Arrendell, Cammid O., 64376A.
Brucato, Robert A., 70902A.
Bubb, Wilbur W., 70900A.
Flattery, John J., 64381A.
Garritson, Melvin H., 70985A.
Garzione, Patrick A., 64364A.
Gower, Robert G., 64380A.
Healy, John P., 64378A.
Johnson, Carrol L., 64373A.
Jones, Douglas O., 64374A.
Jones, James L., 64379A.
Jordan, James E., 64383A.
Kelley, Benjamin F., 70903A.
Kramer, George C., 70901A.
Labinger, Marvin L., 70904A.
McCausland, Joseph E., 70989A.
Nelson, Sigurd J., 70990A.
Nelson, Waldemar H., 64384A.
Oliver, Stephen J., 70991A.
Rushe, George M., 64375A.
Ullrich, Donald W., 64382A.
Whalen, Robert B., 64377A.
Wragg, Paul H., 70992A.

Dental Corps

Clark, Lawrence L., 70383A.
Douglas, Robert J., 70380A.
Gault, Clovis G., 69815A.
Kelley, John R., Jr., 70979A.
Krenzel, Daniel J., 69756A.
Miller, Charles D., 69813A.
Park, Paul R., 70384A.
Rekow, Charles J., 70382A.
Steed, Donald L., 69755A.
Streeter, Arthur H., 70381A.
Welker, William A., 69622A.
Williams, Earl O., 71130A.

Medical Corps

Bell, Eldon E., 70892A.
Hummel, Robert A., 70890A.
Wood, Edward H., 70891A.

Nurse Corps

Adams, Catherine B., 59617W.
Barto, Bette J., 59616W.
Bergeron, James E., 69820A.
Bianchi, Lucile A., 69772W.
Candella, Josephine M., 56408W.
Clark, Mary H., 69770W.
Condon, Charles R., 66039A.
Connolly, Janet M., 59980W.
Covino, Mary C., 66041W.
Cox, Rosemary, 63035W.
Dame, Margaret A., 56574W.
Daniels, Della J., 63064W.
Diblasi, Philip, 70394A.
Dohrman, Marjorie J., 64262W.
Dotter, Patsy D., 69771W.
Fitzpatrick, Geraldine A., 64265W.
Frances, Cotto, Paula, 59738W.
Garza, Juanita, 69768W.
Gasbarri, Jean F., 64266W.
Gengler, Rita E., 59739W.
Giniewski, Mary T., 69819W.
Gorseth, Winifred L., 56573W.
Lund, Geraldine S., 69822W.
Hansen, William P., 66038A.
Harper, Betty J., 70396A.
Hettinger, Juno M., 64260W.
Heyser, Pauline K., 59566W.
Jones, Florence L., 69767W.
Kallinick, Dolores M., 64268W.
Kreasky, Anna M., 56409W.
Kunzmann, Barbara A., 63034W.
Lane, Joy A., 62933W.
Lynch, Barbara R., 70397W.
Marquez, Edith, 59620W.
Moore, Alta B., 63066W.
Navarro, Pete, 70393A.
Nelson, Ethel A., 59978W.
Parry, Barbara J., 59619W.
Ross, Betsy L., 69769W.
Sanchez, Frances, 64264W.
Shea, Delia A., 63067W.
Souder, Sally A., 55930W.

Spores, Kathleen D., 64267W.
Toy, Jo A., 64263W.
Whittemore, Earl C., Jr., 69766A.
Wickboldt, Marlys A., 69821W.
Wilson, Eleanor M., 59979W.
Witner, Joseph D., 70395A.
Youtzy, Cynthia R., 66040W.

Medical Service Corps

Bauman, Willard H., 61163A.
Beem, Gordon R., 55374A.
Black, Gerald N., 65920A.
Bowen, James O., 61164A.
Briggs, Thomas H., Jr., 50187A.
Brown, Dewey F., 61168A.
Cavanaugh, Patrick D., 49128A.
Clemons, Keith, 49130A.
Cooper, Floyd P., Jr., 65921A.
Cox, Willis D., 55371A.
Eggert, Clarence V., 65782A.
Farrell, Hugh R., 55376A.
Fresques, Frank J., 59608A.
Gaede, Rex D., 56474A.
Gillis, John R., 56476A.
Greene, Omar V., Jr., 56539A.
Johnston, Lloyd W., 56540A.
Kennedy, Charles L., 55369A.
Kilton, Roger M., 61167A.
Kuchta, John C., Jr., 56473A.
Marraro, Robert V., 61176A.
McKinney, Dana F., 61171A.
Mullins, Herman L., 61166A.
Newman, Harold L., 59497A.
Nikolewski, Robert F., 61173A.
Olson, Robert N., 55373A.
Parker, Lester B., 55370A.
Perri, Frank J., 61170A.
Ricciardi, Constantine A., 61174A.
Richardson, James E., 65924A.
Rowney, Stanley V., 65922A.
Silfen, Arthur M., 61172A.
Silva, Donald G., 56475A.
Slivka, William R., 59607A.
Stansell, Marion J., 56470A.
Suiter, Robert W., 56472A.
Targove, Bertram D., 56471A.
Watson, John R., 55372A.
Weddington, George R., 65919A.
Wilder, Nelson E., 59498A.
Yates, John R., 59606A.

Veterinary Corps

Barker, Russell B., 65996A.
Boster, Richard A., 66000A.
Flentge, Robert L., 65995A.
Fraunfelter, Frank C., 65992A.
Jackson, Wesley E., 65998A.
New, Albert E., 65997A.
Vanriper, Donald C., 65994A.
Wood, David H., 65999A.

