

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 119: 16: *I will delight myself in Thy statutes; I will not forget Thy word.*

Almighty God, our gracious benefactor, may the memory of Thy grace and goodness daily inspire us to enter faithfully and courageously upon all our tasks and responsibilities.

Grant that we may have a large part in building a social order in which our bruised and broken humanity shall enjoy the blessings of peace and good will.

May the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress be made strong with lofty moral and spiritual ideals as they perform the duties of their high vocation.

Create within us a deeper respect and reverence for the worth and dignity of the soul of man created in Thine own image and endowed with a capacity to have the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Oklahoma will take the time to explain this conference report?

Mr. STEED. Yes, and I shall be glad to answer any questions the Members may have.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 896)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 31, 35, 37, and 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,119,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 104. No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4187(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails after October 2, 1962, with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of the United States Senate to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 32, 33, and 39.

TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MONRONEY,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
E. L. BARTLETT,
CARL HAYDEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
(except as to No. 40),
MILTON R. YOUNG
(except as to No. 40),
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30 to 33, inclusive, and 35 to 40, inclusive, to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each such amendment, namely:

AMENDMENTS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO

Amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 to 13, inclusive, 15 to 29, inclusive, and No. 34, relating solely to appropriations for the expenses of that body, were agreed to by the House just prior to sending the remaining amendments, listed above, to conference on November 8.

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper—Senate

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. Motion will be made to recede and concur.

Joint Committee on Printing

Amendment No. 30: Simplifies, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation arrangement for expenses of compiling the Congressional Directory.

Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$442,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$480,000 proposed by the House. In view of the delay in processing the bill, the lower amount will be sufficient to finance on this central office roll, as the House had provided, the 14 central office jobs currently financed on other rolls.

It is the intention to review the necessity for continuation of these positions during consideration of future estimates.

Capitol Building

The Senate committee report earmarked \$4,500 of the House-approved total for flood-lighting the dome from midnight to dawn. The conferees have agreed to the proposition.

Extension of the Capitol

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. Motion will be made to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Senate proposed to strike from the basic law (Public Law 242, 84th, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th) the authority to enter into contracts in advance of appropriations by which has been prosecuted, under direction of the special commission in charge, the extension of the east central portion, the rewiring and illumination, repair of the dome, construction of a subway terminal, cleaning the exterior of the two wings, furniture and furnishings, and miscellaneous other works. The Senate's objective is to prohibit the special commission from authorizing any contracts for extending the west central portion without a further separate affirmative determination by the Congress on the question. But the Senate committee did express the belief that further engineering surveys of the condition of the west central portion should be undertaken by qualified outside engineers.

The motion to be offered will permit the special commission to engage nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services, in line with the Senate expression, but will also, as the Senate proposed, require subsequent appropriation action by the Congress before any remedial measures can be undertaken.

Restoration of old Senate Chamber and old Supreme Court Chamber

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. Motion will be made to recede and concur, under which \$37,500 would be provided for preparing working drawings, specifications, and estimates of cost for restoration of the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court Chamber substantially to their conditions in 1859 and 1860, respectively.

There are those in the Congress who feel the project is desirable. Others do not. In recommending the instant proposition, the conferees are agreed that this is not to be considered as a commitment to proceed with restoration work at a later date.

Botanic Garden

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$454,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$462,000 proposed by the House.

Library of Congress

Salaries and expenses: The Senate did not change the appropriation but in its report the committee leaned to the addition of 30 cataloging positions to stay abreast of current accumulations and to begin making some inroads into the substantial arrearages, in contrast to the House indication of about 20 such positions, with the \$100,000 allowed from the budget request of \$424,000 based on 57 added positions.

The delay in enactment of the bill favors the smaller number and the conferees agree that the Library should confine fiscal 1964 additions accordingly.

Amendment No. 36, Legislative Reference Service: Appropriates \$2,119,000 instead of \$2,138,000 proposed by the House and \$2,099,000 proposed by the Senate. This is to provide for five additional clerical positions.

Amendment No. 37, books for the general collection: Appropriates \$670,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$650,000 proposed by the House.

GPO revolving fund

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: The two amendments hang together but for technical reasons the second one is reported in disagreement. Motion will be made to recede and concur, under which, in conjunction with the agreement on the first one, a total of \$10 million additional reimbursable working capital would be provided instead of \$8,500,000 proposed by the House, and of which \$6,450,000 would be obtained by transfer from funds previously appropriated but unused because of a change in plans, for construction of a GPO warehouse annex. The House had designated its full allowance by direct appropriation; the unused construction money would have been available for application against whatever new building proposal may later be approved.

Franked mailings

Amendment No. 40: Incorporates, in modified form, a restriction urged by the Senate against use of any funds in the bill to finance mailing and delivery of mail matter with a simplified form of address under the ancient franking privilege available to any Member or Member-elect of the Senate. This conforms to the original position of the bill as reported to the Senate and, in respect to applicability to the House, conforms to the position in the bill when the House considered and adopted it last June.

Under the agreement reached, as under the original House bill, the House would be governed in the matter of addressing franked mail by the regulations (which the department would be expected to reinstate) in effect prior to October 2, 1962—regulations which were permissive, not mandatory as to methods used by Members; regulations which would permit use of addressing methods stated by the department to result in lower per-piece handling and delivery costs; and which it seems, clearly, would simplify preparation prior to mailing.

TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, your conferees are happy to bring to the House today what we think is a very good conference bill.

When the revised budget estimates were taken up the grand total of \$182,218,450 had been requested. When the bill passed the House with the purely Senate items omitted it was at a total of \$140,038,919. After the Senate had made amendments, and added the Senate items, the total that went to conference was \$168,273,069. The conference version of the bill as presented here today is \$168,293,069, or only \$20,000 more than it passed in the Senate.

A large part of the bill this year, more than \$30 million of it, is for nonrecurring capital investment items. Because a lot of the heavy construction work going on on Capitol Hill is funded in this bill, the committee is hopeful that a very substantial reduction can be shown in the bill next year on account of this reduction in the amount of recurring capital investment items.

In the matters that were in disagreement between the House and the Senate, the report and statement before you explain each recommendation. We concurred in several of the Senate reductions partly because of the fact that the nearly 5 months of this fiscal year that

have elapsed meant the amount of money provided by the Senate was sufficient to carry out the functions involved. In the case of the Legislative Reference Service, we have agreed to an increase over the Senate figure of \$20,000 because they have an ever-increasing caseload and needed a little extra help to enable them to keep fairly current in filling the requests for material and information made to them by the Members of the House and the Senate. This service has had a very heavy gain in recent years, and no one at this time can predict any leveling off.

In the matter of the most serious disagreement, that of the so-called patron mail, the conferees agreed to language which conforms, insofar as applicability to the House is concerned, to the position as it passed the House in the first instance and to that which was reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the second instance. The conference agreement and position is in the statement accompanying the report. This means that any limitation contained in this legislation on the use of the so-called patron mail or simplified address procedure applies to the U.S. Senate and not to the House of Representatives.

We are able to present this report with the assurance of the House that the bill, as it now stands, is in absolute and complete conformance with the ancient rule of comity between the two Houses. We hope and trust this action will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. Speaker, before yielding for questions I would just like to take this opportunity to say that being chairman of this subcommittee is more or less a fairly thankless job since there are those who seem to have a continuing open season on criticizing the Congress and aim a lot of their barbs at this subcommittee. It becomes an occupational hazard for the chairman who is the target for a lot of this criticism. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not of any serious importance. But under the circumstances that developed this year when some trying situations were thrust upon us, as chairman of this subcommittee I want today to express my thanks and appreciation, first, to the members of this subcommittee who have worked so hard and who have stood with us so loyally and so completely throughout this whole struggle. Without their confidence and support and help, we could not have accomplished what we have done here today.

I also want to express my appreciation to the leadership of the Congress for the support they have given us. I want to express my appreciation to the Members on the Republican side as well as on my own side for the universal encouragement and support that we have had all along from our colleagues. It has been a wonderful thing to know that Members of the House had the confidence in us that they have expressed and for the help and the moral support that they have given us.

I especially want to express my personal thanks to the ranking minority member of my subcommittee, the gentle-

man from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. There is not a finer coworker in the world; and without his loyalty and support and understanding, this job would have been intolerable.

I also want to express my personal thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the great support and loyalty and help he gave to us.

I greatly regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have an insufficiency of words to express the personal feeling I have for all of you, for your sympathy and support and kindness and help that you have given me in what has been one of the most onerous experiences that I have had in the 15 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for the service he has rendered to the House of Representatives on this bill. Without the work of the gentleman and his subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations, it would not be possible for the Congress to function. Furthermore, I want to commend my colleague for the manner in which he has preserved the prerogatives of the House in matters of disagreement with the Senate. He has insisted that the rule of comity be observed without which it would be impossible for the two Houses of Congress to operate as coordinate legislative bodies.

My colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], is one of the most conscientious and dedicated Members of the House. He always performs his duties in a superior manner.

All Members will agree with me that the work of the gentleman has been most important, and I think all will agree with me that we do owe him a debt of gratitude.

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

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to that pyramid that is being built, otherwise known as the new office building, being built by Ambassador McCloskey, could the gentleman give us any progress report on it, as to what year it might be opened for business, whether it will be 1970 or 1975.

Mr. STEED. We are told by the Architect's Office that the completion date is August 1964. It is my understanding that since this comes so late in the session, the actual occupancy of the building with the new tenants will officially begin at the start of the next Congress, in other words, January 1965. There will be a problem between August and November with respect to the election of the Members to the next Congress. Since some part of the occupancy of that building will be made on an assignment under the seniority system, the building superintendent would have no

way of making a fair and accurate assignment of office space until after the November election returns reveal who the Members of the next Congress are going to be. However, in late January or early February they will begin to occupy some of the building. They will park cars in the parking lots inside on a temporary basis. They moved certain other activities on a temporary basis from the old western end into parts of the building that will be ready. So there will be some occupancy and use of the building as early as late January or early February of next year, but they will be assignments of space only on a temporary basis. We know of no situation that could develop now that would change these target dates materially.

Mr. GROSS. When did they dig that hole over there? I believe it was either 1955 or 1956 that they dug the hole for that building.

Mr. STEED. If memory serves me, it was done at about that time.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us whether they are making progress with the swimming pool. I am not interested in it personally, but I have heard a good deal of talk about it by other Members who are impatient to get into the swim. Will that be completed before the rest of the building so that my colleagues can go down and learn to swim and do the other things that go with a swimming pool?

Mr. STEED. I do not know what the contractor's work schedule is, but the gymnasium and swimming pool will be completed before formal occupancy of the building.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I would like to ask the gentleman about this \$37,500 for the refurbishing of the Old Senate Chamber and the Old Supreme Court Chamber. I regret that there is even \$37,500 in this bill for that purpose in view of the condition of the U.S. Treasury. I am afraid this is a foot in the door to an expenditure that is wholly unnecessary at this time, an expenditure that certainly ought not to be made until and unless our budget is balanced and we are paying on the Federal debt. I cannot think of anything that is more unnecessary than to refurbish the Old Senate Chamber and Old Supreme Court Chamber at this time. I cannot think of anything more unnecessary in view of the fiscal condition of this Nation, and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, if they must provide \$37,500 for planning for refurbishing, will stop there and appropriate not a single penny until we get out of the bind we are in financially.

Mr. STEED. I will say to the gentleman that the views you hold are shared by quite a few other Members, too. As you know, the House conferees resisted this very item for several years. The Senate was insistent this year and we finally yielded on it.

So we made a specific finding and we so stated, that this does not in any way obligate us or indicate that the funding of such refurbishing will be agreed to. There are some advantages to be obtained by having the research work done and the survey made and the plans pre-

pared. But the matter is one in which the other body has taken the initiative and on which they are insisting. It is one, I assure the gentleman, that I personally intend to give a lot of thought to before agreeing to any sizable amount of money to carry out any plans for refurbishing in connection with it. I think the gentleman will find that many other Members feel the same way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question. Were you able to work out with the other body any solution on the matter of the promotional scale and longevity of certain personnel that we discussed?

Mr. STEED. We could not, because of the difficulty of its being out of order legislation on this bill. That is what would have confronted the House and since we have a number of problems in that field we have been in touch with the House Administration Committee. We hope we can get a review not only of that but of several other problems in our housekeeping. That would be the proper legislative procedure and would not make us subject to the points of order that we would have had to face otherwise on the specific matter to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I appreciate the situation. This can, of course, be corrected in the House by simple resolution. We can take care of the House side and let the gentlemen on the other side adjust to that if they so desire.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope that we will be able to clear up the matter in due time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I intend to offer a resolution, with the approval of the gentleman, as soon as possible.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the views of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] from the fiscal standpoint, with regard to the refurbishing of the Old Supreme Court Chamber. But I wonder if the gentleman would not agree that if that is to be done at least it be stipulated, when the Old Supreme Court Chamber is refurbished that we have the words "In God We Trust" above the bench, having in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Supreme Court who sat in those hallowed precincts subscribed to that doctrine.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may require, to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] in the way that he has handled this bill in conference. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the proposal of refurbishing the Old Senate Chamber and the Old Supreme Court Chamber, and whether this would add to their historical significance, that is a matter of opinion. It is estimated that the total cost of this entire project will

be something over \$600,000. But I would call the attention of the House to the language on page 4 of the statement of the managers where it says:

In recommending the instant proposition, the conferees are agreed that this is not to be considered as a commitment to proceed with restoration work at a later date.

So I think that our position as we come here today is quite clear.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 4, line 5, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$2,704,615: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1963, the Sergeant at Arms may employ two additional assistant chief telephone operators at \$2,580 basic per annum each in lieu of two telephone operators at \$1,980 each, one additional messenger acting as assistant doorkeeper at \$2,580 basic per annum in lieu of one messenger at \$2,100, the basic per annum compensation of the administrative officer shall be \$5,280 in lieu of \$4,140, and the title of positions shall be changed as follows: wagonmaster to truck driver, assistant wagonmaster to assistant truck driver, two female attendants ladies' retiring room to two attendants, laborer in charge of private passage to skilled laborer."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: On page 23, line 12, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the proviso to the paragraph entitled 'Extension of the Capitol' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out 'and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.'"

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the proviso to the paragraph entitled 'Extension of the Capitol' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out 'and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof', and by substituting in lieu thereof 'and, prior to any appropriations being provided for extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the west central portion of the United States Capitol, to obligate such sums as may be necessary for the employment of nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services and for test borings and other necessary incidental items required to make a survey, study and exam-

ination of the structural condition of such west central portion, to make reports of findings, and to make recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary, including the feasibility of corrective measures in conjunction with extension of such west central portion."

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 33: On page 23, line 17, insert the following:

"PLANNING FOR RESTORATION OF OLD SENATE CHAMBER AND OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER IN THE CAPITOL

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare working drawings, specifications, and estimates of cost for restoration of the Old Senate Chamber on the principal floor of the Capitol and the Old Supreme Court Chamber on the ground floor of the Capitol substantially to the condition in which these chambers existed and were furnished when last occupied in 1859 and 1860, respectively, by the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court, \$37,500."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein.

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

Mr. STEED. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note in the report that it has been agreed to spend \$4,500 for the illumination of the dome of the Capitol from midnight to dawn.

Does that mean illuminating it from the interior or exterior?

Mr. STEED. As the gentleman knows, under the present practice the dome on the outside is lighted from dusk until midnight and then only the statue on the top of the dome is lighted from midnight until dawn.

There has been some interest shown in the fact that the dome should be lighted throughout the night. This small earmarking of funds will enable the lights to stay on the entire dome all night long.

Now, we are told that while this is not only desirable from the esthetic point of view, it acts also as a desired navigation aid for aircraft in bad weather after midnight which come through this area. Since it does not add any cost to the total of the bill, we agreed with the Senate request that we go along with having the dome floodlighted all night long.

Mr. GROSS. This is not, then, a safety measure for lighting up this entire area because of crime in close proximity to the Capitol? It is not being done for that purpose?

Mr. STEED. I live up here on the Hill, and if it will help in adding safety in that regard, I am glad to have it.

Mr. GROSS. But that is \$4,500 of the taxpayers' money that will be spent. I sympathize with the gentlemen living on Capitol Hill but I am not interested in spending that kind of money for electricity to light the dome simply for that purpose.

Mr. STEED. That is not the purpose. The main purpose is to have the dome

illuminated all night long. It is perhaps the most popular symbol of our Government.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how many people are going to be looking at the dome after midnight, but that is neither here nor there. I think we ought to take a second look at this \$4,500 expenditure. You just do not pick \$4,500 off the bushes around here. Personally, I do not see much point in illuminating the dome of the Capitol after midnight, and I hope the committee will take another look at this next year.

Mr. STEED. We will consider it in its proper perspective next year.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 39: Page 33, line 9, add "together with \$6,450,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Acquisition of site and construction of annex.'"

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.
Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to amendment No. 37 which, of course, has been acted on: do the House and Senate have any authority to recommend the kind of books that may be purchased?

Mr. STEED. I would say we probably do. And there is a Joint Committee on the Library of the House and Senate who are supposed to supervise the activities of the Library. That is one way that influence can be brought to bear.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in the purchase of these books I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma and the people who have the proper authority here will take into consideration in the purchase adding nine Holy Bibles to that collection so the Members of the U.S. Supreme Court may have the privilege of reading them.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include a summary of the conference bill with appropriate comparisons.