Medical Specialist Corps

Margolis, Hannah S., 69765W.
Ryckeley, Martha E., 59988W.
White, Lillian E., 59740W.

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Line of the Air Force

Abraham, Gary W., 71322A.
Abrams, Richard L., 72585A.
Accuosti, Judith A., 72029W.
Ackerman, Ronald R., 71815A.
Albright, Edward L., 71585A.
Allen, Ernest G., Jr., 71323A.
Alligood, Gilbert R., 72031A.
Anderson, George W., Jr., 72032A.
Anderson, Hollis D., 72033A.
Anderson, Paul J., Jr., 71586A.
Angiliss, William W., 72035A.
Arellano, Gustavo O., 72036A.
Ashworth, Pratt D., 72038A.
Austin, William R., 2d, 71588A.
Autsch, Fritz A., 72039A.
Bailey, Thomas F., 72590A.
Baker, Arthur D., 72040A.
Baker, Carol A., 71325W.
Baker, Dale T., 72591A.
Baker, Mary E., 72343W.
Batten, Virgil F., 72345A.
Baty, Richard S., 72594A.
Bean, Larry B., 72346A.
Bell, James R., 72595A.
Bell, Wayne A., 72347A.
Bender, Eduard, 71698A.
Bennett, Frank J., 71331A.
Bennett, Michael D., 72348A.
Bennett, Paul D., 72596A.
Beshara, Thomas M., 72041A.
Biggar, Gordon M., 72042A.
Billeaudeaux, Lionel C., 72043A.
Billings, John H., 72350A.
Bishop, Joseph E., 72597A.
Bishop, Marvin L., 72044A.
Bitschenauer, Albert E., 71699A.
Black, Robert S., 72351A.
Blais, David N., 71333A.
Bliss, George W., 71701A.
Blumenthal, Morris C., Jr., 72352A.
Bodnar, John A., 71335A.
Bright, Edward G., 72047A.
Brown, Dennis W., 72355A.
Brown, Joseph B., Jr., 71704A.
Brown, Roger A., 72048A.
Buck, Edward F., 71337A.
Buck, Virgil A., 72607A.
Burnett, Laurence W., Jr., 71706A.
Burnett, William R., 72052A.
Busko, George, Jr., 72053A.
Buss, Larry H., 71338A.
Canaga, Joseph R., 71340A.
Carey, Charles C., 71342A.
Carter, Frederick K., 72058A.
Cauley, Jerry D., 72059A.
Cavender, Henry J., 71344A.
Cherry, Edward D., 72611A.
Chesnutt, Chambless M., 72061A.
Christison, Charles F., 72612A.
Clapper, Jack K., 71709A.
Collins, Edward R., 71349A.
Conley, William R., 72063A.
Conrad, Robert L., 72064A.
Corder, John A., 71711A.
Cox, Harla D., 72620A.
Craig, James R., 72068A.
Crochet, John L., 71353A.
Cross, Ray I., 71593A.
Crum, John M., 71354A.
Cubberly, Robert L., 72073A.
Cudd, George S., 72074A.
Cummins, Jack B., 71344A.
Cuskey, Russell J., Jr., 71356A.
Dalton, John F., 72076A.
David, James R., 71713A.
Davis, Jerry F., 72627A.
Dawson, John E., 72080A.
Deangelo, Michael L., 68674A.
Demichaels, Robert E., 71358A.
Deming, John P., 72082A.
Dillon, Butler R., Jr., 72084A.
Divich, Duane G., 72631A.
Dodd, Albert S., 3d, 72085A.
Doubleday, Ruth E., 72634W.
Douglass, John D., 72635A.
Durham, Floyd A., 72087A.
Eaves, Philip E., 72641A.
Elliott, Graydon A., 72644A.
Emmermanis, Ivars, 72645A.
Erickson, Raymond S., Jr., 71715A.
Ernst, Kenneth A., 72094A.
Fairbanks, William Z., Jr., 72098A.
Featherston, Joe D., 72650A.
Fischer, Eugene H., 72101A.
Fish, James H., 71364A.
Fletcher, Stephenson, 72653A.
Flint, Sandy A., Jr., 71716A.
Flodstrom, Thomas E., 71366A.
Foster, Bayard E., 72103A.
Fox, Frances V., 71367W.
Freedman, Israel, 72104A.
French, James B., 71369A.
Frey, Edward P., 72658A.
Friese, Ronald A., 72105A.
Frulio, Francesco P., 72106A.
Frydl, Frank W., Jr., 72107A.
Fujii, Donald S., 72109A.
Fullilove, Carlton J., 72110A.
Gardiner, Kenneth B., 72112A.
Garlan, Jerome F., 69377A.
Genakos, George S., 72113A.
George, Herman L., Jr., 72114A.
Ginzel, Weldon J., 71371A.
Gjovig, Jon H., 71819A.
Goff, Elton S., 71372A.
Goff, Jesse E., 71373A.
Goos, Dale A., 72117A.
Gorman, Thomas D., 71822A.
Greenstreet, John E., 72666A.
Gregg, Harold O., 71720A.
Griffin, Edward A., Jr., 72120A.
Griffith, Dayton R., Jr., 72667A.
Grignol, Ronald M., 72121A.
Grover, Franklin D., 71602A.
Hadley, James P., Jr., 71721A.
Hall, Richard R., 72122A.
Hamblin, Joseph E., 72123A.
Hammers, Lavern E., 72125A.
Hardell, Wayne D., 71380A.
Harr, Milfred G., 68643A.
Harris, Alan, 72127A.
Harris, George H., 71605A.
Hawkinson, Robert G., 72359A.
Heil, Jimmie R., 71724A.
Hellstrom, Anders C., Jr., 71607A.
Henry, Clifford W., 72364A.
Henry, Frank D., 72132A.
Hensley, Dale L., 71387A.
Heskin, Robert O., 72133A.
Hillebrand, Lawrence J., 72678A.
Hinds, Hubert T., 72134A.
Hoar, Dean L., 72368A.
Hodson, Raymond M., Jr., 72136A.
Hollowell, Frank E., Jr., 72369A.
Holub, Roland J., 72137A.
Hood, Joseph L., 71388A.
Horsma, Richard J., 71727A.
Horton, Sidney S., Jr., 71389A.
Host, Bruce J., 72140A.
Hunt, Wells E., Jr., 71390A.
Hunter, William H., 3d, 72141A.
Jahnke, Arlon H., 71729A.
Jean, Dennis E., 72142A.
Johnson, Richmond E., 71826A.
Jones, Myles D., 72373A.
Jones, Robert H., 71393A.
Jordan, Franklin L., 71731A.
Juvette, Kenneth J., 71394A.
Kehoe, Peter J., 72375A.
Kelleher, Gerald G., 71395A.
Kelly, John J., 71396A.
Kennedy, Luther L., 72146A.
Kerr, Lynn A., 72687A.
King, Miller S., Jr., 71610A.
Kitchell, Dale L., 71399A.
Kjer, Fred D., 72691A.
Klein, William E., 71400A.
Klug, Robb F., 71611A.
Koncak, Tony, 71614A.
Kruger, Jerry E., 71834A.
Lamm, Edward N., 72378A.
Lapham, George B., 71836A.
Laughlin, John D., 71615A.
Lee, Edward L., 71403A.
Lemaster, David E., 72379A.
Leonhard, Ronald R., 71404A.
Lewallen, Farrell D., 71616A.
Lindley, Robert H., 71617A.
Livesey, James A., 71838A.
Lombardo, Frank A., 69301A.
Long, Robert L., 71839A.
Lonneman, Richard W., 71620A.
Louwien, Rudolph W., Jr., 71405A.
Loven, James V., 71840A.
Lucas, Jon I., 71841A.
Lyng, Reginald W., Jr., 72150A.
Lyons, Laurence E., 71844A.
MacLaren, Allan J., 71621A.
MacLeod, Richard P., 71406A.
MacPherson, George R., 71407A.
Maika, Kenneth L., 72151A.
Marples, Jerry W., 72381A.
Massey, Larry D., 71412A.
Matthews, Horace M., 72152A.
Matthews, James D., 71624A.
Maybury, Robert V., 71734A.
McClintock, William H., 71415A.
McCune, James D., 71625A.
McGrorty, Lawrence W., 71848A.
McIlwain, Peter H., 72704A.
McIntosh, James, 71736A.
McKee, Donald L., 71737A.
McKinney, Harold H., Jr., 72890A.
McMahon, Frank B., Jr., 71418A.
McNeill, John H., 72706A.
McNutt, Francis B., Jr., 71419A.

McWilliams, Carey F., 71420A.
Mensing, Richard D., 72384A.
Mentink, Roger D., 71422A.
Merzlak, Ronald M., 71850A.
Mezzapelle, Edward A., 71739A.
Miller, Henry S., 72711A.
Minnoch, John K., Jr., 72387A.
Moeller, Frank C., 72388A.
Monkell, Roy E., 71628A.
Moran, Dennis M, 72712A.
Moreno, Donald C., 72390A.
Morrow, Charles A., 71424A.
Moruzzi, Frank D., 71629A.
Mullen, John D., 72393A.
Mullen, Neil C., 67603A.
Musick, Allen F., 71427A.
Myers, Edward P., 71428A.
Myers, Henry W., 71740A.
Myers, James D., 71429A.
Nakanishi, Paul T., 71853A.
Nalle, Richard G., 71430A.
Narken, Jan, 72715A.
Neighbor, William A., 71854A.
Nock, Edward L., 72398A.
Noneman, Charles H., 72399A.
Novak, Allan L., 71856A.
Obeck, Gary F., 72718A.
O'Brien, Thomas G., 72719A.
O'Dell, Perry D., 72720A.
O'Grady, Richard E., 71434A.
Olivito, Anthony A., 71857A.
Olsen, Lawrence P., 71743A.
Olson, John B., 71435A.
O'Malley, James F., 72403A.
Opgenorth, Carl R., 72721A.
Ormand, James F., Jr., 71437A.
Paine, Frank G., 71858A.
Pannier, Richard F., 72405A.
Pappas, Fredrick G., Jr., 71438A.
Parham, Clayton E., 71860A.
Passmore, David A., 71439A.
Pedersen, Clifford W., 72408A.
Peterson, Charles T., 71745A.
Peterson, Lawrence E., 71632A.
Pfister, Lewis M., Jr., 72726A.
Phillipo, Richard J., 71442A.
Picchioni, Frederick A., 71443A.
Pickering, Charles H., 72158A.
Powell, William T., Jr., 72412A.
Precious, Thomas D., 71444A.
Prendergast, Robert F., 72414A.
Presar, Don L., 72730A.
Price, Robert M., 71445A.
Ramsay, Kenneth N., 72418A.
Rawlings, Charles F., 71749A.
Rech, Adam, 71449A.
Reichert, Robert A., 71750A.
Repak, David N., 71752A.
Richards, William L., 71451A.
Riebe, Harry J., Jr., 72422A.
Roberts, Leon T., 72423A.
Romero, George A., 71453A.
Rose, Edward L., 71637A.
Ross, Donald J., 71638A.
Rowley, William A., Jr., 71456A.
Samuel, Wolfgang W., 71639A.
Sawyer, Edward L., 72738A.
Schacker, Edward H., 72427A.
Schmidt, Peter F., 72428A.
Schwarzenbach, Roger J., 71464A.
Scott, Gayland O., 71466A.
Shanahan, Joseph F., 72170A.
Shattuck, Lewis A., 67855A.
Shepard, Robert W., 72430A.
Siau, Francis L., 3d, 72431A.
Sierra, Hector G., 71472A.
Simpler, Malcolm G., Jr., 71643A.
Smiley, Jerry B., 71862A.
Smirni, Allan D., 71644A.
Smith, Bobby H., 71474A.
Smith, Quentin C., 71865A.
Smith, Robert W., 71475A.
Smith, Robert W., 72435A.
Sombke, Dennis C., 72172A.
Sorokatch, Lawrence J., 71646A.
Soter, Charles, 72173A.
Spradling, James W., 71478A.
Stewart, William C., 71867A.
Still, James W., 71481A.
Stottman, Thomas L., 71482A.
Stoughton, Oliver W., 68777A.
Strauss, Robert E., 72440A.
Stutz, Willard D., 72441A.
Style, Robert L., 67598A.
Sundholm, Larry O., 72442A.
Tanner, Bill O., 72747A.
Taylor, Thomas H., 72748A.
Teague, John O., 71485A.
Tedder, Robert W., 71647A.
Terrell, Thomas H., 72444A.
Thomas, David G., 71648A.
Thompson, Edwin W., 71487A.
Tidwell, Ray W., 72449A.
Tierney, Thomas T., 72450A.
Timmerman, John C., Jr., 72749A.
Tomlinson, Jon D., 72180A.
Umstot, Denis D., 72452A.
Vance, Kenson R., Jr., 71872 A.
Voss, John D., 71873A.
Vultaggio, Phillip A., 72754A.
Walters, Fletcher L., Jr., 70692A.
Walters, Gary T., Jr., 71494A.
Warfel, Clarence A., 72454A.
Watson, Robert S., 71651A.
Wehman, Clarence A., 72186A.
Weisbeck, John F., 72187A.
Weldon, Roger B., 71497A.
West, James D., 71498A.
West, Neil W., 72758A.
Wheeler, Charles F., Jr., 71499A.
Wheeler, Kenneth R., 71500A.
Wheeler, Maurice J., Jr., 71876A.
Whitman, Walter T., 3d, 71877A.
Williams, Robert S., 72950A.
Wilson, David D., 72457A.
Wilson, Henry J., Jr., 72193A.
Wilson, William E., 72951A.
Winstead, Billy W., 72952A.
Winters, William N., 71507A.
Wolfe, Robert G., 72459A.
Womack, Harold L., 71509A.
Wood, Charles N., 72460A.
Woolbright, William H., 72760A.
Woollen, Virgil N., 72464A.
Woolley, David W., 72465A.
Woolsey, Charles T., 72195A.
Wurmstein, John E., 72466A.
Wurstner, Roland D., 72467A.
Yarborough, Philip P., 72470A.
Young, Franklin K., 71512A.
Young, James M., 71513A.
Young, Norman J., 71879A.
Young, Robert A., 72473A.
Zbylut, Robert S., 72761A.
Zeigler, Curtis O., 71881A.
Zupke, Everett W., 72474A.