Summary of legislative branch appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 6868)

Group	Budget estimates (revised)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action ¹	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Senate.....	\$30,693,205	(?)	\$30,675,350	\$30,675,350	-\$17,855	+\$30,675,350	-----
House of Representatives.....	50,772,950	\$50,131,550	50,131,550	50,131,550	-641,400	-----	-----
Joint offices and items.....	6,297,515	6,271,369	6,271,369	6,271,369	-26,146	-----	-----
Architect of the Capitol.....	34,343,500	30,744,200	33,279,500	33,279,500	-1,064,000	-----	+2,535,300
Botanic Garden.....	483,000	462,000	454,500	454,500	-28,500	-----	-7,500
Library of Congress.....	21,252,400	20,487,800	20,488,800	20,488,800	-763,600	-----	+1,000
Government Printing Office.....	38,375,880	31,942,000	26,992,000	26,992,000	-11,383,880	-----	-4,950,000
Grand total.....	182,218,450	140,038,919	168,273,069	168,293,069	-13,925,381	+28,254,150	+20,000

¹ Many of the items were concurred in by the House on Nov. 8 just prior to sending the remaining amendments—dealt with in the conference report—to conference.
² By custom, House omits all items under the Senate heading and those items under the Architect of the Capitol pertaining solely to the Senate.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

- [Roll No. 197]
- | | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abele | Clancy | Forrester |
| Ashley | Clawson, Del | Fulton, Tenn. |
| Avery | Corman | Fuqua |
| Barrett | Cramer | Green, Pa. |
| Battin | Dague | Griffiths |
| Blatnik | Davis, Tenn. | Hagen, Calif. |
| Brock | Dawson | Hanna |
| Brown, Calif. | Dingell | Harding |
| Burkhalter | Duncan | Harris |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Dingley | Hawkins |
| Cameron | Fino | Hoeven |
| Celler | Ford | Hoffman |

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Johnson, Wis. | Minshall | Selden |
| Jones, Ala. | Morrison | Shelley |
| Karsh | Morse | Short |
| Kee | O'Brien, Ill. | Sickles |
| Kelly | Pilcher | Slack |
| Keogh | Powell | Smith, Va. |
| Kilburn | Quillen | Stubblefield |
| King, Calif. | Rains | Talcott |
| Kluczynski | Reid, N.Y. | Thompson, La. |
| Laird | Rivers, Alaska | Thompson, N.J. |
| Landrum | Rivers, S.C. | Thornberry |
| Latta | Roberts, Ala. | Udall |
| Long, La. | Rodino | Ullman |
| MacGregor | Roybal | Utt |
| Mailliard | St. Onge | Wallhauser |
| Martin, Mass. | Schadeberg | Willis |
| Miller, Calif. | Scott | |
| Milliken | Secret | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND REORGANIZATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the Congress of the United States is operating under rules and procedures that are outmoded and ineffective. In some instances, they even are undemocratic.

How can we expect to pass effective laws to govern our Nation when we are failing in our responsibility to govern ourselves?

I have today introduced an act identical with one introduced in the Senate by Senator CLIFFORD CASE, who has been actively engaged in the struggle for congressional reform and reorganization.

This bill would provide for a commission which would study and make recommendations for improvement in our committee system, regulation of conflicts of interest, regulation of lobbying activities, congressional travel, and other related matters.

Unless we clean our own house, we will forfeit the confidence of the American people which is so vital.

It is high time that the Congress of a democracy shake off the cumbersome and often undemocratic rules and regulations under which we now labor.

AMENDING THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 565 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and, pending that, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 565 provides for consideration of H.R. 9009, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 9009 would authorize \$102 million to operate the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1964. As the Peace Corps operation has expanded and the number of volunteers has increased, the portion of the Peace Corps costs devoted to administration has declined. If the level of funds requested is made available for fiscal 1964, it is estimated that only 19.9 percent, or

\$20,300,000 will be used for administration and the remainder will go to support volunteers. In fiscal year 1963, 28 percent of the funds available were utilized for administration.

The annual cost per Peace Corps volunteer is \$9,000—the figure estimated at the time the original presentation of Peace Corps financing was made to the Congress in April 1961. At that time this included volunteer costs of \$6,300 and administrative expenses of \$2,700. The current estimate for fiscal 1964 is \$7,000 for volunteer costs and \$2,000 for administrative expenses. The increase in volunteer costs is due to an extension of the training period to increase language proficiency.

The countries in which the Peace Corps is in operation have requested more volunteers, and additional countries are seeking Peace Corps assistance. The number of qualified applicants is larger than ever even though the standards have been raised, and there have been no incidents which have made the conduct of our foreign policy more difficult.

In the short period that has elapsed since its beginning, the Peace Corps has already made a significant contribution to the attainment of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this bill before the Committee on Rules I asked some questions with reference to administrative costs and to what extent we may be developing into a situation where, for example, we were getting too many chiefs and not enough Indians. Because of my inquiries and questions, I have done some additional research work and have been given some additional figures which would indicate this is not happening.

Actually, they are improving the efficiency of the operation from the standpoint of administrative costs. In comparing the average administrative cost to the number of people in the field I find the administrative cost to be substantially lower in the Peace Corps than in almost any other agency of Government.

The average grade of the Peace Corps domestic staff is GS-7.9. If you look through the 1965 budget, you will find that this is considerably below other agencies in the foreign or domestic field. To mention a few: USIA, 9.5; Foreign Agriculture Service, 9.3; House and Home Finance Agency headquarters, 9.0; Federal Trade Commission, 9.1; General Accounting Office, 8.2.

It is charged that the agency has become a "burgeoning bureaucracy." Nothing could be more inaccurate. The Peace Corps has only one administrative person for every eight volunteers. If Congress appropriates the money authorized in the bill—\$102 million—the Peace Corps will have one administrative person for every 10 volunteers. No agency has ever come close to those figures. Remember during World War II it was said there were "35 people behind every man with a gun." They have accomplished exactly the opposite already—"eight men with a gun," so to speak, for every man behind him. This record has

been submitted to the church missionary groups, to industrial concerns which operate overseas like Standard Oil, and none of them come close to these figures. The danger, in fact, is not that they will become a burgeoning bureaucracy, but rather that they will provide too little mature leadership for our volunteers.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The Director of the Peace Corps, testifying before our committee, said they had only one administrative person for each seven volunteers.

Mr. SISK. As I recall, when it was discussed before the Committee on Rules yesterday, this was the figure that was cited in the report. At that time I raised the question with the chairman about some of the complaints that had been made. As a result I have done some checking. They tell me they are now operating with 1 administrative person to 8 volunteers, and with this new program they feel with increased efficiency they will be able to do it with 1 administrative person for 10 volunteers. The gentleman is on the committee and heard the testimony.

Mr. GROSS. One to seven is big, as far as I am concerned, altogether too many chiefs with two few Indians.

Mr. SISK. I think my good friend from Iowa will agree with me that if you look at most agencies of the Government and make a comparison, you will find that in the administrative field they are much heavier on administrative personnel as against the active people in the field than these figures would indicate. This, of course, is the basis on which I was making my statement.

Mr. Speaker, because of this very fine record I feel that this program is doing an outstanding job for America. I believe it is a program we should continue. It seems to me the request which is now made to increase the number of volunteers to 11,300, which was the exact number given to Congress in 1961 when the Corps was first proposed, would be a figure which we could live with and which should be adequate.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 9009, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. I can see no objection to this rule and I think the Rules Committee passed it out unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps appears to have done a very fair job up to date. It is only 2 years old. Many of us who may have some doubts as to its efficacy still feel that it should be given a fair chance. Certainly 2 years is not long enough.

There is a question as to whether the very big leap forward in appropriations is altogether warranted. We go in this bill from \$63,750,000 to \$102 million. This may seem slightly excessive. However, I think the House can consider that in the general debate and can hear the pros and cons of this amount.

There is one section that I am a little bit dubious about, and I asked some

questions which to my mind were not satisfactorily answered. I refer to title III, "Encouragement of Voluntary Service Programs." Here it is stated in section 301, on page 5, line 19, of the bill, that—

The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of this act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower.

I am always a little dubious about this kind of a statement. We have become the "Meddlesome Mattie" of the world and although we seem to have very few women in the Congress of the United States, we seem to act like old women in regard to the care we take of other people's business. I doubt very much that this is necessary. I am quite certain from what I have read that the German Government is doing an extremely good job right now in the underdeveloped countries. This situation also applies to Great Britain, Israel, and to many other countries. I think we might as well let them carry on their own programs without help from us.

On questioning it was revealed that some of these countries had asked for our assistance. I suspect that mostly this would be financial assistance, and I would not be at all sorry to see that particular section eliminated from the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That provision in the bill bothers some of us very much. The gentlewoman did not read all of it. In the first place, it encourages the organization of Peace Corps operations in foreign countries. I do not know that I quarrel with that so much, if that would take the load off us and obviate the need for the Peace Corps, at least reduce the Peace Corps now in existence. If you go on to page 6, you will find that \$300,000 may be used to carry out the purposes of this provision. So this seems to be the foot in the door. Then it goes further on page 6 and says that none of the money can be spent for an international Peace Corps. At least that is what it purports to do. I do not know how you can say in one place that you can spend money, authorize \$300,000; and then say there will be no expenditure for this purpose. I am at a loss to understand it. I hope the proponents of the bill, and I am not one of them, will explain this to the satisfaction of those who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as some of us who are members of that committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. If the gentleman will yield there, the gentleman may remember I said I suspected that most of the aid we would give to these foreign countries would not only be in the way of counsel, but that it would be mostly financial. That is my feeling at the present time. I do hope it will be cleared up during the course of the debate on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I want to state that at the

proper time I expect to offer an amendment attempting to clarify this whole thing.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think this section of the bill does need some clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I think, as I said before, that there is no objection to the rule. I think the bill if it is amended in some portions will be as close to perfection as we can expect to get any bill. I do believe the Peace Corps has done a good job and a useful job and has improved, to use a very modern expression, the "image" of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to note that the large television rating service, A. C. Nielsen, is reported to be bringing about the death of certain programs only recently in spite of the fact that the hearings conducted by the Investigations Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee pointed up the unreliability and the distortions present in the rating methods and figures.

It was hoped that by now the National Association of Broadcasters, in conjunction with others interested in the industry, might have formulated the necessary standards to bring a somewhat more accurate picture of audience reaction than is now given. It is my understanding that A. C. Nielsen has not yet responded fully to the request of the National Association of Broadcasters in order to help it formulate these standards.

It was repeatedly stated by members of the subcommittee in hearings that self-policing by the industry was much preferred to licensing of the rating services by the Government. However, this frantic reaction from the industry itself to the same type ratings as revealed in the hearings is rapidly pointing to the need for action in the public's interest.

It is past time for this industry to get out of the numbers racket so that television programs watched by the American people are not artificially distorted by ratings.

[From the Nov. 4, 1963, issue of Advertising Age]

RATINGS DRAGON CLAIMS ONE VICTIM IN EACH TV NET LINEUP AS SEASON OPENS

NEW YORK, October 31.—Spurred on by almost daily box office reports in the newspapers, people in the business seem to be talking even more than usual about TV network ratings this season.

This will come as a disappointment to anybody who had hoped that television programming might be less of a numbers game as a result of the shadow cast over the rating services by the House Commerce Com-

mittee findings in Washington earlier this year.

[From the Nov. 4, 1963, issue of Broadcasting]

THE MUTABLE LAW

Six months ago, those with hardy memories may recall, the A. C. Nielsen Co., along with other ratings services, was being vilified before a House subcommittee.

Last week the first national Nielsen ratings for the new television season were received with such reverence and fear that they might have been carried down a sacred mount by a man with a long white beard instead of delivered by a postman with a bent back and aching arches.

The Nielsen pocket piece shapes the fates of men and their works. It or something like it will exist as long as networks and their advertisers have no other means of discovering what is happening at the receiving end of their transmissions. The hope must remain, however, that the user of ratings will pause occasionally to question their divinity before he starts lopping off programs and, possibly, heads.

[From the Nov. 11, 1963, issue of Broadcasting]

SOME OBSERVATIONS BY TV AND RADIO EDITOR RICHARD K. DOAN, EXCERPTED FROM THE SUNDAY HERALD TRIBUNE OF NOVEMBER 3, 1963

Television's rage for ratings is possibly more feverish this fall than ever before. People in the business feel it, and can't particularly account for it.

The upshot * * * has been a general blurring of any programming standards other than the gage of mass approval as reflected in ratings of individual shows, the shares of audience they pull against other shows on the air at the same time; and the competitive standings of the networks in terms of total homes reached.

The picture is distorted.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, before the House is the question of whether a rule should be granted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs to debate this matter. I have always felt that the function of the Committee on Rules was primarily to determine whether the legislative committee had done the proper work on a measure so that it was ready for formal debate, so that the House itself could evaluate the pros and cons involved in the matter. I must confess I was shocked to find that there was only one witness, apparently, who was heard by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If that constitutes an adequate preparation for this House to consider increasing a program and to double its size in the space of a year—one that has increased in similar proportions in previous years—then I must confess I am in complete disagreement.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly do.

Mr. MORGAN. We looked, begged, and borrowed and could not find any more witnesses. No one was interested in testifying on the bill except the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. I was going to ask that question. Inasmuch as the gentleman made that statement, may I ask whether or not any of the private charitable

agencies who are in this kind of business and in the missionary programs—and I happen to know many of them who are deeply concerned by this—were contacted about this? What efforts were made by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to find out whether people had knowledge that they wished to give on this subject in the discussions? I am going to go on and point out some things you might well have gone into, but will the gentleman give us that information?

Mr. MORGAN. Why, certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. What happened?

Mr. MORGAN. As far as the charitable organizations that communicated with us are concerned, they were in agreement with the Peace Corps 100 percent and did not feel it necessary to testify in front of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the gentleman, were letters sent to various groups and, if so, will you supply for the RECORD the names of the organizations you notified and asked whether they wanted to be heard and also the letter sent to them?

Mr. MORGAN. No letters were sent. We do not go out and solicit witnesses.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is about time, if I may suggest so, that our committees begin going out and soliciting witnesses and not just sit back and expect people to know when the committees are going to hold their hearings.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me finish this thought first.

If we want to get the proper information so that Congress can legislate with intelligence on these programs, we have an obligation to do something about it rather than just sit back and say that there was nobody who was interested in it and that the only person who came in was Sargent Shriver.

I want to ask some questions. A year ago our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that had to do with the Peace Corps had a statement in there—and I think it was a unanimous report—saying that the overhead costs of the Peace Corps, if I recall the figure, were 42 percent. Indeed, if they were 42 percent or anything like that, I suggest that a great deal of looking into is needed, because I can tell you those private missionary programs—and I am not just talking about religious missions but I am talking about medical missions and educational missions like the university at Beirut, for example, and sanitary missions—certainly have no overhead costs of that nature. I might say, this being around Community Chest time, that one of the things we pride ourselves on when we go around soliciting funds for our private charities is that you can count on the fact that over 90 cents of each dollar you contribute is going to go to that charity and is not going into the overhead aspects of the operation.

I am very much interested in knowing about one thing the Peace Corps has been strong on, and the only thing I am sure they are strong on, which is publicity—self-serving publicity. I have also noticed this, and I am going to go on and

document a little of this within my own knowledge. The publicity the Peace Corps is getting for itself and the cost involved—and we all in Congress are in this business, so we know the cost of publicizing things, because we all have to conduct political campaigns and are aware of the costs involved. The costs of this publicity are not just directed to the publicizing of the Peace Corps favorably, but a lot of it is apparently being spent being sure that unfavorable publicity does not see the light of day, or even constructive critical publicity.

I may direct attention to some specifics. The Peace Corps came before the Committee on Ways and Means at the time of its inception to ask for special privileges for its own people; the privilege that no other employee or group in the United States gets, in two instances: one, to average their income over the period of time for which they are paid a lump sum at the end of 2 years so that they could put it back into the year in which it is earned. No one can do that, because you have to pay your tax on your income when you get it; and the second tax privilege which was even more of an exception I thought, and an unwarranted one. During the time that they train in this country and the income they received, or whatever is in lieu of income, is not counted as income. And yet our Foreign Service people and people who go abroad for our private enterprises have to pay taxes during their training periods for the moneys and allowances they receive just like everyone else.

I got into this matter before the Committee on Ways and Means in order to try to find out, as a member of the committee and for the benefit of the House, what the facts were. I took the floor of the House during that debate to point out this very important tax privilege we were granting to the Peace Corps personnel. There was not one smidgeon of that criticism, and it was constructive criticism against the Peace Corps, printed in the papers of the United States. I have made these points I am making here in speeches in my own community time and again. Somehow or other, anything that seems to be a little bit critical of the Peace Corps, when we try to understand what it really is, does not get publicity. So I suspect that not only is the taxpayers' money being spent to publicize this organization but some of it seems to go to see to it that no fair criticism of it is reported.

The people who are supporting this organization have had plenty of time, but there are very few people who are willing to take the floor and say anything against this holy cow that receives all of this favorable publicity. It is not a pleasant thing to try to shed light on this subject, because I am deeply sympathetic with the objectives of the Peace Corps and the motivation of our young people in joining it. I think it is a wonderful thing. But let me say that this motivation has been going on in our society for hundreds of years. This is our missionary type of program, and I again emphasize not just religious missions.

Back in 1954 I authored an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to increase the tax deduction by an additional 10 percent which would go to medical institutions, educational and religious institutions, and what I had in mind at the time and said at the time had to do with the right to channel our private funds into the real person-to-person programs, our private programs. This Peace Corps program is no person-to-person program. Sargent Shriver himself testified that he gets the consent of the political government before he moves into that particular area with the Peace Corps. And this is as it should be, because it is a Government program.

When you go into a country that is run by a dictator, with consent of the dictator, it becomes a weapon in his hands to keep himself on the backs of the people, because a little community that will not bow under the heel of the dictator will not get the Peace Corps or any of the other foreign aid programs through their political government. But it is a different thing with our missionary programs; and again I emphasize not just religious missions, the sanitary missions, the educational missions. They go where they choose, because it is a private and a true person-to-person operation.

There is nothing in this committee report that gives us any indication of the balances between the private sector and the governmental sector in this fine missionary work, in this tremendous and wonderful field of trying to assist more unfortunate humanity outside of our shores. For the Congress to pass judgment of how much and what we should do in the governmental program, we need to know what its relation is to the private sector. If we go too far in our zeal to do good, we may actually be damaging the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment if we got into these balances and if the committee would make these kinds of studies, which it has not done, I think we could come up with a little more realistic approach to this program.

As it is—and this is a matter of discussion on the rule, in my judgment the committee, regrettably, has not done the work necessary so that the Congress can pass any intelligent judgment upon this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the rule be voted down, and if we do further discuss it, which will not do any harm, then it might be recommitted and the Committee on Foreign Affairs may develop the necessary data so we can act intelligently on the matter.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has made some charges which I do not find substantiated by any record that I have been able to read.

Actually, it is my understanding that this legislation was introduced and has been pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs now for many months. It is also my understanding that there were studies made of the matter. It is my understanding that no one was refused permission to appear and testify.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, with reference to the attitude of the various missionary organizations and other independent and private groups, there is consultation. I myself, in reading some of the reports which the Peace Corps has put out, find that they certainly indicate there is a rather broad checking and coordinating and discussion with these groups.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri infers that most of the publicity is self-serving. I would like to beg to differ with the gentleman on that statement. I doubt very seriously if the Peace Corps is in any position to bribe reporters and the press corps of this Nation.

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

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will just let me finish this statement.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman used a very unfortunate word. No one suggests bribery.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will just withhold 1 moment until I finish my statement, the point I am trying to make is that the usual stories which we read about in the press of this country in regard to the Peace Corps, in my opinion, give a pretty good story of what is happening and what the attitude is.

Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that I seemed to have touched a tender nerve with him. I am not charging that the gentleman himself has bribed anyone. I am simply saying the Peace Corps is not in a position to dictate to the press what the press prints about this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, the gentleman was not suggesting any bribery on my part or on the part of anyone else, when I was talking about the public relations media. I am suggesting that we are all familiar with how publicity is obtained, and it is obtained in many ways and there is a lot of hard work which is done by these people in public relations.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not a question of bribery. It is limited to exactly what I said, the amount of money that is spent and is being spent to publicize the Peace Corps and its visits around to various countries. This costs a good bit of money.

There is no implication of bribery or anything of that nature. It is not meant in that sense. It is simply a question of how you do get the public information to the people and to the Congress about this particular program.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by citing the figures which the report sets out and which are the figures that we have before us

today. On the cost of administering this program there is the figure of 19.9 percent for the administration of the proposed program. This program has never been heavy in administrative costs. In fact, that was the point I intended to make originally. In comparison with other agencies of Government, it has a much lower cost for its administrative operations than most agencies of the Government. Actually, the majority of the money is going into the field to assist the volunteers and back them up in doing a job in whatever country they may be.

This is an important facet of the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if it is just a coincidence that we got these copies of a booklet from the Peace Corps yesterday, the day before the bill comes up for consideration? Some Members have stated they received this propaganda in the mail this morning. I just wonder if this is purely by coincidence?

Mr. SISK. I cannot say about that. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, so that the House may be permitted to go into the Committee of the Whole for a full explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9009, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9009 authorizes funds to finance the operation of the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1964 and also includes 16 amendments to the basic Peace Corps Act, none of which involves any major change in policy, organization, or operation.

I am glad to be able to report to the House that the Peace Corps has completed more than 2 years of successful operation. The bad things that many of us were afraid might happen have not happened, and the reaction to the Peace Corps everywhere it is in operation is favorable.

I suppose that 2 years ago, when the original Peace Corps legislation was under consideration, every one of us had

some doubt as to whether it would be possible for several thousand men and women from the United States, most of them of college age, to live and work in the less-developed countries of the world without creating a lot of incidents which would result in unfavorable publicity and add to the problems of carrying out our foreign policy. Two years of operation have proved this fear to be groundless. The only case that has made headlines and stirred up sentiment in any foreign country was the case where the Peace Corps girl in Nigeria lost a postcard which she had written describing to a friend in the United States the conditions which she found in Nigeria in a manner which was accurate but which was displeasing to the people of that country. This happened more than a year ago. This incident, although widely publicized, did not interfere with the Peace Corps program in Nigeria where Peace Corps operations are going forward in a manner most satisfactory to all concerned.

Out of approximately 7,000 Peace Corps volunteers now overseas, only 21 have been sent home for misbehavior. The total number who have had to return to America for personal reasons is about 4 percent. There have been 64 who came home for medical reasons; 68 have been dropped because of their inability to adjust to work or living conditions overseas; 65 have come home for compassionate reasons, such as death of a parent or a family problem requiring the return of the volunteer to the United States; 56 have been brought back for personal reasons, such as marriage or divorce while in service. This record is remarkably good. The percentage of people brought home is lower than for other branches of Government service or, according to the information available to us, than the records of corporations conducting large-scale overseas operations.

Let me emphasize again the fact that in none of these cases has there been any case which produced headlines or anti-American sentiment.

Another problem which all of us were concerned with when the Peace Corps began its operations and which has failed to materialize was whether or not the countries would find the Peace Corps volunteers useful and would make them welcome. Here again the results have been most favorable.

We at present have Peace Corps volunteers located in 48 countries, and there is no case in which any country has asked to have the Peace Corps program terminated. The largest number in any one country has been the Philippines where the latest number reported was 628. Most of these are teachers. In every country where volunteers are now working, the country wants to have their number increased, and there are several additional countries who want to be included.

Let me say in passing that the program for fiscal 1964 provides for sending Peace Corps volunteers to only three additional countries: two in Latin America and one in Africa. The expansion which is desired will be in the direction

of sending more volunteers to the countries where the program is already in operation rather than pioneering in new countries.

All of the evidence available to the committee indicates that the Peace Corps volunteers are rendering useful services to the countries where they are working, that they are well liked, and that more are desired.

Another question that many of us had in mind when the Peace Corps was proposed initially was whether or not an adequate supply of volunteers would be available. Again, the record speaks for itself.

There are three times as many applicants today as there were a year ago. Only one applicant in seven actually becomes an oversea volunteer. Nevertheless, there is no indication that the supply of volunteers will fail to keep pace with the demand in the foreseeable future.

The bill authorizes \$102 million for fiscal 1964. The appropriation for fiscal 1963 was \$59 million, of which \$3,870,000 was returned to the Treasury. The original request made by the Executive was for \$108 million, which was reduced to \$102 million last October at the time of the committee's hearings on the Peace Corps legislation.

The decision as to how much money should be voted for the Peace Corps is basically a decision as to how many Peace Corps volunteers should be sent overseas. It costs \$9,000 a year to train, transport, and maintain a volunteer. The readjustment allowance of \$75 a month which each volunteer gets upon his return to the United States after completion of his service is only a small part of the annual cost. The largest cost items are for training, transportation and living allowances while stationed abroad. All volunteers are given 6 to 8 weeks of language training, as well as other preparation for their assignments. Most of this training is carried out at various universities in the United States and in Puerto Rico. The administrative costs of the program decrease as the number of volunteers becomes larger. It is estimated that in fiscal 1964 administrative expenses will amount to only 19 percent of the total cost.

The Executive has requested \$102 million for fiscal 1964 in order to build up to a level of 11,300 volunteers by August, 1964. There are approximately 7,000 volunteers overseas at the present time. Last year the Peace Corps announced its goal as being 10,000 volunteers which would cost approximately \$90 million a year to maintain. When the appropriation last year was reduced to \$59 million, the Peace Corps reduced its planned level to 9,000 volunteers. During fiscal 1963 this level was not attained, and in August only 6,600 volunteers were on board. This delay in building up the organization was due to two factors:

First, it was decided to increase the length of the training period in order that more training in languages could be given. This slowed down the rate of increase.

The other reason was that the programs in different countries required volunteers with specialized backgrounds in many instances, such as, teachers of science and persons with agricultural training. It was more difficult to recruit people of this kind than some others, but the rate of recruitment was adjusted to the availability of the required skills rather than filling up the organization with whatever kinds of volunteers happened to be most readily available.

As a result of this delay, the Peace Corps returned \$3,870,000 to the Treasury at the end of the last fiscal year. The evidence indicates that the Peace Corps has been prudent in its handling of the taxpayers' money. It has not recruited volunteers as fast as possible within the limit of the funds available and has returned money to the Treasury rather than obligate it for low priority requirements.

It was the feeling of the committee that this conscientious use of funds by the Peace Corps deserved commendation and encouragement. We, therefore, approved the entire amount requested in the belief that should the Peace Corps during fiscal 1964 find it impossible or undesirable to expand up to the level of 11,300 volunteers as programmed, the unneeded funds would be conserved and returned to the Treasury.

The reason why the Peace Corps has decided to build the number of volunteers above the 9,000 or 10,000 level contemplated last year is the increased demand for volunteers from the countries of Latin America and from Africa. In both these areas, the lack of teachers and of skilled technicians is particularly serious. These countries need teachers, nurses, tractor mechanics, surveyors, and other technicians who are ready to work at their specialties.

Let me remind you that when a Peace Corps volunteer is stationed in a foreign country, he is not working on something called a Peace Corps project; he is working at some operation being carried on, directed and financed by the Government or some other entity in the country where he is located. If he is a teacher, he works as a teacher in a school under the direction of the education authorities which run the school along with local teachers. If he is working on a highway project, he works under the local highway authorities as a surveyor or engineer, or in whatever capacity his skill permits. In hospitals and health centers, Peace Corps volunteers are serving as nurses and technicians along with local people.

The need for people with the skills possessed by Peace Corps volunteers in the less developed countries is self-evident. The record shows that the Peace Corps has been remarkably successful in helping to meet this need.

I will not discuss in detail the 16 amendments to the basic Peace Corps Act which the bill contains. Each of them is described in the committee report, which I commend to your attention.

I would like to say a word, however, about section 8 of the bill which deals with encouragement of voluntary serv-

ice programs. The Executive requested authority to use Peace Corps funds to finance the International Peace Corps Secretariat and to assist other nations in organizing and operating peace corps of their own. The committee was firmly opposed to the use of Peace Corps funds in this manner.

The committee recognized, however, that there are a number of countries in the world, particularly those in Europe, whose citizens are possessed of skills which would be of great value to the less developed countries and were willing to volunteer to serve in these countries under arrangements similar to those of our own Peace Corps. We believe that it was desirable for the United States to encourage these countries to develop voluntary service programs of this kind and to give them the benefit of the knowledge and skills which we had derived as a result of our own experience with the Peace Corps.

Section 8 of the bill prohibits the contribution of Peace Corps funds to any international organization or to any country. It authorizes, however, the Peace Corps to provide knowledge and skills to countries, or international organizations, within a limit of expenditures of \$300,000 for fiscal year 1964. The knowledge and skills which may be provided are limited to the selection, training and programming of volunteer manpower.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is a remarkably successful operation which deserves our continuing support. There have been no significant criticisms of its operations to date.

There appear to be some who have misgivings about the future of the Peace Corps, who fear that it may become too big and too bureaucratic in its operations.

I urge you to judge the Peace Corps on its record. Just as the fears that many of us had at the beginning have proved to be groundless, I think the fears that are expressed about the future of the Peace Corps will also prove groundless.

The administration of the Peace Corps has been careful of the taxpayers' money and has held its rate of expansion within realistic limits.

There is every reason to believe that the record in fiscal 1964 will be as good as the record for fiscal 1963 has been. At the end of fiscal 1964 we will all have an opportunity to evaluate what has been done and to consider what should be done in the future. The Peace Corps today, however, has shown itself worthy of our support, and I urge the approval of this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. I wish to address my questions, Mr. Chairman, to title III. Do you have a copy of it over there?

First of all, let me say in preface to my questions that I believe in the Peace Corps and I think it is doing a fine job in meeting the requirements that are outlined here, but I am worried about the words "or areas" on line 24, page 5,

and line 1 of the next page—"or areas." Does the committee mean by that those are foreign countries or foreign areas, or domestic areas?

Mr. MORGAN. No. Those are foreign countries, foreign areas.

Mr. GIBBONS. There is no intention on the part of the committee to allow any of this \$300,000 to be spent for the establishment of a so-called Domestic Peace Corps or National Service Corps?

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has given us a good indication of what is proposed in this bill, H.R. 9009. I rise in support of this legislation. I only wish I could answer all of the questions which have already been asked of me since I came on the floor.

I would like to begin by a brief comment with respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri about the adequacy of the hearings. It so happened that I was in southeast Asia at the time, so I was not actually a participant in those hearings. I would agree with him that committee hearings should be as substantial as possible. It might well have been advisable to seek out, for their opinions and advice, some of the private organizations which are interested in the same area of effort as the Peace Corps. And yet my impression is that there is more than enough room for all of the private efforts now underway as well as the Peace Corps itself. So far as I know, there is harmony between the private and the governmental efforts.

The needs are so enormous that we do not need to worry about possible overlapping of efforts, or a diminution or lack of interest on the part of private organizations because of the activities of the Peace Corps.

It seems to me important that we recognize that this program is one of the least expensive, and probably one of the most productive, ways in which we can demonstrate our interest in the problems of other people.

The gentleman from Missouri criticized this program as a "holy cow," as not being a person-to-person program but one which involves government with government. In answer to that contention, I would like to point out that any private effort, missionary or otherwise, can only operate within a foreign country with the permission of that government. In some cases missionaries have been forced to leave certain countries. The Ford Foundation, as I recall, was obliged to leave Burma because it was no longer considered acceptable to the Government of that country.

On the other hand, how can we truthfully say that the Peace Corps does not represent a person-to-person effort? I say this because our trip to Asia took us both to Malaysia, where we have a program involving 260 Peace Corps volunteers, and to the Philippines, where we have one of our more substantial programs, involving 474 individuals. On our trip to Kuala Lumpur, capital of Malaysia, part of our study mission had the

opportunity to visit a leprosarium outside that city. There are about 2,500 patients in this particular leprosarium. There have been three Peace Corps volunteers in that establishment. On the day of our visit, two volunteers had already returned home and there was only one young lady left there. Her name, I might add, is Miss Sadie Stout, of Arkansas City, Kans. She impressed us all very deeply with her intelligence and her devotion to the job she was doing. We were also impressed by the respect in which she and her covolunteers were held by those who worked with them.

It was our understanding that this American effort, small as it was in numbers, had made a very substantial impact on the Malaysians themselves. The volunteers had encouraged the Malaysian people to join in working at this institution. When we discuss this program, therefore, we need to keep in mind the very real amount of good it does.

The chairman has indicated that this program has been slow to develop and that a great effort has been made to recruit volunteers with care and to give them adequate training. Recently the training program has been lengthened.

There has been increased emphasis on learning the language of the areas to which the volunteers will go. In various ways, I think it is fair to say, the Peace Corps has learned by experience. It has significantly improved the recruitment and selection of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, there is going to be a major discussion about the rate at which the Peace Corps should expand. Questions will be asked also about its capacity to expand as quickly as would be possible if this full authorization of \$102 million should be approved.

I do not suppose any of us can tell with any positiveness how quickly a quality establishment can be recruited. However, I would think it would be the path of wisdom for us to approve the authorization recommended by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me a letter which has been circulated to some of the membership of the House, signed by four members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which claims that the Peace Corps has had consistent difficulty in obtaining the number of volunteers scheduled, and by the admission of its Director, can only do so by lowering the standards of selection, which is not contemplated.

I have indicated that I was not here for the hearings, but my reading of the hearings would not support such a contention.

We all know that the goal of 9,000 volunteers by the end of the last fiscal year was not achieved. That this was the case, I believe, should be a source of congratulations rather than a source of concern. The goal was not reached because the Peace Corps was deeply determined to maintain the quality of those they did select.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should now decide that we should make it impossible to go ahead with the proposed expansion. This is an expansion which has been anticipated since the pro-

gram was first set up. Certainly we should not hold down the proposed expansion simply because they did not meet their goals last June 30.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Director of the Peace Corps, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, admitted that the only way in which the proposed expansion could be made would be by lowering the standards of selection. Quite the contrary. My feeling was that he suggested that the applications were coming in in such volume, as the chairman of the full committee has pointed out, that we would be able to maintain, and even improve, our standards and still meet the goals.

Furthermore, I think it should be pointed out that the experience in the last fiscal year should be an indication of what may lie ahead, if we should allow this authorization. The Peace Corps deliberately did not expand its roster to the full 9,000 authorized. Consequently, just under \$4 million which was available to the Peace Corps was not utilized.

If it should not reach its goal of 11,300 volunteers in this current fiscal year, I think we could reasonably anticipate that some of the money available to the program would not be utilized.

Mr. Chairman, we would be very uncharitable and illogical if we should conclude that because the money is available they are inevitably going to expend it.

Therefore, I do hope that we will think twice before we support a major cut of the kind which I understand is contemplated. The amount of the proposed cut, I might add, was not spelled out in the letter which was circulated to some of the membership.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I have several questions that I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey.

A recent publication quotes one Douglas Kiker, who signs the mail as Chief of the Public Information Division of the Peace Corps, as saying—this is in regard to sending Peace Corps volunteers to Indonesia to help Sukarno who is a known Communist—the following:

You can be sure we're not going to send any flag-wavers over there, any kids with the Declaration of Independence tattooed on their chests. All our people will be acceptable to Sukarno.

I wrote to Mr. Kiker and asked him about this. He wrote back the following:

Our belief is that the volunteers would be a continuing source of controversy if they went to all these countries with the professed duty of "preaching" the democratic free-enterprise system to the local citizens.

My question would be this: What system does the testimony indicate they are "preaching" to these people?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In answer to the gentleman, I did not see the reference to which the gentleman refers until a few minutes ago, so I have not been able to check the facts. My feeling is the Peace Corps volunteers are not primarily engaged in political activity

of any kind. In my opinion it would be inadvisable for them to do that.

The gentleman has suggested that the Peace Corps volunteers being sent to Indonesia are being sent to help Sukarno. I think that is an unfair way to put it. There are approximately 17 volunteers in Indonesia. As far as I know they are experts in physical education. To what extent, and in what way, the development of the capacities of young Indonesians in the field of physical education would be helping Sukarno is a question. I would not think that the so-called leadership of Sukarno would be in any way affected by those 17 volunteers. I think this is an unfortunate description of why they are being sent to that country.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Kiker's letter to me in effect indicates it is the custom to send Peace Corps volunteers that are acceptable to the leadership of the country. If they are acceptable to Sukarno and they are not over there to preach, as he says, "the democratic free enterprise system to local citizens." He says that if they did they would be put out.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is not arguing, I hope, that we could expect to send volunteers to countries that are not willing to accept them, whether or not they are going to preach when they get there, or whether the group is a governmental or private group. There has to be clearance by the authorities in the countries to which the volunteers go in order to have them get there. One of the surest ways to have them ousted as soon as they get there is for them to preach the overthrow of the existing government of that country. It would be well to keep out of the political problems of the kind the gentleman is describing.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to inform the gentleman from Kentucky that each Peace Corps volunteer is given a handbook as a guide for his conduct. I should like to read one of the paragraphs which appears on page 46 in the hearings. The Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver, put in this quotation from the handbook, and I think that will answer the question.

It reads as follows:

We hope you will represent the best in your country with honesty and with dignity, and that you will explain American principles and problems to the honest doubter and the curious. You are likely to be most effective if you speak from your personal beliefs and experience. Bear in mind, however, that the Peace Corps purpose is service. Your equipment does not include a soapbox. Answer detractors through hard work and accomplishment, not in political debate (pp. 16-17).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Am I correct in my belief that about 125 volunteers are set aside for the United Nations to strengthen the U.N.; is that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That authority is in the legislation now for a

maximum of 125 volunteers to work with the United Nations and its specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization. There is no increase recommended in this bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Am I also correct in my assumption that Peace Corps trainees are trained for approximately 4 months, during which time they are supposed to learn the language and customs of the country they are going to?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There is a very intensive instructional program in the language of the country to which they are going, including a training period of up to 120 days. I think that is the normal length of the training program.

Mr. SNYDER. I have been told that a Peace Corps staff officer by the name of John Cort draws \$10,645 a year, and it cost \$13,150 to send him and his family to his station, is that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Again I have no specific information about the case to which the gentleman refers. As I understood from the facts available to him, this family was composed of nine children. If this big a family was sent to the Philippines I would think it would cost that much. However, I would not attempt to argue with the gentleman about the validity of those figures.