Medical Service Corps

Archibald, Charles J., 70929A.
Edwards, James D., 70930A.
Micka, Richard G., 70932A.
Perlstein, Robert J., 70933A.
Schumaker, Clarence J., Jr., 70931A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Thomas O. Holston, Jr., Akron.
James R. Baird, Dora.
Alton L. Hamrick, Empire.
Herbert Allen, Newton.

ARKANSAS

James L. Kirby, Gravette.
J. B. Barnes, Hartford.

CALIFORNIA

Clara S. Fredinburg, Applegate.
William G. Clark, El Cajon.
Norma J. Giger, Fawnskin.
L. Pearl Ramsay, Heber.
L. Dorothy Mayfield, Stinson Beach.

CONNECTICUT

Anna M. Maye, Botsford.
Stanley K. Wasowicz, Middlefield.

FLORIDA

Irma M. Keever, Ellenton.
Florence M. Johnson, Englewood.
Elmer Robinson, Lehigh Acres.
Cecile P. Heard, Sanford.

GEORGIA

James H. Mitchell, Hiram.

HAWAII

Donald Kimura, Waiakoa.

IDAHO

John G. Rost, Boise.
Lloyd R. Merrill, Moreland.

ILLINOIS

Charles H. Parker, Ashmore.
Eugene L. Herwig, Ashton.
John A. Waters, Baylis.
Gladys J. Lash, Big Rock.
William H. Kilver, Bluffs.
Floyd J. Wesemann, Buckingham.
Joseph E. Powell, Chenoa.
Edward J. Sichta, Clarendon Hills.
Arnold R. Pedersen, Cuba.
Milan S. Gjundjek, Downers Grove.
Sally A. Sondgeroth, Eola.
Carl R. Brown, Findlay.
LeRoy M. Grande, Forreston.
Anne G. Barker, Frankfort Heights.
Edwin G. Mengeling, Hampshire.
Norbert L. Gotway, Kampsville.
Archie V. Gauwitz, Lacon.
Maurice E. Potter, Lafox.
Norman L. Smith, Manito.
Frank E. Woodruff, Marengo.
Harold C. Woodard, Milledgeville.
A. Janet Masterson, Monroe Center.
Oliver B. Westendorf, Montrose.
Harry W. Van Hook, Mount Pulaski.
Delmar R. Haun, Nashville.
Edward M. Rohr, Newton.
Robert C. Johnson, Richton Park.
John J. Barry, Sheffield.
Elmer W. Heuerman, Teutopolis.
Charles W. Gruber, Towanda.
George S. Mentel, Valmeyer.
Richard E. Gilchrist, Waterman.
Lelan D. Graham, West York.
Willis D. Spafford, Yates City.

IOWA

John W. Elliott, Ainsworth.
Wallace P. Hawcott, Burt.
Alice L. Brayton, Denmark.
Jeanette E. Rohwer, Dixon.
Leo L. Seyb, Donnellson.
Charles J. Murphy, Dubuque.
William P. Marshall, Farmington.
Emmett J. Hodapp, Granville.
Marvin J. Hayostek, Lake Park.
Mabel J. Alverson, Popejoy.
Daniel K. Murphy, Sioux City.

KANSAS

William W. Knouse, Horton.

LOUISIANA

Bobby R. Thomas, Campti.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Condon, Beverly.

MICHIGAN

Hilbert G. Geyer, Frankenmuth.
Janet L. Ruddy, New Lothrop.
Edgar A. Richards, Vanderbilt.

MINNESOTA

Lowell E. Anderson, Clara City.
Bernard J. Newman, Eveleth.
Robert L. Thompson, Garrison.
Ronald L. Christensen, Geneva.
Louis L. Indihar, Gilbert.
Alfred E. Feierabend, Grey Eagle.
Donald L. Randleman, Renville.
Julian V. Melander, Willmar.

MISSISSIPPI

Milton S. Draper, Ackerman.
Floyd R. Smith, Amory.
E. Blaine Claypool, Clinton.
Clarence B. Minyard, Lexington.
Hoskins L. Deterly, Natchez.

MISSOURI

Zula M. Stover, Cross Timbers.
Charles C. Kinley, New Franklin.

James G. Magee, New Hampton.
Elden C. Ommert, Raymondville.
James E. Kurtright, Salem.

NEBRASKA

Charles D. Young, Filley.
Marie M. Smith, Gandy.
Frank C. Evans, Shubert.
William H. Hancock, Yutan.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stanley C. Bogardus, Canaan.
Norwood A. Ball, Franconia.

NEW JERSEY

Vincent R. Loftus, New Brunswick.
Beatrice B. Bowden, Pomona.
William J. Schultz, Roebling.
Oscar N. Benson, Rumson.

NEW YORK

James F. Hill, Centerport.
Elmer H. McCann, Chateaugay.
Thomas W. Schermerhorn, Esperance.
Merle E. Parsons, Red Creek.
Helen M. Cascanette, St. Regis Falls.
William B. Mackey, Schenectady.
Kessler B. Baldwin, South Otselic.

NORTH CAROLINA

Tommie F. Bostic, Sr., Beulaville.
William L. Hall, Leicester.
Edward L. Womble, Rich Square.
Frances T. Slater, Toast.

NORTH DAKOTA

Galerd F. Paul, Grand Forks.
Clarence H. Potter, Ray.

OHIO

Otto Zancanella, Adena.
John D. Hilger, Alvordton.
Victor J. Bodish, Columbus.
Elton E. Wallis, Convoy.
John B. Arlington, Mount Blanchard.
Philip J. Ragazzo, Niles.

OKLAHOMA

Mildred F. Almack, Deer Creek.
Jean E. Haynes, Langston.
Marvin L. Johnson, Roosevelt.
Ebert O. Simpson, Thomas.

OREGON

Neil T. Smith, Jr., Burns.
Albert G. Riney, Condon.
Norma L. Benson, Days Creek.
Conard G. Miles, Richland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph F. Morris, Ardmore.
Margaret E. Richey, Carmichaels.
James L. Yingling, Gibsonia.
Walter B. Helhowski, Hilltown.
Robert G. O'Neil, Pleasant Mount.
Roger G. Eshelman, Terre Hill.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gerald L. Cloos, Big Stone City.
Louis N. Jarding, Humboldt.
Wesley E. Cloutier, Redfield.

TENNESSEE

Juanita J. Waller, Baxter.
James L. Lee, Collinwood.
Christine B. Harris, Finger.
Frederick C. James, Jr., Gadsden.
Benton P. Scoggins, Harrison.
Mary A. Warf, Hohenwald.
Woodrow W. Parker, Jasper.
Billy V. Taylor, Mercer.
Alva L. Hassler, Monteagle.
Lemuel H. Gill, Monterey.
James M. Taylor, Santa Fe.
Clay N. Blevins, Shady Valley.
Toy J. Fuson, Smithville.
Jack R. Walker, Walland.

TEXAS

James I. Mills, Canton.
Wilburn Piefer, Devers.
Marion E. Summers, Dripping Springs.
Sadie B. Davis, Elgin.
Juanita F. Perrin, Frankel City.
Eddie G. Rinehart, Franklin.
Maxine H. Fuson, Hankamer.
Elva L. Davis, Hedley.
Charles A. Fleming, Jr., Kress.
Arthur W. Faubion, Leander.
Ollie T. Bullock, Milano.
Hiram C. Hughes, Munday.
T. C. Wilhite, Pecan Gap.

UTAH

Earl T. James, Clearfield.
Kay F. Probst, Midway.
Ray M. Wettstein, Woods Cross.