Mr. SNYDER. These questions come from a constituent of mine in a letter. That is why I would like to get the answer. This constituent indicates that Wheaton College and Berea College, which happens to be in Kentucky, are not acceptable to the Peace Corps because they are "too religiously oriented." She quotes from a publication known as Christianity Today, issue of December 21, 1962. Does the gentleman know whether that is correct or not?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Again, I am not a regular reader of Christianity Today.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Let me make the record clear on this point. There is no ground to the accusation of religious discrimination by the Peace Corps in the selection of training institutions. As a matter of fact, in addition to Georgetown and Notre Dame, the Peace Corps has trained at Oberlin, Chicago, Berea, and Springfield Colleges, all of which have various Protestant affiliations.

In addition, a Peace Corps official who is an ordained Baptist minister, will be busy making the annual address at Wheaton College tomorrow.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In view of the chairman's reference to the instructions for the Peace Corps members not to take soapboxes along, I wonder if they can give assurance that in countries such as Sukarno's the hosts are admonished not to have soapboxes to expound their ideologies.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, as already has been outlined by the very able and distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDOWELL], the Peace Corpsmen have, indeed, proven themselves. The charge that the Peace Corps has almost no record of accomplishment, as stated in the minority report to this bill, is completely in error.

I rise in support of H.R. 9009, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. I, like the gentleman from New Jersey, was not at the hearings. We happened to be in southeast Asia on a congressional study mission of which I was chairman. We were in southeast Asia to assess the military, political, and economic situation there. One of the bright spots in the picture was the study mission's observation of the fine work being done by the American Peace Corps.

As the gentleman from New Jersey has stated, we visited the leprosarium in Selangor near Kuala Lumpur, in Malaysia. One could not help but feel a real sense of pride in these Americans toiling far from their homes and loved ones, not in the big cities but in the hinterland.

Right on the boundary between Malaysia and Thailand was a single Peace Corps girl working not only in the field of nursing but also at giving the people of her region the real image of what America stands for.

Besides the volunteers in the leprosarium, there are others employed in the district hospitals in Malaysia, in rural health centers, in yaws and tuberculosis control programs, or engaged in child and infant care.

Other volunteers in Malaysia are teachers, 4-H project leaders, and rural development workers. Among the latter occupation group are architects in charge of school construction, heavy equipment operators, and surveyors engaged in road construction, foresters and soil analysts who are mapping the forests to provide information necessary for land-use planning.

The Malaysia press has been almost unanimously complimentary on the subject of the Peace Corps. Its Government is among those which have requested more volunteers—and is willing to contribute to their upkeep.

Right now, for example, the Malaysian Government provides 70 percent of volunteer housing and basic furnishings. They also supply uniforms for nurses, transportation on work assignments, medical care and general equipment on the same basis as that provided for Malaysian civil servants.

The reputation of the Peace Corps was high in the Philippines which we also visited. There we were told of the many accomplishments of the 474 volunteers working throughout the Philippine Islands. Most of this group were teachers, working in 350 rural elementary schools, high schools, normal schools and colleges.

The impact of these young people on Philippine education has been notable. According to Philippine officials, the volunteers are making important progress in giving the average Filipino a better education and, consequently, a better chance in life.

As an expression of the high regard in which the Peace Corps is held in the Philippines and elsewhere throughout Asia, its volunteers working in the Far East and the Pacific were given the 1963 Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding. This award is known as the Asian Nobel Prize.

Is this not an instance of evidence of accomplishment in fact?

Director Shriver, who received the award on behalf of the volunteers in a ceremony in Manila last August, has called it, and I quote "The finest tribute the Peace Corps volunteers have received."

More than that, however, it is the best possible advertisement for the United States and the American way of life. Through their collective efforts, the Peace Corps volunteers are showing the world what Americans are really like.

The accomplishments of the Peace Corps have been recognized by most of those who originally opposed the creation of the program. Yet there are individuals who oppose the modest expansion of the program included in the legislation now before this body.

Their opposition, they say, is based on the fear that the Peace Corps will grow too big, too cumbersome, too bureaucratic. I share their concern about this eventuality, but I do not fear that it will occur with the modest expansion provided in the pending legislation.

Let us fear that the Peace Corps is too big when the number of volunteers begins to approximate the number of requests for volunteers.

We know that this is far from the case now. Although the Peace Corps now has volunteers at work in 46 countries, some 20 more countries have had to be turned down in their requests for corpsmen.

In many of the countries in which the Peace Corps is working, the Governments have repeatedly asked that additional volunteers be sent. None of us need to be reminded of the work that remains to be done in the underdeveloped and emerging countries of the world.

This is particularly true with respect to Central and South America where a continentwide effort against hunger, ignorance and poverty are underway. Most of the additional Peace Corps men will be sent to assist our neighbors of Latin America.

Let us fear that the Peace Corps is too big when administrative costs begin to surge upward.

Thus far, as we have seen and has already been stated, the opposite is true. The ratio of administrative expenses to the cost of the Peace Corps programs has decreased.

Let us fear that the Peace Corps has grown too big when the quality of the volunteers lags.

As we know, this has not happened. Rather, the trend in the Peace Corps has

been toward attaining tighter and higher requirements for more technically qualified volunteers.

As the result of 2 years experience and continuous research into what makes a good Peace Corps volunteer, selection procedures and criteria have improved. This improvement is reflected in the quality of the young men and women we are sending abroad as representatives of our Nation.

No, Mr. Chairman, I have no fear that with the passage of this bill, the Peace Corps will abandon its hard scrabble, pioneer stance to wander down the primrose lane of bureaucratic bigness.

Rather, I have every confidence that the Peace Corps, under the able leadership of Director Shriver and his staff, will continue the fine record of achievement which has been compiled in the first 2 years of the program's existence.

History will call the Peace Corps one of the finest products of American genius. We cannot abandon that genius now.

Two years ago, when this body passed the original Peace Corps Act, we were directly instrumental in putting America's best foot forward. Now, Mr. Chairman, the time has come to take another step. Therefore, I very strongly recommend that the bill be passed as it has been recommended out of our committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps has since its inception shown most careful restraint in the expenditure of the U.S. taxpayers' money. Last year alone, the Peace Corps returned to the Treasury \$3.9 million of unused funds. Let me make clear that the Peace Corps could easily have expended this amount, like some other agencies of Government have in the past, but chose not to. I want to state that to turn this commendable practice into an argument against authorizing all of the funds requested by the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1964 is both unwise and unwarranted.

It is unwise, Mr. Chairman, because we want to encourage all Government agencies to show the type of restraint that the Peace Corps has demonstrated. It is clear that the Peace Corps could have met its last year's goal of 9,000 volunteers if it had chosen to do so and thus could have expended those \$4 million, for the Peace Corps received over 32,000 applications last year, which is far more than enough to create a 9,000-man Peace Corps. But the Peace Corps voluntarily chose to raise even higher its selection standards. It also chose to try to fulfill requests of countries overseas for certain hard-to-find skills rather than send over persons with difficult skills which were not specifically requested. Thus I certainly want to add my support to the statement made by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in their majority report that:

The restraint that has characterized the administration [of the Peace Corps] should be encouraged. The full amount of the

funds requested have been approved by the committee in the belief that they will be used prudently.

Mr. Chairman, not only do I feel the argument that I have described is unwise, I also feel that it is unwarranted. There is every indication that the Peace Corps will have 11,300 well-qualified volunteers on board by the end of next summer. The American people are continuing to respond to the challenge of the Peace Corps—and they are responding in ever-increasing numbers—4,338 applications were received last month, compared with 2,342 for October 1962. In fact, yesterday no less than 537 people applied for the Peace Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I think these figures I have just mentioned are a fine tribute to the American people. They also demonstrate that the Peace Corps is going full steam ahead and will meet its goals. In setting its goals for this year, the Peace Corps has taken into account its shortfall of last year. It has reduced its goal from 13,000 to 11,300 volunteers and, consequently, reduced its request for funds from \$108 to \$102 million. I think we should give this fine organization a vote of confidence; I think we should adopt the majority recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and vote the Peace Corps the \$102 million that it has asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one of the strongest arms of our foreign policy. I have traveled in Africa, in the Far East, and in the Middle East. I have seen the members of the Peace Corps out in the jungles around the world. I have seen these areas where they have 98 percent illiteracy. And if it were not for a member of the Peace Corps, living out in their jungles in a tent or in a hut, or in a little trailer, along with another member of the Peace Corps, educating these children—if it were not for these members, such education would not be available to these poor, unfortunate people out in the farflung jungles of the world. I have seen areas where they had to travel for miles and miles and miles, over dirt roads, or on the back of a donkey, or water buffalo without finding a nurse or a doctor to care for the ills of these poor people afflicted with malaria, yaws, dysentery, or any one of the many other tropical diseases.

I have seen 4-H members now in the Peace Corps working in a school feeding program—irrigation work, animal husbandry—helping and teaching the downtrodden how to produce crops to sustain themselves from starvation.

I have seen members of the Peace Corps working in a project of self-help community development in Africa, laying out roads, building bridges and culverts, schools, and water systems.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this honorable body will vote this authorization bill in full today.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is with a sense of amazement that I have been sitting here listening to a debate as to whether we should cut from the Peace Corps budget request a figure

amounting to some 10 or 20 percent of the total.

I am firmly convinced that the Peace Corps is achieving, with a striking degree of success, the goals which were established for it. And I believe that they have worked toward those goals wisely and responsibly, never sacrificing quality for the sake of quantity. Every indication available to us seems to support me in those convictions.

If any Member of this House believes that the Peace Corps has failed or that it is destined to fail in the coming year, I would be delighted to discuss with him whether it should continue to exist at all. But I cannot understand what is to be gained by the saving of 10 or 20 percent of the Peace Corps request at the cost of crippling that agency during the coming year, and perhaps permanently.

I have heard nothing so far which supports the assertion that \$85 million is a more suitable level of authorization for the Peace Corps than \$102 or \$50 or \$2 million. Until we have an indication that some portion of their request is indeed marginal—that some can be spared and some cannot—I maintain that we should give them the full amount or nothing at all. On the basis of the Peace Corps performance during the past 2½ years, I am sure that we would not be making a mistake in giving them the full amount.

There are, of course, those among our membership who consistently look at the negative side and project America's future into the depths of communistic atheism.

Two months ago the Birch publications called it defeat for capitalism and appeasement for the United States to sell wheat behind the Iron Curtain, un-American to limit our armaments in any way and arm ourselves to the teeth.

It is significant that yesterday's issue of U.S. News & World Report concluded in a major editorial that the Soviets had lost the cold war because they have given up in space and now want to trade with us.

U.S. News fails to recognize that the existing Democratic administration is the responsible entity that has convinced the Soviets that Birch and Smoot groups do not speak for the United States—they can trust us both in trade and space. The Peace Corps is assisting in promoting this international understanding.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, if there was one bill that has seemed to capture the imagination of the entire Nation, if not the entire world, it was the bill that was put before us some 3 years ago when we first passed the Peace Corps bill. I do not think since I have been in Congress that I have been identified with a more popular issue than the Peace Corps. I understand that later in the debate there will be an effort made to cut back the Peace Corps from the amount requested in this bill.

What are the reasons we should be asking as to why the Peace Corps should not be given the room to move which the committee has suggested in the bill

now before us? In answering that question to ourselves we should ask why has the Peace Corps not fulfilled its past commitment that they had made, of recruiting some 9,000 members by August of this year. What is the reason for this? I think if we examine carefully into the matter we will find that the Peace Corps raised the criteria for the selection of their people.

In other words, they specifically have changed from a training requirement of 140 hours in languages to 280 hours of training in languages. This has, in effect, resulted in a slowing-down influence on their recruitment. For this action, I think they should be commended. I do not believe that we in the Congress should be in a position of penalizing them for having tightened up and improved the criteria and quality of the members of the Peace Corps as they go about getting into this occupation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the minority report they say that they heard only from Sargent Shriver who is the head of the Peace Corps, in rather salutary terms. The minority report says that "against these accomplishments, by public relations, we have almost no evidence of accomplishment in fact."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of another committee in Congress that has been furnished more information about an activity of Government than we have in the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the Peace Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand three volumes, "The Story of the Peace Corps Volunteers," and it was furnished every member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has a long index. Under the index it reads "What We Were Told To Do" under the first heading. The next heading is "What We Achieved." The next heading is "Where We Propose To Go and What It Would Cost."

Now, Mr. Chairman, under each of those headings it is broken down so that anyone who really wanted to dig deeply into the Peace Corps would have adequate information at hand. That is only volume I. In volume II it goes into the geographic areas of the world and tells the story of what has happened in each area of the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the statement in the minority views is incorrect because, certainly, there has been ample information that has been supplied.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the mail the Peace Corps received over 6,000 pieces of mail in 1 day. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the method of recruiting volunteers has been substantially changed. During the last 3 years, they have been going to college campuses in the spring of the year in order to attract the graduates. The Peace Corps this year have changed that because they find most seniors have made up their minds as to where they are going to work prior to that time. So, they are beginning in the fall of this year to go out and now anticipate that of the 650,000 graduates of the colleges next year about 10 percent of them will be interested in the Peace Corps and that

1 percent of that 10 percent will be finally selected.

Mr. Chairman, these are statistics which have been compiled not by a partisan individual or group. Indeed, the figures were prepared by the former Comptroller of the General Services Administration, Mr. Max Medley, who was the Comptroller of the GSA during the Eisenhower administration. He is the man who is now statistical adviser to the Peace Corps. He has made the estimate that the Peace Corps will have 65,000 volunteer applications of which they expect to recruit approximately 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should support the Peace Corps in this instance, and vote the authorization that was overwhelmingly approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9009.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest things that has come out of the Kennedy administration is the Peace Corps.

Several years ago, when Dr. Dana Farnsworth of Harvard University researched into the question of why our young men and women were turning to crime and delinquency, he came up with this conclusion: that our young men and women today are afflicted with one grave illness, a lack of purpose in living.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps has given to our youth, and even to our elders, a new purpose in living.

I may sound more like a minister than a Congressman when I say this, but what greater purpose in life can we instill in our youth than to serve one's fellow man, regardless of race, color, or creed, toward the end of peace?

This is what the Peace Corps has done.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is the best and cheapest investment that this country has ever made in international good will.

Moreover, dollar for dollar, this expenditure has proven more effective in selling American democracy abroad than anything else we have ever done. The United States has spent many billions of dollars in military assistance and in direct expenditures in maintaining U.S. forces abroad for the sole purpose of our own national security, to guard against the further territorial expansion of communism. In South Vietnam, alone, we are spending a million and a half dollars a day.

The Peace Corps budget asked of Congress this year is puny in comparison. No money appropriated by this body was ever spent for a better purpose, or with greater efficiency in terms of the results obtained.

Last year the Peace Corps operated in 46 different countries. The demand for U.S. Peace Corps volunteers far outstrips the supply. At the beginning of this fiscal year, there were 4,393 volunteers serving overseas and 2,161 in training. Of these, 2,238 are in Africa or preparing to be assigned there. There are 2,194 in Latin America, 1,272 in the Far East, and 850 in the Near East-south Asia re-

gion. The unselfish services of these Americans have been greatly appreciated in every country they have entered. This is a true measure of achievement.

One of the most encouraging signs relative to our program has been the organization of Peace Corps units by other nations of the free world. The Netherlands, Denmark, West Germany, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and Switzerland have all started such programs. In addition, the International Peace Corps Secretariat is helping to create domestic Peace Corps units in a number of the nations where the United States and European Peace Corps units have already been at work.

The great work of the Peace Corps has been recognized by the various nations served, but the most definitive recognition has come from the Philippines, which awarded the Ramon Magsaysay Award, the Asian equivalent to the Nobel Prize, to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps.

The Manila Evening News commented that the American Peace Corps volunteers who worked in that part of the world secured a verdict not before vouchsafed to any other foreign group, and that Peace Corps workers achieved in less than 2 years an understanding with Asian peoples that promises to pass all tests.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to inform this body that many of the Peace Corps men who helped in winning this coveted award were trained in the State of Hawaii. Under the able leadership of Dr. John N. Stalker, Director of Peace Corps projects of the University of Hawaii, volunteers for the Philippines and for other Asian nations have been trained at the Hilo Training Center. The transition training program set up in Waipio Valley, Island of Hawaii, offers a realistic simulated environment for service in southeast Asia, complete with rice paddies, thatched huts, and even a team of carabao.

The Hilo Peace Corps Training Center has been highly praised even by those who at one time said the Peace Corps would not work. One of them, John White, now a Peace Corps official in Thailand said the Hilo Training Center is doing an "excellent" job and praised the atmosphere prevailing at the Hilo project.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with trainees at the Hilo Training Center. I have found them fired with enthusiasm and possessed of high ideals. They can only continue to bring credit and favorable reaction to the United States wherever they may serve. The Peace Corps program is one which ought to be continued and expanded.

I urge passage of H.R. 9009.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to others here today in

support of H.R. 9009. I am in full accord with the majority views in the committee report on this bill and urge the Members of the House to support the measure.

The success of the Peace Corps in fulfilling its goals has been demonstrated many times over. More and more volunteers are requested by those countries that have had the opportunity to observe the Corps in action. While we hear many words of criticism of all aspects of our foreign assistance programs, it is significant that seldom do we hear words of criticism of the Peace Corps. Those who withhold their support of this program usually do so on other grounds.

It is noteworthy that this past summer the nearly 1,300 volunteers in 11 Asian countries were selected collectively to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award in international understanding. Often called the Nobel Peace Prize of Asia, this award was conferred on the volunteers "for their contribution to work among people and service to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way." Usually given only to individuals and to Asians, the award is a signal honor and mark of achievement in the relatively short history of the organization. This, Mr. Chairman, attests to the impact the Corps has had in Asia.

I am especially proud to note that the State of Hawaii has had the privilege of contributing in some measure toward the success of the Corps in Asia. Our Hilo training facility has trained more than 25 percent of the total number of volunteers in five southeast Asian countries. We have had the opportunity to observe these spirited and eager volunteers undergo their rigorous training at Hilo, and have followed their work in Asia. We are proud of the opportunity we have in playing a small part in this tremendously important program.

The Peace Corps needs our support. It is a program that offers hope of achieving the goals of international understanding on a more personal basis. It serves the end that men and women of other lands will look on America as a nation of people, not dollars.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I feel the Peace Corps, if it is in any danger at all, it is in danger from its own supporters who are lavish in their pronouncements and their support and in their endorsement of all the press releases that we receive daily from the Peace Corps operations.