VERMONT

William L. McGraw, St. Johnsbury.
Edward E. Freeman, Saxtons River.
George A. Rooney, Springfield.
Matthew J. Kenny, West Rutland.

VIRGINIA

Bernard M. Anderson, Jr., Dublin.
S. Carson Broyles, Waynesboro.

WASHINGTON

Pearly R. Lusk, Richmond Beach.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert H. Edwards, Chester.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Krenke, Dale.
Viola K. Stauffer, Monticello.
Francis J. Cosgrove, Richland Center.
Malen L. Teclaw, Thorp.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Eleven Pioneer Friends of TVA Who Voted for the Original Act Continue To Serve as Statesmen in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the TVA was passed in 1933 by the 73d Congress.

This year we are celebrating the 30th anniversary of that significant action of the Congress. This act, every fairminded citizen today recognizes, was one of the most important actions ever taken by the Congress to assist in an area of our country to help itself for growth and economic progress. The seven States area has made great strides and progress in many ways in recent years since the original TVA Act was passed.

Today TVA stands as a fruitful example of how democracy works and how a democratic society through utilization of its resources in a cooperative effort can uplift an entire region and its people. Today TVA is not only returning rich dividends to the people of the valley area and to the United States as a whole, but it is one of our Nation's most impressive showcases to the world. It stands, on its 30th birthday, not only as a symbol of democracy in action throughout the United States but as a monument of progress to other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Library of Congress to provide me with the names of the Members of Congress who are serving in Congress who originally voted for the TVA Act. These men—11 in number—who are continuing to serve in the Congress were among the real pioneers and statesmen who made this great development possible.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fitting and appropriate that the names of these original supporters of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act who are still serving in Congress be acknowledged and their names spread upon the record.

Those still in the Congress who supported and voted for the original TVA Act in 1933 include our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, ranking member of the Committee on Rules; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules; and the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The Members of the other body who were in the Congress and voted for the bill in 1933 are Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia.

These men—pioneer friends and supporters of TVA—are all great American statesmen.

Minority Group Distribution at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the clamor of minority races for fairness echoing loud in the ears of Capitol Hill, many times, outstanding existing performance goes unrecognized. It is my pleasure to call the following matter to the attention of the Nation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1963.

Rear Adm. EDWARD J. FAHY,
Shipyard Commander,
Mare Island Naval Shipyard,
Vallejo, Calif.

DEAR ADMIRAL FAHY: As a result of our recent discussion in Washington I have reviewed your statistical head-count of minority group distribution at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. On broad review, it would

appear that the shipyard should certainly be congratulated on assuming its obvious nondiscriminatory employment attitude, not only as is exemplified by the statistics which you provided, but also by a long history of fair employment practices at the yard of which I am cognizant.

Your 1963 statistics indicate that there is a total of 8.6 percent Negro, 3.7 percent oriental, and 1.8 percent other minority groups for a total of 14.2 percent, representing a total of 1,471 workers out of a shipyard personnel level of 10,329 as of 31 July 1963.

According to the 1960 census, there is listed a total of 13,436 minority persons in Solano County out of a total census count of 126,566—a minority percentage of 10.6 percent. This statistical consideration is extremely favorable and is evidence of perhaps an overly fair employment policy. This fairness policy is further exemplified by the fact that, despite a shipyard loss of better than 700 personnel from 1962 to 1963, the minority group workers were depleted by only 61 persons and their overall percentage of yard employment was expanded from 12.8 percent to the 14.2-percent figure.

A further review of the balance of the statistics presented shows that the percentage of minority white-collar workers is steadily expanding and bears a reasonable relationship to the total number of minorities. Additionally, the overall number of journeymen and those above the class of journeymen has expanded over the past year, in spite of the fact that the overall personnel level of the shipyard has declined.

I am particularly impressed with the statistic indicating that in the classification "above journeymen and less than supervisor" there is a total of 228 minority persons out of 1,679 in this classification for a total of 13.6 percent.

I am sure our democracy in the West has been enhanced by such employment practices. Certainly our shipyard is nonetheless competitive because of such employment practices and stands as a model of Americans of all races and faiths working competitively for the good of the Nation.

Sincerest congratulations.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., minority group distribution, July 31, 1963

	1962		1963	
	Number	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*
A. Total	11,035		10,329	
Negro	865	7.74	894	8.65
Oriental	393	3.55	387	3.75
Other	152	1.38	190	1.84
Total minority	1,410	12.8	1,471	14.2
B. White collar	1,988		1,890	
Negro	36	1.8	43	2.3
Oriental	47	2.4	48	2.5
Other	7	.3	11	.58
C. Blue collar	9,047		8,439	
Negro	829	9.15	851	10.1
Oriental	350	3.9	339	4.01
Other	147	1.6	179	2.12
1. Less than journeyman	3,005		2,632	
Negro	521	17.3	533	20.3
Oriental	204	6.8	200	7.6
Other	47	1.6	59	2.24
2. Journeyman	3,507		3,295	
Negro	184	5.25	183	5.56
Oriental	89	2.5	92	2.8
Other	61	1.7	64	1.94
3. Above journeyman, less than supervisor	1,760		1,679	
Negro	120	6.8	130	7.7
Oriental	45	2.6	43	2.6
Other	98	5.6	55	3.3
4. First line supervisor	538		581	
Negro	4	.75	5	.9
Oriental	2	.4	3	.5
Other	0		1	.2

German-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the first permanent German settlement in America was made at Germantown, Pa., with the arrival of 13 families there on October 6, 1683. Two hundred years later, in 1883, the anniversary of the arrival of these colonists was celebrated as German Pioneer Day by large numbers of citizens of German descent. This is believed to be the first formal notice taken of the importance of the German migration to this country. German-American Day is a continuation of this traditional celebration, and it reminds us not only of the early settlement of this Nation but also of one of the great original sources out of which the Nation itself—its growth and its prosperity—developed.

The migration of Germans to Pennsylvania came about through the influence of William Penn, who encouraged some of the leading Protestants in Frankfort to form the Frankfort Co. to arrange the migration of Germans to America. The first impulse to migration, however, came from Crefeld, a town on the Rhine near the Netherlands border. Penn had visited the Quakers and Mennonites there during this visit to the continent in 1677. In 1682 Penn deeded to three citizens of Crefeld 5,000 acres each in Pennsylvania. Francis Daniel Pastorious heard of the Frankfort Co. and went to London as its agent. In the spring of 1683 he bought a tract of 25,000 acres. He then put himself at the head of a colonization movement and sailed for America on June 10, 1683, reaching Philadelphia on August 20. Thirteen families followed him from Crefeld, sailing from London in the ship *Concord* on July 24, 1683, arrived in Philadelphia on October 6, and took up the land in Germantown which had been bought by Pastorious, thereby founding the first permanent German settlement in North America.

This beginning of their history in America is celebrated with speech and song every year on the first weekend in October by San Franciscans of German descent. The *Concord* is the German *Mayflower* and the descendants of its passengers are the first families of the German Americans. A third of the names of the pioneer settlers in California are German. The German newspaper, first published in 1853, is the oldest German language paper in the West. The first church, St. Mark's Lutheran, was founded in 1856. The number of immigrants has steadily grown until now there are about 65,000 in the city who are of German descent, and more whose origins are found in other German speaking parts of Europe.

One of the many fields in which the German Americans enrich the life of the city is music. There are hundreds of German musicians in the city—members of the symphony orchestra, music teachers, and makers and repairers of musical instruments. The German churches have the best choirs in the city and there are over two dozen German singing societies.

It gives me great pleasure to join these German Americans of San Francisco and of other parts of America in celebrating German-American Day, a meaningful occasion which symbolizes the richly varied character of this great land and its people.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 28, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

TAX BILL PASSED AND REAL ISSUE NEVER DEBATED

In 2 days of consideration by the House the provisions of the President's tax bill and the real issue of planned deficits were never debated. Yet, the bill passed 271 to 155. The key vote was on the Republican motion to recommit to add an amendment which would trigger the tax cut if Federal spending in fiscal 1964 were held to $97 billion and in fiscal 1965 to $98 billion. This move was defeated 226 to 199—1 Republican voting against—26 of 251 Democrats voted for the motion. To summarize:

1. The tax bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which prevented any amendment except the motion to recommit.

2. The 305-page bill and the 250-page report containing rate and structural changes in tax law was not read, explained, or debated and undoubtedly understood by only a few.

3. The whole assumption of the President's tax proposal is based on planned deficits and it passed, but no one championed that point of view.

The greatest danger is No. 3, the merit of a tax cut within a balanced budget concept as against the planned deficit concept and an increased public debt. Strangely, not a single liberal champions deficits and debt, but subscribes to it. The proponents of the bill almost entirely overlooked the reality of present debts and deficit financing. On the other hand, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee firmly disassociated himself from the President who would follow both tax cut and increased spending paths at once. Our chairman chose the tax cut route and indicated that he would refuse to go the spending route. But he is alone as far as the President is concerned. Let's see what the Kennedy administration believes:

1. In January the President said there must be no matching cuts in spending when taxes are cut.

2. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Economic Advisers, says repeatedly there must be no cutback in spending. Indeed, spending must be increased and new programs started.

3. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, who dictates a certain amount of Demo-

cratic policy, says that cutbacks in spending would nullify the advantages of a tax cut.

4. Only recently the Commerce Department took the same position.

There you have it. The leaders of the Kennedy administration believe in deficits—in planned deficits, not a balanced budget. Yet, no proponent admitted this.

THE KENNEDY APPROACH

The Kennedy spending program is not only incompatible with tax cuts but proves that we have not earned a tax cut. This tax cut without spending cuts means deficits for years to come. President Kennedy, following the Walter Heller philosophy, has abandoned the balanced budget concept over a yearly balanced budget or business cycle. The Heller philosophy is based on the disproved theory that prosperity can be built on big Federal spending and a constantly increasing public debt.

The record proves that the Kennedy administration will not hold the line on spending. The report on the tax bill shows an increase in the annual spending level of $23 billion in 5 years from $78.9 billion in fiscal year 1961 to the estimated $102 billion of 1965. At the same time the public debt level has gone up $35 billion. There is every evidence our present $305 billion debt will be boosted to $320 billion in the next go-around demanded by the President.

REPUBLICANS DEMAND RESPONSIBILITY

The Republicans, and I agree fully, have historically championed fiscal responsibility—lower taxes within a balanced budget. Republican tax cuts have resulted from balanced budgets, surpluses and debt retirement in 1947 and 1954. Historically, Republicans have cut taxes 9 times—boosted them once—Democrats have cut them 1 time and boosted them 14 times.

SUMMARY

1. The tax bill will lead to bigger deficits, deficits which have never produced growth or employment in the past.

2. The President will not cut spending. Many new programs and new increases await congressional action at his demand—foreign aid, ARA, Domestic Peace Corps, YCC, mass transit, public works, aid to education, to name a few.

3. He has added 137,000 more Government employees plus 36,000 requested in fiscal year 1964 for a total of 173,000 additional.