I prefer to use a few statistics which the public picks up rather than the complicated philosophy that we have in the House today. I would remind the Members that the Peace Corps was promoted 2½ years ago as a program for dedicated young crusaders who would struggle in the far corners of the world on a fantastic salary of \$75 a month.

We are now told it costs \$9,000 a year to keep this man in the field. In effect, this means 88 percent of the cost of keeping a Peace Corps man in the field is the cost of bureaucracy, and this huge bu-

reaucratic expense is hardly a credit to the Peace Corps man.

May I refer to what the gentleman from New York said a few moments ago, and since I doubt his figures, I wish he would recheck them. I do not see how it is possible for the Peace Corps to receive 6,000 letters a day. I am told that the White House averages 5,000 letters a day, and I do not believe the Peace Corps has outshined the White House as the Great White Father of the Nation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. In fact, I said that more than 6,000 letters are received. The actual letter count yesterday was 6,625 pieces of mail.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Is this for 1 day?

Mr. BARRY. One day.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Then we should increase the authorization to allow extra millions to handle the mail.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to say that with respect to \$9,000 for keeping a man in the Peace Corps, a great deal of this is in the training prior to his going into the field.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I realize that, and I also realize it is due to the cost of issuing press releases.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there is so much interest in the Peace Corps, why do they have recruiting teams running all over the country drumming up volunteers?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I hate to be facetious in answering the gentleman's question, but after all, the Marines, the Air Force, and Navy have recruiters, so there is competition for manpower.

The point I make is that according to the latest statistics we have available, there are approximately 7,100 Peace Corps men in the field. We maintain it is impossible for the Peace Corps to reach its goal of 11,300 by the end of this fiscal year, therefore they could not possibly need the \$102 million.

The point therefore becomes: Rather than have the Peace Corps come in year after year with requests for funds they cannot possibly spend, we would do more to help the cause of its altruistic position by putting them on a realistic basis. We should supply the funds actually needed. We would not have to go through additional debate or concern about the motivation of the Peace Corps every year because it would be reporting to us with legitimate figures. As a Member of Congress who voted against the Peace Corps in the two previous opportunities, this is a painful vote to cast. I recognize the crusading spirit, I recognize the tremendous zeal that individuals carry into the field. But I also recognize that despite any number of booklets the Peace Corps itself may publish or any amount of press releases they produce, the Peace Corps is the great mystery of this era. We know nothing about the Peace Corps except that information which has been generated through a 99.5-percent favorable press. I do not

believe that we as Members of the Congress should put ourselves in the position of giving a blank check year after year to a well-meaning but less than perfectly operated organization. For this reason I urge your careful consideration of amendments that will be forthcoming to give the Peace Corps a realistic sum of money that will not in any way hinder its operations and will permit it to continue serving the country.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that opposition to this bill is led by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON], three of my friends and colleagues from the Middle West.

It is ironic, I say, because if there is one area of the country whose heritage and tradition is in accord with the spirit of unselfish cooperation and working together of the Peace Corps, it is our Middle West. It was over our prairies that the wagon trains rode. It was our clearings that the neighbors helped to clear. It was our barns that the friendly people of the Middle West helped each other raise.

It was Abraham Lincoln of Illinois of history and Johnny Appleseed of legend who were the outward and visible signs of what the Peace Corps now stands for.

I am proud that 10 percent of the members of the Peace Corps, 625 young men and women, are from Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois. I was proud that when I saw the Peace Corps in Chile a year ago, a young woman from Green Bay, Wis., was there showing them how to be a dental technician. A young man from Iowa was showing animal husbandry to those poverty-stricken people. Another young man from the west side of Chicago was sharing his talents with them.

I hope the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois will consider the bill this afternoon and see whether they cannot be sympathetic to it, so that the young people of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa, who want to volunteer their services in the most unselfish effort of the age, and the young people from the other 47 States, can have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That frontier the gentleman is talking about out in the Middle West was the real frontier, not the theoretical frontier of the New Frontier and Kennedy.

Mr. REUSS. I am sure these Peace Corps people have the real spirit of the frontier.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Will the gentleman include me among those midwesterners, since I come from Michigan?

Mr. REUSS. Among the midwesterners who are for the Peace Corps principle?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me say I am deeply stirred by his description of this pioneer spirit. He only left out the most crucial point in describing it. It was not tax subsidized.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago when we were first called upon to vote for the Peace Corps, I joined a very considerable number of our colleagues who did so with great reservation. Each year since that I have had the opportunity of voting for this bill, I have done so with a little more assurance. It is my intention to vote for it this year. This is not, Mr. Chairman, to say that the operation of the Peace Corps is perfect. On the contrary, there are many deficiencies. We could stand here and recite specific examples of things that have been done incorrectly. My file at the committee table contains instances in which money has been improvidently and improperly, in my opinion, spent. But on balance, I believe the program has been good. On balance I believe it is the best of the programs which may generally be grouped together under the heading of foreign aid—and I use that term in its broadest sense. It has been good in part because, as has been pointed out here earlier this afternoon, there has been a sort of missionary spirit connected with much of this program. That is fine and proper and it is as it should be.

On the other hand, I would not have my colleagues think that all people employed by the Peace Corps are employed at minimum wage levels. If you turn to the hearings on page 43, you will find a table of salaries. You will observe that in the Peace Corps there are 19 people who draw salaries between \$18,000 and \$20,000 per year. There are 35 people, if my memory serves me correctly, who draw salaries between \$16,000 and \$18,000 a year. What I am saying is that this program has been generally good. It has a great deal of the missionary, crusading spirit to which I have previously referred. But at the same time in many respects, it is not what one might designate in its entirety as a bare bones type of activity.

I now must pay tribute to Mr. Sargent Shriver and many of his staff. They have performed their duties in a diligent, and I think effective, manner. I believe they are to be commended upon the fact that they have turned back this year almost \$4 million of the amount that was appropriated for the use of the Peace Corps in the last fiscal year.

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Peace Corps should be supported again this year. But I think at the same time the amount of money provided in the bill is too great. This can be gone into in more detail later and I am sure it will be more fully discussed. But what I think this committee and this House ought to do today is to pass the bill with a reasonable reduction in the

amount of dollars authorized for the continuation of this program next year.

One other point should be made, Mr. Chairman. That is in the original proposal there were very broad, sweeping provisions for the activity which we know generally as the International Peace Corps. There are activities of this sort afoot now. The headquarters is in connection with our Peace Corps.

The committee felt, very wisely, that if the Peace Corps is a good idea, if it is an American idea, it ought to be continued as an American project.

In modifying the original provisions and in setting a limit dollarwise of \$300,000, we have done a good and a wise thing. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to permit the values which have been extolled here this afternoon of the Peace Corps as an institution of the United States, as a demonstration of the sentiment of our people—I do not believe we ought to permit that to become diluted and perhaps lose its identity as a part of an international peace corps.

Under the terms of the bill as now before us we may give knowledge and skills to countries which desire to set up their own peace corps establishments, but we have fixed a dollar limit and we have removed much of the sweeping authority originally requested for this purpose.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by urging my colleagues to support this bill and also to support a reasonable dollar reduction, which I do not believe will seriously hamper the proper operation of the program.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, the subject of the Peace Corps is receiving much attention here today as it has since its inception. The primary reasons for its acceptance, in my opinion, are twofold. First, the American people have recognized the failure of other types of foreign aid programs which have created a damaging image of America and are looking for a program that will have a longer range, more productive effect. Second, our people are beginning to realize the urgency of establishing a program that will initiate an ideological offensive of our own—an offensive designed to set the stage for winning the cold war against the U.S.S.R. and other advocates of the Communist doctrine.

There are, however, a few observations that I would like to make. Since 1955, I have participated in a program that provides various missionary services throughout the world—a program designed to promote self-sufficiency. This program is carried on with no tax support from the Federal Government. It has been our experience throughout the

years, once a mission station is established and the native staffing is completed—the service continues to expand but the financial requirements of the sponsoring organization tend to decrease. In effect, the mission programs carried on by many denominations can be appropriately identified as private peace corps.

Where I strongly believe in the principle of the Peace Corps, I feel it is pertinent to point out that the requests for additional funds here today suggest an increasing financial commitment to the sponsor—the U.S. Government—the American taxpayer. With this in mind, I believe we should give more incentive and recognition to the efforts of organizations willing to carry out and expand the private peace corps concept—it would appear to be more efficient and truly provide the motivation for people best equipped to carry on the presentation of the American image.

The great struggle between ideologies continues on and will be with us for years to come. The ideological offensive of the Soviet Union advocates a program where the public sector, I repeat the public sector, provides all services to their population—directs their destinies and controls their opportunities. The American way of life is just the opposite—at least, it has been in the past—bringing this country to its present plateau, where we enjoy the highest standard of living. The American way of life advocates a minimal intervention in the life of the individual by Government. Our federal system of government was designed to provide the guidelines, under constitutional law and to create the environment for the private sector to advance and flourish, with a minimum of restrictions.

Quite frankly, I do not believe the full potential of our Peace Corps effort will be realized until the Committee on Foreign Affairs reconsiders the underlying philosophy of the program. Our philosophy should be reflected in all of our foreign aid programs—more emphasis in the private sector and less emphasis in the public sector. Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am for the Peace Corps concept—and will continue to support the cause. However, it will be my intent to do everything within my power to promote the philosophy that reflects the American system. In addition to current programs, I want to vigorously recommend that the leaders of our private enterprise system recognize a new responsibility of providing for our security. They must take the lead in projecting an ideological offensive truly representative of our private enterprise system—it is they who are the most qualified to lead. The Congress might consider broadening tax incentives to expedite the formation of such a program. Further, the creation of a Freedom Academy, sponsored by our private sector, staffed by qualified graduates of our private enterprise system is, in my judgment, the type of program we should advocate as the answer to the Soviet ideological offensive. A defensive posture, by itself, is no longer adequate to

provide for our security in these rapidly changing times. The American people can be proud of their accomplishments thus far in history—let us show the developing nations throughout the world the American way—a program that positively reflects the American image—peace, security, and freedom with justice, under law.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and I would like to call the attention of the House to a very pleasant letter I received from one of my constituents, Miss Irene M. Kreuser, who is stationed in Asmara, Ethiopia. This letter points out, among other things, that—

There is a great need for teachers in Ethiopia and, as a part of the university extension program, I am teaching philosophy and English in Asmara. The dearth of teachers is exceeded only by the dearth of books. This is difficult for me to do anything about unless there was a way to defray the expense of shipping books, which I could collect from generous contributors in Chicago. The climate is most agreeable here, but I have not yet experienced the rainy season in Ethiopia.

It seems this young lady is doing a most impressive job in Ethiopia in teaching people there the English language and teaching them about America. This young woman is a real credit to our Nation and I am sure she symbolizes all of the fine men and women who are doing such an excellent job for the United States in the Peace Corps.

I am particularly pleased to note that the legislation before us today makes provision to help ship the educational material Miss Kreuser mentions she needs in the form of books to make her efforts even more effective. This is the second letter I have received from my constituents who are part of the Peace Corps who have told about the inspiring work that the Peace Corps is doing under great difficulties. Making it possible to ship them books and other material, as provided in the bill, will make their work even more meaningful.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that those who would want to trim this program should give it another look. I think we can all agree we are all for economy. I have supported many measures here that would reduce Federal expenditures. It would seem to me, however, that here we have a program which really has shown some excellent results. It has been operating with the least amount of red tape and has been carrying the story of America and who we are and what we stand for right down to the grassroots level all over the world. I will gladly join those who want to support measures to reduce Government expenditures—but it would be my hope we do not begin here with the Peace Corps. It seems to me we ought to try to find ways to make this program even more successful than it is. I say this because I am sure many Members of Congress have received similar letters from their constituents, young people who are not looking for anything at all except a

chance to serve their country overseas and to tell the glory of our freedom to people all over the world. I think this is a very worthwhile program. I supported it from the outset. It would be my hope that we do vote the committee's recommendation and leave this program intact. Mr. Sargent Shriver, who is a Chicagoan, has done an outstanding job in establishing the Peace Corps and make it a model Federal agency. I shall rely on the Committee recommendations in evaluating the legislation. The Committee has gone over every single item with Mr. Shriver and I am confident if either he or the Committee felt further economies would not impair the program, such economies would be reflected in the measure before us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to support H.R. 9009 which further amends the Peace Corps Act.

Under its fine leadership, the U.S. Peace Corps has continued to expand its membership and service to all parts of the world. The original Peace Corps operation began in 17 countries and has now expanded to 46 countries, with more than 4,000 volunteers. I would also like to point out that all of the members of the Corps whom I have had the pleasure of meeting demonstrate a great responsibility and dedication toward promoting democratic ideals in all parts of the world.

The passage of this bill, will enable the Peace Corps to continue to review and revise its concepts of programing, selecting and training of volunteers to give more effective, efficient and economical operation, and better experienced personnel in aiding underdeveloped countries around the globe.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am for the continuation of the Peace Corps because of the excellent work it has done throughout the world during the first 2 years of its existence. Therefore I am in favor of the passage of H.R. 9009.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the very able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, and other speakers earlier in the debate made reference to the number of Peace Corps volunteers and that the Peace Corps did not attain its objective of 9,000 volunteers by August 31, 1963.

I note that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has shown, on page 3 of the report on this legislation, that this delay in reaching its quota was due primarily to two causes—the high standards in selection and, secondly, to adjusting recruitment to specific needs.

I think perhaps there is a third consideration, although I do not have any statistics. However, recently I visited the University of Washington, and the president of the university, Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, mentioned that in the university's training program, he had observed that great care is used to weed out any individuals not properly suited to the work for which selected. By careful screening during the training period, potential misfits are eliminated just as soon as any evidence develops. This probably explains why there has not been much, if any adverse criticism about the program. Also this may have slowed down the achieving of a predetermined level of volunteers, but it is sound procedure. It is such a selective recruitment system that makes a program succeed, even though in this case the Peace Corps administration might run into criticism that it was not meeting its objectives.

I must say I have been pleasantly surprised at results of the Peace Corps. This is a foreign aid program that is successful. I support this program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, in 1961 when this legislation was presented for the first time to the U.S. House of Representatives I happened to be sitting in the back of the Chamber, close to my late and beloved friend, John Riley, who was at that time a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations and who had long been a personal friend of mine. As we were talking about the legislation, the prospects for the future, and the good that this Nation might realize and that other nations might realize from it, he said, "I am going down to the well of the House and express myself on this particular legislation." And I will never forget what he said.

In effect, he said:

I do not know what my generation has done for future generations. I do not know what we can say to them that we have done to assure their place in the sun. But I feel that the Peace Corps is their chance to take their place and do their part, and I am for the legislation. Let's give them that chance.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that he was right in his analysis and right in his prophecy. I have never voted for foreign aid but I urge support of this particular effort because I believe that this is the way—here is the way—to put people-to-people, heart-to-heart, and contact-to-contact in work and teaching other peoples less fortunate than we are.

Mr. Chairman, I think Director Sargent Shriver has done the best administrative job possible. When I read in the report such catching phrases about what we are trying to do as "eliminate unemployment, delinquency, and anti-American passions" in countries overseas, I know of no higher purposes in connection with any part of our foreign aid program.

For my part, I would much rather see us make the effort through participating in a baseball game in Venezuela

than have to read in a book such as the one entitled "The Ugly American" of a cocktail party high on some hotel roof in some foreign country.

This is a program of the young people. This is a program of the generation to which tomorrow we hand this country and its responsibilities. This is the program which I think has had the finest measure of success of any program in which we have spent our money across the waters, to which I am usually diabolically opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that they have made some mistakes. If they had made no mistakes they would not have the humanities we expect in a program like this. If they had made no mistakes, some of the Members of Congress would find much unhappiness in the fact that they made no mistakes. But when people have done a job that has caused bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle, certainly such a Peace Corps deserves our support.

I received a letter this morning telling me that some of my good friends here, men whom I admire very much, are going to try to cut the program. Ordinarily, I would be in favor of that. But then when I turned to the 1962 Peace Corps report and found out that in some countries they have so many people and they have other people in training for the country, then in other countries they have some people but they do not have other people in training, it came to me, with suddenness, that the efficiency of this administration is detailed in this report. If something otherwise were found and it were bad, certainly, they would not delineate between those countries which need other people and those countries which do not need the additional people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I read further in this particular report something which again aroused my immediate interest. I read the phrase "tough and neglected people." Maybe our troubles in Latin America and South America are due to our neglect of people in those categories. The Peace Corps seems to me to be the answer.

I could scarcely believe my eyes when I read that a few of our colleagues believe the Peace Corps is in danger of becoming an enthusiastic crusade.

I could understand the Communists calling the Peace Corps a fetus of neocolonialism and a Trojan Horse—as they have recently done.

But to become concerned about the Peace Corps becoming too enthusiastic and possessing a crusading spirit—well, that, Mr. Chairman that is like saying the Nike-Zeus is too accurate, or Billy Graham and the Pope too religious, or Grace Kelly too beautiful.

Those of us who have had experience with Government agencies know too well how unenthusiastic the bureaucracy can be. We have all decried the redtape, the stuffiness, the creeping pace at which some agencies work.

Now there comes along a program that in less than 3 years has captured the imagination of the world—a program which both George Gallup and pollsters

report is supported by 75 percent of the American people—a program which has proved that Americans are not as flabby and soft as some of our critics say we were—a movement which denies Khrushchev's charge that American young people are nothing but "dissident good-for-nothings"—and what is the reaction?

That it is in danger of becoming an enthusiastic crusade.

Permit me to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Communists are crusading to win the world. They are not ashamed to be enthusiastic or fervent or dedicated. It is not a secret that in Latin America the Communists and pro-Castroites are almost always better organized and harder working than anyone else. The Communists have learned that they do not have to be a majority group to exert excessive influence—they have learned that energy and devotion can win where numbers would fail. It is an open fact that among the hardcore Communist student leaders in Latin America the foremost requirements for leadership are zeal, hard work, and dedication.

So let us not be ashamed to support a program that is enthusiastic, that is crusading for democratic ideals and free institutions. Mr. Shriver, his colleagues on the staff, and volunteers in the field have combined with this enthusiastic spirit a tough-minded practical approach that deserves our admiration and our support. I say we need more enthusiastic crusades like it.

I support the Peace Corps and salute the efforts of those dedicated men and women who are making it work and live and produce all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Peace Corps legislation.

Mr. Chairman, few undertakings of the Federal Government have so established their value and importance so quickly and so obviously as has the Peace Corps during its first 2 years of existence.