Will Republicans, and some Democrats, now rebel at increases and reduce appropriations in the remaining eight appropriation bills and refuse the next requested debt ceiling increase? Perhaps, we conservatives have lost a battle, but may yet win the war.

Federal Aid Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I note that on August 16 Life magazine published a rather unfactual attack on Federal aid projects, distastefully titled, and labeling all Federal and Federal-State cooperative programs as "pork."

I took the trouble of making inquiry into Life's activity in the field of "pork barrel" and my inquiry led to writing the following letter to the editors after their second request for my views.

I hope this letter helps to set the record straight:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1963.

Mr. MORTON B. WHITE,
Assistant to the Publisher, Life Magazine, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I had chosen to ignore the Life editorial on pork barrel as being well intentioned but ill conceived, but your last communication brought the matter so forcefully to my attention that I felt obliged to give the comment which you requested.

I hope you will publish this comment in your "Letters to the Editor."

I called the Post Office Department to ask the deficit on copies of Life magazine sent through the mail. They advised me that costs exceed revenues on the average magazine by 4.6 cents.

The Post Office estimated that Time sends 130 million pieces, Fortune 4.4 million pieces, Sports Illustrated 48.4 million pieces, and Life sends 315 million pieces through the mail per year, making a total of 497.8 million pieces of mail for 1962, subsidized by the taxpayer to the tune of 4.6 cents each.

My computations led me to conclude that, using the Post Office's figures, Life received a postal subsidy of approximately $14.49 million in 1962. Since 1956, when statistics concerning mail subsidies were inserted into the RECORD by one of my colleagues, Life has averaged a postal subsidy of somewhere between this $14.49 million figure and $9,494,000, which was the subsidy in that year. On this basis we can compute an approximate postal subsidy to Life magazine alone of approximately $100 million over the past 10 years.

When we turn to Time, Life, and Fortune, which sent 497.8 million copies through the mail during 1962, the postal subsidy at the average rate indicated by the Post Office Department can be computed at $22.89 million, for 1962.

You will note I have not included the book rate at which Time and Life, now major book publishers, are mailing books through the offices of the Post Office at a subsidized rate with a public service allowance. This, I am sure, comes to another substantial figure.

It would appear, on the basis of these figures, that Time and Life have not done bad at the pork barrel either.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

No. 10—Florida: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Florida about the importance of gambling in that State. In Florida, as in many other States, gambling is a billion dollar business, oiling the wheels of organized crime syndicates.

Last year, $158 million was gambled legally at Florida racetracks. This made the Sunshine State the sixth ranking in parimutuel betting which helped the State treasury to the tune of over $13½ million in 1962.

However, Mr. Speaker, this accounts for only a small part of the money wagered in Florida last year. It is illegal betting which lines the pockets of the criminals and it is illegal betting that makes up the great bulk of the gambling that takes place in that State.

Miami is a national nerve center of the gambling syndicates. According to the McClellan committee, Florida's share of estimates of off-track betting came to almost $1.4 billion in 1962.

But, off-track betting is not the only form of illegal gambling. The consensus of testimony before the McClellan committee was that off-track betting accounts for less than half of the total illegal wagering in the United States. In the light of these figures, gambling in Florida may well have seen a $2½ billion turnover last year.

The gross profits of the gamblers could very well have been in the neighborhood of one-fourth billion dollars. Certain expenses must be met, because illegal gambling supports public corruption as well as organized crime and its various other illicit endeavors. This has given organized crime quite a bankroll in Florida. Because of its social ignorance Florida is bankrolling the mob.

If gambling were both legal and controlled, Mr. Speaker, there would be no great opportunities for corruption and the crime syndicate's treasury would be badly depleted.

The best form of controlled and legalized gambling is a national lottery. Throughout the world, it has shown itself effective in cutting the financial prop of gambling out from under the crime rings, while at the same time causing new revenues to flow into the Public Treasury.

Hungarian National Day of Mourning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the heroism of the Hungarian people is written large in the annals of history. The Rakoczi rebellion of 1703–07, the War of Independence in 1848–49, and the uprising of the freedom fighters in 1956 are but the most illustrious of the Magyars' valiant struggles to overthrow oppressive foreign rule.

The revolution of 1848–49 occupies a place of honor in the Hungarian national heritage with such stirring figures as Kossuth and Gorgei. The Hapsburg Empire was splintered by revolutionary uprisings in Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and elsewhere. One by one the Austrians suppressed these revolts until Hungary was the last stronghold of resistance. In

April 1849 the Hungarian Diet proclaimed the Hungarian Republic, and Kossuth was elected "responsible governor-president" by the Diet. In June Emperor Francis Joseph accepted the offer of Tsar Nicholas of Russia to aid in the suppression of the Hungarian revolt. The Russians attacked from the north while the Austrian Army invaded from the west. This two-front was proved too much for the Hungarians, and they were decisively defeated at the battle of Temesvar. The Russian intervention prevented the Magyars from achieving independence for another three generations.

The repression which followed this Hungarian defeat was one of the most brutal in history. Despite promises of clemency, the Austrian general, Haynau, known as the butcher, visited sanguine vengeance on the Hungarians at the "bloody assizes of Arad." There on October 6, 1849, nine generals were hanged and four shot. The same day Louis Batthyany, who had taken no part in the war, was shot at Budapest. Over a hundred patriots were executed in a butchery which roused indignation all over Europe.

The anniversary of this grim day is a national day of mourning for Hungarians, and today, 114 years later, the recollection of these bloody events is no less painful. I join all Hungarians and Hungarian-Americans, particularly the many San Franciscans of Hungarian descent who greatly enrich the life of that city, in observing this sorrowful anniversary.