The proof of this fact shines forth in the many remarkable achievements of this unique people-oriented agency, achievements which even the early skeptics now readily concede: the open and unabashed idealism and generosity which the Peace Corps program has unleashed among young Americans and guided into constructive channels; the enthusiastic reception Peace Corps volunteers have received in the countries which have welcomed them, and the growing number of new and repeat requests for their help; the continuing high caliber of the volunteers themselves and the maintenance of high selection standards by the Corps; the record number of applicants today, long after the bloom could be expected to have worn off a less substantial program.

The Peace Corps, Mr. Chairman, will not save the world for freedom, and its

most dedicated people would never claim such an objective. The Corps knows its limitations as well as its strengths, but it is motivated by that highest of objectives: the desire to help the less fortunate of our fellow human beings.

In pursuing this modest but immeasurably important goal, the Peace Corps is not only doing its job but it is displaying your country and mine in its finest colors.

The House has the opportunity today to express its faith in the nobility of the Peace Corp concept and its support of a working program in which we can all take great pride.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, last Saturday I received an emergency telephone call from the district which I have the honor to represent, which is directly related to this bill. The purpose and the nature of the telephone inquiry prompts me to make inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], to see if some solution can be arrived at of the problem with which I am faced.

However, Mr. Chairman, before I do that I wish to state that I originally voted against the original Peace Corps bill. I watched it develop for a year, and when I saw the good start that it made I voted for it the second time, and I shall vote for it again this time.

The problem I have is this, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], also raised it partially but got no answer.

The telephone call I received was from the Lion's Club in Superior, Wis., the largest city in my district. They received some pleading letters from a member of the Peace Corps in the Philippine Islands telling of the great admiration the rank and file people of the Philippines have for the United States. He stated that the greatest problem he was facing in his work as a Peace Corps member was lack of books. He pleaded with the people of his hometown to send him books.

So the Lion's Club got the students of the school system in the city of Superior to solicit the area and they came up with over 2,000 usable, first-class books. These books are all wrapped in the post office at Superior and have been there for approximately 10 days. The postmaster has served notice on the Lion's Club to either get the books to the Philippine Islands or out of the post office. We made inquiry of the Peace Corps officials and found out there are presently no funds available for the transportation of these books. I think this is an important area, and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or anybody who can answer the question, particularly since \$4 million has been turned back, which I greatly respect the Peace Corps officials for doing, is there provision in this appropriation bill for the important work and inexpensive work of getting these good, usable books to the areas where they are needed? If it is not provided for in this bill it ought to be.

Can the chairman help me in solving this problem that the people of Superior are having?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman may be assured that section 5 of this bill under consideration today will help with this problem. If the gentleman will read section 5 and follow it up in the report, section 5 amends section 10(a) he will be reassured. This authority will make possible the payment of transportation of books on a selective basis.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I can tell these people who made the telephone call to me that if this bill passes the problem will be solved, just hold the books in abeyance until the Peace Corps bill is passed. These books will be picked up and shipped by the Peace Corps. Am I correct?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; the authority is provided by this bill. There may not be enough money to ship every book that may be donated in the future.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman. This makes for a better bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, around the world today the peoples of the newly developing countries are struggling for economic and social progress. In a very real sense our freedom, and the future of the free world, depends on their success—on their ability to build stable, independent nations where men can live in dignity, liberated from the bonds of hunger, ignorance and poverty.

One of the great obstacles to the achievement of this mutually held and vital goal is, of course, the lack of trained men and women with the skill to teach the young and to assist in the operation of development projects—men and women with the capacity to cope with the demands of swiftly evolving economics, and to unleash the capacities of a nation for growth and progress.

To meet this critical need for skilled manpower, to meet the demand for workers with the ability to substitute modern for outdated and unproductive skills, we initiated the Peace Corps. The time since 1961 has been too short for thorough evaluation, but the immediate indications are that the program has been an outstanding success—that the hopes and confidences of the American people and the Congress have been justified.

As the committee has stated in its report on H.R. 9009, the countries in which the Peace Corps has operations have requested more volunteers. Additional countries are seeking Peace Corps assistance, and the number of qualified applicants is higher than ever before, despite the fact that entrance standards have been raised.

In Africa, volunteers have enabled many countries to increase vastly their school enrollments, to improve previously unmanageable pupil-teacher ratios, and to broaden and deepen curriculums.

In Latin America, a long list of vital public works projects have been initiated and completed with volunteers' assistance. In Colombia alone, as the Peace

Corps' very able and hard-working Director, R. Sargent Shriver, has pointed out, this list includes the building of more than 100 schools and school kitchens, 30 aqueducts, 49 roads, and 14 bridges.

And in the Far East, the Peace Corps volunteers, serving in 11 nations, were the first non-Asian group to receive the Ramon Magsaysay Award—an award which has been called Asia's equivalent to the Nobel Prize. As the Manila Evening News stated in commenting on this unique recognition:

In 22 months of quiet labor, Peace Corps volunteers have secured a verdict not before vouchsafed to any other foreign group. Peace Corps workers achieved in less than 2 years an understanding with Asian peoples that promises to pass all tests.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today calls for a modest, realistic increase in this program. And the experience to date indicates that the new funds will be used prudently and with restraint. The fact that the Peace Corps this last year, on its own initiative, turned back \$3.9 million of unobligated funds to the U.S. Treasury, is strong evidence to this effect.

This is a program in which Americans can take pride. It is a program which by helping others to help themselves may truly be said to be in the best tradition of our country. It is a program which deserves our continuing support and encouragement, and I urge that this bill be approved as a further and practical step toward increasing the welfare of man and enhancing the cause of freedom.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to what I consider some very curious language in the minority views. I refer to the last paragraph, which states:

It would be better for the Congress to continue the program in more modest dimensions that are built upon a solid basis than to allow some at home and abroad to pervert it to an enthusiastic crusade.

I do not know how jaded or cynical we can get, but I fail to see anything perverted about an enthusiastic crusade in the cause of democracy around the world. I am very happy that these are minority views, because if the day should ever come when it is the majority view of this Congress that an enthusiastic crusade is something to be sneered at, laughed at, or criticized, we will be in deep trouble.

I would like to ask the signers of these minority views if they really mean that an enthusiastic crusade in the cause of democracy around the world is anything to be ashamed of?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should not have to remind the gentleman he has probably voted for every enthusiastic spending crusade since he has been a Member of

Congress. He seems perfectly willing to vote all the money anybody ever asked for any project. So far as I am concerned, that is what I was alluding to in the overfinancing of this Peace Corps program.

Mr. JOELSON. I have not voted for every spending measure, but if I think something is an enthusiastic crusade for the best interests of America, the gentleman can be well assured I will support it. I think destructive criticism is what is so damaging to our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am among those who were very skeptical when the Peace Corps was first suggested. We had had the year before an amazingly fine portrayal of a peace program by Walter Judd. When an almost identical program was brought before us by the Peace Corps it made me feel that the suggestion was good. Then as I watched the various possible roads to success I was skeptical. I voted for it, however. Every year since then I have done the same. I have watched it exceedingly closely. I have been in correspondence with many Peace Corps volunteers, some of them my friends, and children of friends, of course. I have had some expression of criticism of the way things were done. A number have felt it was not fair here and it was not fair there, and so forth. I have checked them all and have found that very few have held water.

There have been very few of the many who have gone over who have had to be sent back, many of those for reasons of health. I think that is a record of which we should be very proud. What it means, of course, is that they have been exceedingly careful in their screening of applicants. Now they are increasing that care. They are making it more difficult in every way. There are increasingly high standards, not only just physical standards, because the wear and tear is really something, but psychological standards, general capacity for work, desire for work, and then the personality of the individual.

We had one statement that there was a very fine Ph. D. who was very eager to serve but he was finally refused because of his personality. Work that is so close to the people of the country as is the work of the Peace Corps makes it exceedingly important that this principle be continued. I think we stand in no danger of its discontinuance.

I was interested this morning in reading a little squib in one of the inside pages of a paper that in one of the countries of east Africa, they are very, very critical of the teaching of English. They could not understand the English that the teachers were teaching. They happened to be American teachers. Their background of English had been British English. Of course American is difficult for them to get used to. We go to England and we do not always understand what they say, and they certainly do not always understand what we say when

they come over here. But those are matters that work themselves out.

My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], said that he had voted for it with some reservations. I think many of us did in the beginning but we have fewer reservations today. And surely we are willing to recognize the fact that the standards we use should be tightened. Of course we do not go over there to teach them democracy—but we do try to live democracy.

It may be that there is an area which the Committee on Foreign Affairs has not looked into sufficiently. Perhaps we have not compared Peace Corps members and funds with other organizations working overseas. We have not set the comparisons up in columns to see how well the Peace Corps really stacks up. For myself, I feel it stacks up very well. And I do know that those of us who have seen them at work and those of us have, as I have done many times, talked with them before they left and talked with them when they returned—and you know we have the first batch back this year—I, for myself, am going to watch those young people. How well do they do when they come back and what do they do? The next year we will have a background of what they have done and what this working overseas has done for them and what it can do for us and for the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping very much that the House will see fit to pass this bill. Of course, we probably will have amendments. Those will be discussed. I should be very sorry if it were slashed too deeply because we know they return what they do not use. They are very careful. You know they look a little bit to me like Connecticut Yankees—like myself—they like very much to have the money used in the right way. When they cannot use it, they return it. I think that is a very valuable activity to have as a part of any Department of our Government.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the first wave of Americans we sent overseas in the Peace Corps 2 years ago are coming home. Virtually none of us will gainsay the fact that they have represented the American people with courage and dignity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer a question raised by the gentlewoman from Ohio.

The Wall Street Journal recently pointed out that American industry is vying for their services. Blue chip firms such as IBM, Du Pont and the First National City Bank in New York are actively seeking to recruit these Peace Corps veterans. And well they should, for their mettle has stood the acid test for 2 years.

It may surprise some of us to learn, however, what they are doing now. Apparently these Americans take their idealism to heart. For they are more interested in continuing their public service than in taking the handsome rewards industry is offering. Of 413 returned volunteers, almost half are re-

turning to study at the graduate level, most of these on scholarships and fellowships. Peace Corps volunteers, for instance, received 78 percent of the Ford Foundation fellowships offered to persons who wish to prepare for service in developing countries. Sixty are now employed by the Federal Government. Three hundred and thirty-one have filed for the Foreign Service officer examination, 63 for the U.S. Information Agency examination, and 54 for positions with AID. Fifty-two volunteers are already at work teaching in American schools.

We are doing much more than simply sending energetic Americans to work abroad in the Peace Corps. We are getting a steady stream of dedicated public servants back into the United States: Tested and tough, and imbued with the same kind of idealism that is at the very bedrock of our Nation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago, while speaking on the rule, I read a letter I received from a Catholic priest, and I think it bears repetition because it is one of the greatest arguments I have ever heard for the bill. Father Tom Cronin, who is a native of my city and whom I have known since he was a boy, came from the Philippines and wrote me as follows:

More than 300 Peace Corpsmen arrived recently in the Philippines. The impact of their arrival was greater than the impact of the 50-megaton bomb exploded by friend Khrushchev. And the fallout promises to be more effective still. This is the first time that a major power has crossed the ocean with books, not guns, brains not bombs, for peace in order to win a war.

This is the greatest export the United States has ever made. Better than sewing machines, TV sets, refrigerators, tractors, or jeeps. All the world loves the Irish. And well they might. For years the Irish have been exporting the most popular commodity on the market. Real live human beings. Mostly priests and nuns, who in one capacity or another end up teaching people of every shade of color in the human spectrum. And now the United States is catching on. The best the United States had to offer formerly was a cowboy with his six-gun. He was a likeable guy. But he always did a lot of shooting. Out here 11,000 miles from Boston, people get impressions of America which are terribly unjust. For most of the people out here, America means "Al" Capone, "Billy the Kid," Marilyn Monroe, divorce, two cars in the garage, and one lonesome baby in an overstuffed cradle in a jumbo-sized house. They like us all right.

A new image is taking shape. True, America has been helping people all over the world with food and clothing. But always, we send things. Now we are sending people, people whom the people of Asia can get to know as the real Americans. They will eat their food, they will sleep on mats in nipa huts, they will pet their babies. They will teach with their teachers, they will farm with their farmers, they will nurse with their nurses. One American living in a Philippine town is worth more than a whole boatload of corn. A boatload of corn is hard to digest, but a real live American, him they can love.

The United States has finally realized that superiority in the realm of material things is useless without the corresponding superiority in things of the spirit. To my mind

nothing typifies that new attitude more than the Peace Corps. May their tribe increase.
Sincerely in Christ,
Father THOMAS J. CRONIN.

I hope that this bill for the Peace Corps increases through the years. To me I think this letter is a thing of beauty. I think it perfectly pictures the great job that the Peace Corps is doing in the various sections of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support that bill and I am very gratified to see it has such strong bipartisan support.

There is no part of the world where the Peace Corps is not acknowledged as representative of the best in our American life. There is no better weapon working for peace through bringing truthful understanding among the peoples of the world. Our Communist opponents have not been able to match it. The Honorable Sargent Shriver, as Director, has been able to set standards and "esprit de corps" unique in a non-military organization. The record shows that if the money cannot be well spent, it just will not be spent. What a fine example. One must sometimes wonder what some of the "agins" would vote for. I commend those of my Republican colleagues who stand firm today in their full support of a great nonpartisan American success and achievement more needed today than when it was conceived by President Kennedy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this highly successful program.

In the 187 years since the signing of our Declaration of Independence, the American ideal of freedom and human worth has never burned more brightly than it does today. Believing that there is a universal desire for peace and believing that man's ancient adversaries must be removed from the earth, thousands of young Americans have taken this ideal into the darkest, most desolate corners of the earth. They daily show the less-fortunate people of the world that America is able and willing to help them. The Peace Corps affirms that the American Revolution was one for all mankind, for all time.

Because I believe the Peace Corps manifests the best in that ideal, I am speaking today in support of H.R. 9009, a bill to authorize \$102 million for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1964.

The Peace Corps began in 1961 with less than 500 volunteers working in 8 countries and operating on an annual budget of \$30 million. By the end of the summer in 1962, the Corps had more than 3,500 volunteers in 38 countries. By the spring of 1963, there were more than 5,000 American men and women in 45 countries on 4 continents.

The Peace Corps has enjoyed remarkable success. The reports have been coming in now for 2 years, and the accomplishments have been most impres-

sive. Men and women of the Peace Corps, in the true American revolutionary spirit, have, among other things: saved lives, grown rice, taught people of all ages how to read and write their own language, have created food industries, started farms, built roads, schools, and hospitals, planted forests and, more importantly, have created good will and friendship.

In short, much has been done in these 2 years, but what is most striking is what is yet to be done. Author Frank Laubach's comment in 1951 about the work of volunteer agencies could well apply to the Peace Corps in 1964—"Wake Up or Blow Up," Fleming H. Revell Co., 1951, page 109:

We must offer our technical skills, asking neither favor nor profit in return. We must show them how to get 10 times or a hundred times as much from their land as they get now. We must show them how to conquer those diseases and insects that kill their crops and animals and children. We must show them how to conquer malaria and hookworm, and dysentery and venereal disease and plague. We must help them as they struggle up out of their hell. We must go to their sides and help them. There is no substitute for the real, living, loving person rubbing elbow to elbow with the people who toil. We must have 100,000 technically trained men of unimpeachable integrity over the world, to help people help themselves. We must give or loan money when these technicians call for it.

It was with this kind of situation in mind that the Peace Corps was born, and it is recognition that much of mankind is still trying desperately to "struggle up out of their hell," that tells us the Peace Corps must be permitted to meet its new challenges.

When Congress established the Peace Corps on September 22, 1961, the objectives were clearly defined in the establishing act. Only after an exhaustive study did Congress appropriate the first dollars and approve the objectives of the Peace Corps. Today those objectives are still valid. Simply stated, those objectives are to make available to interested countries American men and women who will help their peoples improve their lives and in the process help them better understand the American people and their democratic ideals.

It has become increasingly evident even to the most cursory observer of world affairs that, if there is to be peace in the world, the people of the have-not nations must, I emphasize that word—must—be given the opportunity to achieve a life of dignity, opportunity, and emotional and spiritual well-being. The Peace Corps is giving such help.

President Kennedy, when he was a Senator, expressed what Americans had known for more than a century and a half; namely, that the desire to help the less fortunate springs from the American democratic philosophy and the ethical values of our society. The Congress must be aware that the idea of an operational Peace Corps has captured the imagination of the American people. This is heartening evidence that Americans have not evaded their responsibility and that the American ideal is still very much alive.

Mr. Chairman, much of the world is hungry, ill-housed, disease ridden. Americans in true revolutionary tradition are concerned about the less fortunate of mankind and man's irresistible drive for human dignity and individual freedom.

The Peace Corps represents the best in the American ideal because it helps the peoples of the world follow the American example of peacefully reordering their society within the philosophical concept that man is capable of determining his destiny.

The Peace Corps is a reflection of our diverse, pluralistic society. The peoples of Latin America, Africa, and Asia see young men and women of different color, different religious faiths, different economic and social backgrounds, and different geographic and cultural heritages, leave our shores with a common purpose—that somehow Americans must help the less fortunate of the world attain a higher degree of human dignity. To do less would be a travesty of the American ideal of which I speak today.

We must encourage this great work, not because the program must be sold. The Peace Corps is already sold to more American volunteers than the Peace Corps can train, and to more interested countries than the Peace Corps can supply with volunteers. In a word, the program can stand on its own merits and on its own record of success. The question before us is are we willing to permit the Peace Corps to carry out the historic mandate of the American tradition of helping others secure human dignity.

This bill, H.R. 9009, deserves the support of this body. America has a historic opportunity. How shall we meet it?

As Shakespeare put it in Julius Caesar: There is a tide in the affairs of men, Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;

Omitted, all the voyage of their life Is bound in shallows, and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat, And we must take the current when it serves, Or lose our ventures.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I heard it stated at the outset of the debate that there were very few witnesses or not sufficient witnesses before the committee. Any witnesses who wished to appear were certainly welcome to appear. The fact of the matter was that there was not sufficient criticism of the program to warrant the criticism that was asked for by those who seemed to be unhappy at the fact that the program has been successful.

I would also like to point out to the Committee on Foreign Affairs that no Member of the Congress, either in this body or the other body, has sat through so many days of hearings or so many days of markups as has the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman MORGAN, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. His dedication to duty should be an example to every Member of this body. Also there was a remark passed that the Peace Corps is fast becoming one of the large bureaucracies of the

Government. I would like to point out that in the fiscal year 1962, 33 percent of the Peace Corps budget was for administrative costs. This was reduced the following year to 28 percent, and in the fiscal year 1964 budget requirements will be down to 19 percent.

Similarly in 1962 there was one staff member for every four volunteers. There was 1 staff member in 1963 for every 7 volunteers and the Peace Corps estimates that this year there will be 1 staff member for every 10 volunteers. This is not just the result of statistical gamesmanship.

I would like to point out that the actual staff of the Peace Corps has declined in absolute as well as in relative terms in recent months. Some people see this as a question of tax advantages for corpsmen. Someone pointed this out earlier in the debate. I would like to point out that there are absolutely no special tax advantages that are given to any members of the Peace Corps in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There are two specific tax benefits given the Peace Corps under a special bill passed out by the Committee on Ways and Means. The Peace Corps people, if they report a lump sum at the end of 2 years are permitted to pay the tax on the basis, not of receiving all that money in 1 year but according to the rates on half of it for 1 year and the other half in another year.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Let me answer that first. The gentleman is now talking about \$75 that is given to the Peace Corps volunteers at the end of their service.

Mr. CURTIS. I am talking about whatever remuneration is given them.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman is talking about that \$75 that is held up until they leave.

Mr. CURTIS. I am stating exactly what the situation is, whatever the amount may be. I am saying that the bill applies to whatever the remuneration is.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is not in an area where it could be considered a great tax benefit.

Mr. CURTIS. That is not the point. The gentleman said that there was no tax privilege and I said that there was. The gentleman may say that it does not amount to anything.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly what I say.

Mr. CURTIS. But the privilege is there. The other privilege does amount to quite a bit; that is the allowances they are given during the time they are in training here.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. The gentleman had some time earlier and I have answered his question. I have been granted only 5 minutes and if I have additional time I will be glad to yield later.

They call this a benefit to these people, the \$75 that is held up until these people finish their term of 2 years. If that tax benefit is viewed in this manner then

it is a small advantage that these people are given. I think we ought to talk about some of the things that these volunteers have been doing. There have been six of these people who have already died for their country. There are Gold Star mothers of the Peace Corps, also, I might say. There were two people who died and their sisters took their place. These people are out in the boondocks. Some have contracted diseases that they will have for the rest of their lives.

Some are talking about managing an image. These people have created an image themselves so that it is not necessary for the able staff of the Peace Corps to manage an image. These people have created an image of the good American, like the good Samaritan, in place of the ugly American. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] put his finger on this. We have been sending people out into the boondocks to represent the United States with faith, with devotion, with true patriotism. Whether they bring along their soap boxes or not, they are out there living Americanism.

Mr. Chairman, I am unable to see the wisdom of this amendment to reduce the Peace Corps authorization below \$102 million.

For one thing, Sargent Shriver came before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and voluntarily cut his request from \$108 to \$102 million.

He did not have to do this. He could have done as other agencies do and leave in his request a little "fat," knowing that the committee and the House would reduce him. He would then be able to claim that he did not get all he wanted from us.

But once Mr. Shriver determined that he did not need \$108 million, he took the initiative and requested the reduction to a figure he says is honest. If the House further reduces that amount, we will be guilty of perpetuating the old shell game whereby the executive branch asks for more than it needs because it knows the Congress is going to cut arbitrarily anyway. Once a man like Mr. Shriver, who has always dealt fairly with the Congress, revises his request on the line of actual need, I think we should accept his request in good faith.

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker. The Peace Corps will return to the Treasury any funds that are not spent. It gave back almost \$4 million at the close of the last fiscal year. How many of our colleagues have heard of an agency indulging in this kind of fiscal responsibility.

I think the Peace Corps should be congratulated for refusing to sacrifice quality for quantity. Mr. Shriver did not bring into service as many volunteers as he estimated last year he might do. Nor did he bring into service as many as he could have. Instead of reaching his estimate of 9,000 volunteers by August 31, he had on board on that date 6,634.

Two reasons account for this. One is simply that the Peace Corps deliberately applied higher standards to the selection of volunteers as the result of research and field experience showing what kind of person makes a successful volunteer. For example, greater

stress is being placed upon language aptitude tests as a general predictor of success overseas. The Peace Corps doubled the amount of language training and raised standards of language competence. Standards were raised and made more stringent in matching skills to overseas needs.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, while the number of applicants has tripled, the Peace Corps is selecting proportionately fewer volunteers from the total input.

The second factor in the difference between the Peace Corps estimates and the present number of volunteers is the shortage of available people with the skills in highest demand overseas. Mr. Shriver had requests for more than twice as many mathematics and science teachers as we have sent abroad. The supply of trained agriculturalists also failed to meet what appears to be an insatiable demand. Other scarce skills are in great demand: Engineers, geologists, doctors, and nurses, to name only a few.

The Peace Corps could have chosen to respond to requests for programs with skills which are more easily filled than those which the countries particularly requested. Or it could have chosen to relax its selection standards. Either choice would have enabled it to meet on time the estimates made to the Congress last year. But neither choice would have produced the kind of Peace Corps Congress has supported enthusiastically the past 2 years. Mr. Shriver chose not to compromise. As a result, he turned money back to the Treasury and on his own initiative reduced his estimates for next year.

I think he should be congratulated—and supported.

Now we come to the argument being offered that the Peace Corps should be cut anyway—that it is growing too fast, that it is getting too big.

But what do we mean by "too big"? Too big for the need abroad? Too big in light of the poverty, illiteracy, and disease overseas?

Too big in the light of the intensity of communism's efforts overseas to project its image to the people of developing nations?

Too big in the light of America's need to express its basic principles on a people-to-people basis in the villages of the world?

No, I cannot believe it is getting too big.

Certainly you can vote to cut more money from the authorization. But let me point out some of the effects that such a cut would have.

First, in Latin America the forgotten rural villages, villages that official economic development plans have not included yet, would be forsaken if it were not for the Peace Corps. More than 300 volunteers will be returning from these obscure communities next summer after having helped these people—who were formerly considered helpless—take what has usually been their first step of progress: A town meeting, a public shower, a clean well, or just a new pair of rawhide sandals to protect against hookworm.

With the funds requested the Peace Corps must do more than just replace these volunteers. Over 700 more are included in the \$102 million request. Each of these volunteers is in answer to hundreds of new requests for one volunteer. In Central America last week, a mayor from a town of 400 people found his way into the country's capital city—the first trip he had ever made. He had heard of the Peace Corps from a neighboring village and his townspeople petitioned him to ask for one for their community. He had to sign his request with an "X." The Peace Corps hopes to fill his petition from its expanded program next summer.

Second. Perhaps the greatest impact of the Peace Corps in Latin America has been through its work in the slums which ring almost every Latin city. Here misery is at its starkest, the downtrodden are most accessible to Communist propagandizing, the people are the most desperate and forgotten. The Peace Corps is unique in its work in these areas because the volunteers have not been afraid or ashamed to move in with the slum dwellers and share their problems. Volunteers are living as members of the Latin slum communities, often without plumbing, electricity, water, heat, or light. Where other programs give money or send people in from the outside to help by the day, the Peace Corps volunteers are inside, taking part in the total lives of the residents.

No program has caused more aggravation to the Communists than the Peace Corps. Agitators have threatened the volunteers to get them to move out; others have spread false propaganda among the people about them. In Arequipa, Peru, it was said that volunteers involved in a Public Law 485 school feeding program were poisoning the children; the residents, who had been living and working side by side with the volunteers knew better. They awarded the Peace Corps the annual silver medal of the city for service to its residents. From Cuzco came another citation for "incomparable service."

The Peace Corps presently has more than 400 volunteers in urban slums working in Latin America and has plans to put in 489 additional volunteers mostly in new projects this spring and summer with the funds it requested. Any diminution of funds will mean a corresponding cut in this vital program.

The Peace Corps has just recently opened up the field of university teaching in Latin America to volunteer participation. It now has 137 volunteers in 40 universities in 7 countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Jamaica, Dominican Republic, and Costa Rica, plus 28 in training. There are 245 more firm requests for university teachers in this vital field of training tomorrow's leaders in Latin America, requests that could not be fully filled if the Peace Corps funds were drastically cut. The Peace Corps has been invited to send university teachers to Chile and more to Venezuela where crucial elections will be held during the coming year. Other requests come for first programs in Ecuador, Bra-

zil, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Panama, while requests for additional volunteers have come from Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, and, as mentioned before, Venezuela.

These Peace Corps university programs have demonstrated that they hit the Communists where it hurts, among the intelligentsia of the country. The Communists already tried unsuccessfully to organize a national student strike to remove the Peace Corps from the universities in Peru. The leftist tendency of the Latin American university populace is well known—it was students that split on Vice President Nixon when he was in Peru. The opportunity to expose the Latin students to Peace Corps volunteers should not be lost for the saving of a few pennies.

Fourth. The Peace Corps has made a most dramatic impact on Bolivia. President Paz, during his recent visit to the United States, called the Peace Corps volunteers the most democratic and most warmly received Americans ever to arrive in Bolivia. He said that they are also the hardest workers. At present there are only 123 volunteers in Bolivia but the full funds requested will allow a growth to triple that number by next summer. The Peace Corps has undertaken a major health project and is also active in the fields of agriculture and university education. More are needed to continue this work. Additional volunteers are needed to continue the modernization of a leper colony. The activities of the Peace Corps have stimulated similar activities on the part of a Bolivian Peace Corps. Many future, joint activities have been planned. To curtail this work—which has been more productive both economically and socially than other projects in Bolivia costing far more money—would be foolhardy.

Fifth. Most of Nigeria's population of 40 million people are engaged in subsistence agriculture. Here is a country three times the size of Italy, well endowed with natural resources, which is still not feeding herself adequately. The Peace Corps has repeatedly received requests for volunteers to help in improving agricultural practices, but until now has had to restrict itself to the field of education.

This summer for the first time, the Peace Corps will attempt assistance in this field, which is so directly related to the welfare of Nigeria's people. Volunteers working in agriculture will meet and get to know a whole new section of the Nigerian people.

Nigeria has put the highest faith in America by welcoming volunteer teachers in increasing numbers into her secondary schools and universities. The Peace Corps now has an opportunity to confirm that faith by sharing America's agricultural knowledge with Africa's largest nation. To cut this program with its impact would indeed be false economy.

Sixth. For the past year and a half, 16 Peace Corps volunteers assigned to rural construction in Sierra Leone have pioneered the field of self-help community development in Africa. Working with the local chiefs and voluntary village labor, they have laid out roads, helped to build bridges and culverts,

schools, and water systems. Their pilot project has been so successful that a Cabinet-level resolution has just been passed requesting that the number of volunteers be doubled and their activities greatly expanded from its base in the northern province to include all three provinces of the country. In conjunction with this, the rural development budgets in each of the country's 12 districts have been tripled. One provincial secretary made the significant point that Peace Corps teams work successfully in remote areas where private contractors will not even bid for jobs and where sorely needed rural development projects cannot otherwise be undertaken, even with the funds available.

In addition the first Peace Corps medical project in Sierra Leone was such a success that the Government of Sierra Leone has requested the Peace Corps to set up public health programs throughout the particularly underdeveloped sections of that country. It is a tremendous opportunity to make significant inroads against disease in that country.

Seventh. What will this proposed cut do to the Peace Corps in Thailand?

The Thailand malaria eradication program has reached a critical stage. The existing program is already losing ground to the disease due significantly to a lack of middle-level manpower at the village level. The Government of Thailand has asked the Peace Corps for 30 volunteers to assist in this program at a vital level, as field organizers and workers.

Through a house-to-house, person-to-person program, the volunteer, by spending 20 days of every month in the field, will be the keyman in field logistics, action, and followthrough.

The volunteer will be the only American in a team of Thai who work right in the villages. The United States is thus identified directly with the program and its results. Credit for U.S. participation in malaria eradication could easily be lost if our role was limited to supplying equipment and high-level technical advice.

Villages exist today where one or two members of every family are afflicted by the disease annually. There are areas where the incidence of the disease is on the increase. However, the urgency of completing the attack phase is not limited to measurement in medical terms. Emphasis on the program provides a demonstration of the Thai Government's interest in areas notably vulnerable to Communist ideologies originating north of the Mekong.

Eighth. What will a cut do to the Peace Corps program in Malaya?

The Government of Malaya has a program in progress to provide land to those who have never owned land. This homesteading project grew out of a realization during the Communist insurrection that landownership had a direct bearing upon stability and progress.

Thirty thousand acres have been set aside for this propose in 38 homestead schemes. Approximately 600 families are being resettled in each location. The settlers are provided with approximately 30 acres of land.

Full title passes to the settler after 7 years. Peace Corps volunteers have been assigned as assistant administrators in these projects. During the projected fiscal year the Government of Malaya has based its plans for opening new schemes upon the arrival of some 30 Peace Corps volunteers. If these volunteers are not sent to Malaya it is estimated that the homesteading could be reduced by 1,800 families during the next 2 years. This could have a disastrous effect on internal stability in that country.

In like manner, the Government of Malaya has planned to open new rural health centers on the assumption that some 30 volunteer nurses will arrive. Each of these health centers is scheduled to service a population of approximately 20,000. If the nurses do not arrive, the new health centers will not be opened. It is as simple as that—600,000 people will be deprived of even rudimentary medical care.

Ninth. A cut in the \$102 million requested would jeopardize the program of providing 83 volunteers to work programs directly bearing on the success of the crucial land reform program in Iran.

In Iran the Shah's land reforms are at the head of his so-called revolution of peaceable progress for Iran. In this nation on the border of the Soviet Union, a vast land reform program is changing the age-old relationship of serf to landlord. For the first time in centuries, many Iranian peasants own the soil which they have hitherto tilled for others or sharecropped. The Shah in large measure has staked his personal future and that of his western-oriented regime on the success or failure of this program of land reform. However, there is an acute shortage of trained men, and of men with the basic practical know-how. To help in this crucial effort, the Government of Iran has requested Peace Corps volunteers to work in the following fields:

A pilot group of 30 volunteers to assist in the expanding community development program.

Sixteen volunteer American farm boys to demonstrate their skills and instruct in general agriculture, livestock, and poultry and farm mechanics.

Twenty-four volunteers to work as assistants to extension agents in two Provinces where the Iranian Government is putting on a concentrated campaign of agricultural betterment.

Thirteen volunteers to do demonstration work on experimental farms.

We cannot afford for these programs to be curtailed or dropped.

Tenth. After 2 years of constant scrutiny, and after carefully evaluating the performance of the Peace Corps volunteers, the Afghan Government has requested 20 teachers, a number of whom will be assigned outside Kabul in major provincial towns, to broaden the impact of the English secondary education program. They will teach Afghan students and work closely with Afghan English teachers to upgrade their skills. The proposed cut in funds might destroy this program and eliminate the tremendous

opportunity to send American Peace Corps volunteers to outlying areas in Afghanistan.

The Government of Afghanistan has long been reluctant to allow westerners into that country, and especially into areas outside Kabul, the capital city. Peace Corps volunteers in other Asian and African countries so impressed the Government of Afghanistan with their skills and desire to serve that Afghanistan officials requested a small group of nine volunteers, nearly 2 years ago, to assist with its health, education, and mechanics programs in Kabul. After carefully observing these first volunteers for over 6 months, they requested about one hundred additional volunteers to work in printing, English teaching, engineering, public administration, and agriculture. Still, the Government remained reluctant to send volunteers into areas outside Kabul.

It has taken over a year for the Afghan Government to become convinced that the Peace Corps could make a substantial contribution to the growth of the country as a whole—not just the capital city. Now that Afghanistan has finally concurred, it could be disastrous for the entire future of the Peace Corps in that country if we were not prepared to respond to their request to move outside Kabul.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to the gentleman that I was astounded to hear that what the Committee on Ways and Means did for the members of the Peace Corps was a special privilege to the members of the Peace Corps. It was to correct an inequity. It was not to give them a special privilege. It was simply to make it possible for them to be on the same basis as any other citizen of the United States and merely not to penalize them because they received a lump sum at the end of the year.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his comment. Instead of this being a special privilege, it is a small thing, in my opinion, that we could give to these people who are participating each day in a great drama throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, through this program we are helping to eliminate poverty, at no great material reward to the members of the Peace Corps themselves. We are helping to eliminate disease and misery. These are the people who are the new image of the United States and who are projecting of themselves this image through dedication and through the faith that they have in the great system that we here are privileged to represent in this Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, instead of asking about the great mystery of the Peace Corps, it is a simple thing. There is no mystery about it. They are living Americanism. They are showing people

who never heard of America what democracy really means.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, peace. We pray for it. Then comes the mention of war and we vote \$49 billion without the blinking of an eye. Then comes peace again, the peace we pray for, and the shouting starts. Why? Why do some run away from that for which they pray?

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no misunderstanding of the position of the three Members who signed the dissenting minority report. They are against the Peace Corps, period. The Peace Corps bill came up in 1961. The gentleman from Illinois, my beloved friend [Mr. DERWINSKI], made a speech against it and said he was going to vote against it. He did vote against it. My beloved friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], made a speech. He attacked the bill. He was against the Peace Corps. He voted against it.

At that time the great statesman from Wisconsin, my dear friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Governor THOMSON, was not a Member of the House but since he has been I have noticed that he follows pretty closely the leadership of the great statesman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the arguments of these distinguished Republicans as well as did another Republican of towering stature in this very well in September of 1961.

Mrs. Church served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for 11 years. She always voted against foreign aid. She was sincere in that. She believed in foreign aid. But she wanted a perfect type of foreign aid. So, every year she voted against the program. But when the Peace Corps concept was presented, Mrs. Church came into this well and in one of the most stirring, emotional talks to which I have ever listened she supported the bill. At last she had found in the Peace Corps what was to her foreign aid in the full blooming of perfection. She answered directly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, may I read from the speech of Mrs. Church in this well on September 14, 1961, answering the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to follow the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and to find one's self immersed in the aroma which he sheds upon those who support this bill. Neither is it easy to accept as a definition of what I believe to be a magnificent example of American youth, the appellation of "Kiddle Korps," the charge of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, this program is as American as Boston beans and apple pie. I would say to all those who call this a hairbrained scheme for a kiddle corps, you are doing the youth of America a great injustice. Yesterday, I heard someone say, "What could a hairbrained youngster just out of college do in the jungles?" I thought back, Mr. Chairman, to 1941 when an earlier generation of young boys proved that they could master the jungles where they died, in war. I want our generation of youth to go out

in the world and show their willingness to give, in living, American? Of course, it is.

Mr. Chairman, I would add just one more word. As the gentleman from Michigan indicated, there were indeed 10 crusades that failed of full or final accomplishment. I know that. I also know that 20 centuries, as he said, have passed since the words first were spoken: "Peace on earth, good will toward men." But despite all the failures, Mr. Chairman, the truth and hope remain—the dream of peace on earth and good will to men still exists. The crusades are still going on.

It means much to me in this day and generation that young people still have a dream; that American young people still have a willingness to sacrifice; and that we, in this country, have a chance to go out and proclaim our true selves to a world that sees us only as spending dollars for projects and guns; that sees us building up for ourselves a reputation for materialism that will be hard to dispel. As I say, Mr. Chairman, it means much to me that we have now a chance to go out and say, "Here is something new—here is what we really are." Let us say it to the world—and say it to ourselves. For all of that is involved—in the Peace Corps.

This was the answer, Mr. Chairman, of a great Republican Congresswoman to some of her fellow Republicans who opposed the Peace Corps in 1961, the same members of her party who still oppose the Peace Corps. The words of the Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church spoken in this well over 2 years ago are as current today as they were then.

The Peace Corps is America in her highest and noblest expression. I have the faith that the pending bill will be passed by an overwhelming majority and in the exact form reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee, with just two dissenting votes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in seeing the United States end some of its foolishness in Latin America and get down to some hard-core business. Castro and the Communists are working very hard in that area. They are blanketing the villages and towns of the region with agents who have in fact begun to twist the minds of local residents.

But there is one thing they did not reckon with. They did not expect that young Americans, Peace Corps volunteers, would be in the same villages and towns. They did not know that these Americans would be in the fields with the villagers showing them that man can do things for himself. Proving that the schemes and promises of the Communists are empty when one can learn to grow corn as a cash crop.

As one example, in a small Peruvian village the people were disillusioned. They were poverty stricken and very much willing to listen to local Communist leaders, but two young Peace Corps volunteers moved into the area as part of a community development program. They observed the natives weaving blankets for their own use. No one had thought of selling these crafts on a retail basis, and the volunteers, products of the free enterprise system, suggested it. They helped the local people to market a few blankets in the nearest city,

and soon, through contacts the two volunteers had established, these villagers had a thriving business and were in fact exporting their wares to this country. The Communists cannot fight that kind of example. In fact they do not know what to do.

The Communists first reacted to the presence of Peace Corps volunteers by railing about them at every opportunity. The volunteers were called CIA spies, and undercover military men. These young Americans were harassed by the Communists in many areas of Latin America. But the volunteers did not back down. They continued to work with the people. Such good will was established, that every time the Communists criticized the Peace Corps volunteers they were in danger of incurring the wrath of local villagers.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of program that makes the Communists look foolish. They cannot duplicate it because only a free society can make it work. They cannot criticize it too much any more, because the local inhabitants believe in the volunteers. Finally the Communist lies look ridiculous when a Peace Corps volunteer succeeds in showing his hosts how to help themselves.

This is the way to fight the Communists, and the people who are doing such a great service for their country deserve every bit of support we can give them. This is no time to cut back the Peace Corps. Their effect should be heightened. And this is exactly what Mr. Shriver and his staff intend to do. They are asking for more money to double the number of Peace Corps volunteers in Latin America. They want to put 5,000 of these Americans into that area. One American, Mr. Chairman, who lives in a Latin American village is well worth our investment in him. No effort to make developing nations self-sufficient has been quite so successful.

Let us not give Castro the key to every door in Latin America. The Peace Corps volunteers are slamming the door in his face.

I strongly urge the passage of this legislation today and commend my distinguished friend and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and the members of his committee for their great work in this and other fields of our foreign affairs.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support for this legislation, H.R. 9009, authorizing funds for an expanded program for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1964. I am privileged and proud to have been an early supporter of the Peace Corps, and to be a staunch advocate of its purposes, aims, and programs. I sincerely urge my colleagues to resoundly approve the legislation before the House today, not only in recognition of the difficult job remaining to be done in the future by the Corps, but also as a vote of confidence for the outstanding work this young agency has already achieved in contributing toward the improvement of world social and economic conditions and in the laying of a foundation for world peace.

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing today about the notable accomplish-

ments that the Corps has carried out abroad. We have heard of improved farms, schools, roads, health conditions, water, and sanitation facilities overseas. And I think it is only proper that we emphasize these splendid accomplishments, for they have truly enabled other nations to see this country in a new light, as one that not only talks about being a "good neighbor" but, more importantly, acts as a good neighbor in assisting other countries when they call on us for aid.

But I would like to place my emphasis on another aspect of the Peace Corps accomplishments, in addition to the acknowledged good it has done abroad. I would like to commend the Corps for its inspiring example of the vitality, imagination, and spirit of the young American volunteers. This is the part of the Peace Corps story that pleases and impresses me so greatly. All of us in Congress know the time and effort we spend in programs to aid our youth, the bills to fight juvenile delinquency, prevent school dropouts, provide job training, and other assistance. I recognize the value and need for such programs, and have always supported legislation of this nature. But today, in considering the Peace Corps program, it is like a breath of fresh air, and a heartening reassurance of the fine quality of our people, both young and old, who have made such a good record as volunteers in the Corps. I think it is most encouraging to note that this year there are three times as many applicants for Peace Corps work overseas as there were last year, and many of them are young people, in spite of the fact that a great number of available posts are "hardship" in terms of health, housing, social, and recreational benefits. This volunteer spirit for hard work truly makes me proud of our young people and our older volunteers, and it reaffirms my faith in the pioneer spirit of our people. It is heartening to know that the pioneer spirit in America is not confined to television presentations of days gone by when our country was young, but is still very much alive in the spirit of our people of today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see this legislation approved and the program of the Peace Corps expanded, until every oversea plea for assistance can be met, and every dedicated, qualified American volunteer can be utilized. Each step in that direction, I believe, is desirable and proper, and thus the bill before us is worthy of our approval.

Let our critics take note, and let our Communist adversaries pay heed. No one is going to "bury us" and, indeed, our adversaries will find it difficult to even keep pace with us when we have the imagination, courage, energy, and spirit so amply displayed by our Peace Corps volunteers.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see us approve this program with optimism, for it has proved itself a great benefit to our Nation in the difficult world conditions that we face today. This Peace Corps program is small in comparison to many that come before this body, yet it is big in past accomplishments and future goals. Let us by our affirmative vote today express our

approval of these past accomplishments, and our confidence in an even more effective and far-reaching Peace Corps in the future.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9009, authorizing \$102 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1964. The opponents of this legislation claim they are uncertain of the accomplishments of the Peace Corps, but they are acutely aware that it is a burgeoning bureaucracy. I do not know what they want as proof of accomplishments. Newspapers throughout the United States and throughout the world have endorsed the Peace Corps and praised its members for their zeal, idealism, and accomplishments. I have inserted many of these editorials in the RECORD for my colleagues to read, over the last 2 years.

One of the outstanding and most glowing tributes to Peace Corps achievements was printed in the respected Times of London on the first anniversary of the Peace Corps. The article was by Alec Dickson, founder of the Voluntary Service Overseas, who traced the ideological thrust of the Peace Corps back to the British hopes of Carlyle and Ruskin a century ago, and to the self-sacrificing examples of the late Dr. Tom Dooley in southeast Asia, and the adventurous and courageous "Crossroads Africa" operation under the dynamic Negro pastor, Dr. James H. Robinson.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one of the measures of success of the Peace Corps is that the countries in which the Peace Corps is in operation have requested more volunteers, and additional countries are seeking Peace Corps assistance. Also, the number of qualified applicants is larger than ever, even though the standards have been raised, and there have been no incidents which have made the conduct of our foreign policy more difficult. In the short period that has elapsed since its beginning, the Peace Corps has already made a significant contribution to the attainment of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, as the Peace Corps operation has expanded and the number of volunteers has increased, the portion of the Peace Corps costs devoted to administration has declined. This does not point to a burgeoning bureaucracy. Remember there have been three times as many applicants this past year as a year ago for Peace Corps volunteers. If the level of funds requested in this bill, \$102 million, is made available for fiscal 1964, it is estimated that only 19.9 percent, or \$20,300,000, will be used for administration and the remainder will go to support volunteers. Last year, fiscal 1963, 28 percent of the funds available were utilized for administration.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, much of the credit for the success and achievements

of the Peace Corps during its relatively short span of over 2 years of life must go to Sargent Shriver, the energetic and enthusiastic Director of the Peace Corps. Mr. Dickson wrote of Director Shriver in the Times of London:

The Peace Corps may be a Government agency, but it is Mr. Sargent Shriver's strong personality, in a way an extension of the President's, that inspires and dominates the organization, unvintated by considerations of what is administratively convenient.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Peace Corps has been a success and has accomplished much by helping the peoples of underdeveloped countries meet their need for trained manpower, and by promoting a better understanding of the American people, and the objectives of American foreign policy. And I feel that Director Sargent Shriver is to be commended for these successes. I do not agree with the critics of the Peace Corps and I do not think that this legislation to authorize \$102 million is excessive and unwarranted.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Peace Corps for one reason—it is giving the taxpayers their money's worth.

For example, four Peace Corps volunteers from my hometown of Nashville are serving as Peace Corps teachers in Africa and Latin America. They get \$75 a month which is part of a readjustment allowance, and a small living allowance. I do not think their services can be duplicated at that price anywhere in the world. Moreover, all four are teachers and there is a better than even chance, according to a Peace Corps survey, that they will return to Nashville and enter the teaching profession. I consider that a bargain.

Some of our finest young men and women have gone to the far corners of the earth in the service of their country. I think they deserve every bit of support we are able to offer them. It is one thing to cut back on programs that have not worked out as intended, but here some very talented Americans have gone out, many times under very difficult conditions, to offer a living example of our way of life. They have done just that. They have impressed people around the world with the dynamic possibilities of democracy and the free enterprise system. I think we should emphasize this kind of effort. For a long time we have searched for the means to show developing nations throughout the world the inherent advantages of our way of life. The Peace Corps is doing just that in a manner that has exceeded all expectations.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, want more of the same. I think this is the reason that the Gallup and Harris polls both show three out of four Americans enthusiastically supporting the Peace Corps.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, insufficient information is no basis for almost doubling the Peace Corps funds. No public witnesses but one—and only administrators boasting of the program's success. Yet little specific data is given.

Basically, these efforts should be in the private sector, not Government. Evidently, few of the Peace Corps proponents recognize that private help through missionary and educational efforts is one thing and Government programs are another. Government effort at best becomes socialism; private help is not. Government-to-government help is socialistic in implementation. Neither can government extend charity. Charity is private, person to person, not by government aid.

The do-gooders, of course, have let their enthusiasm run away with their judgment. How much Peace Corps aid is going to Socialist countries, to countries that subjugate their people; as example, to those countries where there is no religious freedom; also freedom of speech, assembly, and press. Or are we not to question those with stars in their eyes over their visualized goals?

Where are those who know of the success of missionary and other private efforts? Why are we denied this information? The Committee on Foreign Affairs is ill prepared to give us the data we need.

The material in report and hearings does not give us the data we need—what the cost is by country, by workers, and the projects involved, the successes and the failure. All we have are glowing reports by those running the program.

Too much of the taxpayers' money has gone into publicizing the Peace Corps.

I commend the members who submitted the minority views. Their charges have not been rebutted; namely, first, uncertainty of accomplishment and the burgeoning bureaucracy; second, the self-praise without solid accomplishment; third, overly ambitious target projects; and, fourth, excessive authorization of money.

Finally, I cannot agree that Congress can sensibly approve such a program with so little actual information. For my part, the Peace Corps was and is an unwarranted intrusion into areas properly of the private sector. I hold such activity is unconstitutional, unnecessary, and self-defeating. We encourage Government planning, welfare statism, socialism, and godless materialism, all at the expense of capitalism and basic U.S. spiritual and moral values.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to

carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1963" and "\$63,750,000" and substituting "1964" and "\$102,000,000", respectively.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On the first page, beginning in line 6, strike out "\$102,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$81,000,000".

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to be consistent with the Members who have addressed this body today, I should preface my remarks by saying I rise in enthusiastic support of an amendment to reduce the dollar amount of the authorization in this bill, and with equal sincerity to the enthusiasm with which it is presented.

As everyone has pointed out, the only witness before the committee was the Director of the Peace Corps. He is a real sharp, polished, enthusiastic, suave and articulate individual for his cause. He has done a magnificent job in selling the Peace Corps. You have heard this afternoon all the accolades and eulogies about this Peace Corps program without taking the time to look at what it is costing the American people.

When it began it cost \$3 million, with a Presidential directive. Next year it cost \$30 million. The next year the authorization was \$63 million with \$59 million appropriated. This year the request is for \$108 million.

I think it is correct to say that this is one of the fastest burgeoning bureaucracies in the Government. True, it is only 2.4 percent of what is being spent on foreign aid. Even with that 2.4 percent it is acknowledged to be the strongest part of the foreign policy of this administration.

But why do I say \$81 million is adequate and all that is justified? It is simply this. There is no possibility of more than 9,000 Peace Corps volunteers being enrolled in the next fiscal year. One-half of the fiscal year has already gone. The appropriation will not be available. Six months of the year have gone.

Another thing I waited and listened for in this debate, the last speaker mentioned the fact that many of the Peace Corps members are now finishing their tour of duty. If you will look on page 3 of the testimony, the Director tells us that before next January 1 there will be 700 members of the Peace Corps who will have completed their tour of duty, and during 1964 there will be 3,000 more members who will be completing their tour of duty. I say to you that just replacing these 3,700 members of the Peace Corps will be a better average of enrollment than has been made so far in the history of this infant organization. They are not going to reach 9,000 members, to say nothing about 11,300 members.

Again quoting the Director, they have increased, they have doubled the amount of language training and raised the standard of language acceptance. They have extended the time from 8 to 10

weeks to 10 to 12 weeks, and it is going to take more time to train members of the Peace Corps.

The second reason I want to advance to you is another one given to us by Mr. Shriver, that they have been unable to find, there has been a shortage of available people with certain skills in high demand overseas. Mr. Shriver wants to have the finest kind of Peace Corps and create the best image possible overseas. So he is searching for these people in mathematics, in science, in agriculture, and in other scarce skills that are so badly wanted in these areas that we are proposing to serve throughout the world. So without regard to the praise that has been lavished here this afternoon on this organization, I think that simple prudence in finance dictates that we authorize no more than reasonably will be needed or used by the Peace Corps. Sure, they say they will return it, but I think proper fiscal policies and practices require that this body use a sensible approach, that we do not throw the bars down and open the floodgates for everything that is asked.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the debate this afternoon and I have read the minority views. So far I have heard no serious objection to the Peace Corps. The only suggestion made here is perhaps we are authorizing a little more than what we should. Let us see whether that is so or not.

You heard earlier in the debate that recruitment has been a little bit difficult because they were seeking to recruit seniors from the various colleges. But that is now being changed and they are seeking to recruit men in the third year of college. Therefore, it is anticipated there will be a greater number of men and women who will join the Peace Corps.

Remember this is a young program. This is an expanding program. I do not think in view of the accolades we have heard here this afternoon that it is our intention to restrict it any more than absolutely necessary.

If we had any evidence at all that there was any misappropriation or misuse of funds, then I could understand cutting down the authorization that has been requested. But we have not heard anything of that kind at all. There was only one suggestion—that \$9,000 was being spent for bureaucracy.

I suggest to the gentleman who said something about the sum of \$9,000 per recruit being spent for bureaucracy that he look at page 18 of the hearings and there he will see a list of the various items for which this \$9,000 is authorized in this instance and subsequently appropriated.

The average cost for a recruit is as follows:

Average cost per volunteer

Postselection:	
1. Transportation:	
United States.....	\$200
International.....	1,200
Travel allowance.....	33
"Home leave" allowance.....	60
2. Project equipment and supplies.....	
	780

3. Vehicles.....	\$750
4. Housing.....	1,240
5. Medical kit.....	25
6. Personal supplies.....	25
7. Oversea orientation.....	100
8. Readjustment allowance.....	1,638
9. Settling-in allowance.....	125
10. Living allowance.....	2,625
11. Leave allowance.....	273
12. Clothing allowance.....	200
13. In-country travel.....	225
14. Medical care.....	315
15. Medical evacuation/emergency leave.....	210
Subtotal.....	10,024
Total direct cost for 2 years of service.....	13,336

So, Mr. Chairman, we know that there is no idea of anybody doing anything wrong in connection with the use of any of these moneys.

As a matter of fact, the minority views claim that there are no accomplishments and they claim that most of these accomplishments are by public relations, that we have no evidence of accomplishment in fact.

What accomplishments can we exhibit?

Do you want us to tell how many pupils are being educated in these various countries?

Do you want us to tell how many rows of corn have been planted in various countries?

Do you want us to tell you how many children have been taught farming or how to build or to do various other things that it is the purpose of the Peace Corps to do?

No, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard anything at all in opposition to the Peace Corps. I do not believe, in view of the history of the Peace Corps in turning back unused moneys that they have received, that we should in any way seek to restrict them in their effort to develop a good image of America. This has been best explained in the letter which was written by a distinguished Catholic prelate and read by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

It seems to me that this is something we can be proud of, and something that we can throw our chests out about. We can thus show that by this people-to-people program we are creating an image of America that is certainly a wonderful image. If anything, it seems to me that we ought to grant them all that they want and even more rather than restrict them in connection with this authorization.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 1, strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "substituting '1964'."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply bring this bill back into financial perspective. It would provide for the authorization given to the Peace Corps last year—\$63,750,000.

Someone referred to the fast expansion of this organization. In 1960, 3

short years ago, Congress appropriated \$10,000 for the Peace Corps. In 1961, the Peace Corps was allocated \$1,620,000. In fiscal 1962, \$30 million and last year the Congress appropriated \$59 million. Yet, we are asked here today to authorize \$102 million—when the spending last year was \$55,130,000 out of a \$59 million appropriation.

Now what has the Peace Corps been doing in the way of spending since the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, 1963?

For the 4 months up to October 31, 1963, it has been obligating at the rate of approximately \$19.5 million. This simply means they have been obligating under the continuing resolution at a rate of some \$5 million a month. On a basis of 12 months that is \$60 million. As the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out in behalf of his amendment, 6 months of this fiscal year will have gone by before this bill is signed, and whatever appropriation is made to implement it. Six months of this fiscal year will have passed into history. Yet you ask here today for \$102 million. How in the world can the Peace Corps possibly spend \$102 million in 6 months? How can it spend even \$80 million or \$81 million, as the Thomson resolution would authorize? There is nothing in the Record that shows they could possibly do this, because, I say again, they are obligating today at the rate of less than \$5 million a month.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Are there any countries which have accepted Peace Corps members not now receiving foreign aid? Do you know of any such country not receiving foreign aid, or for that matter do you know of any country, period, not receiving foreign aid?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of any country either way.

Mr. DOLE. When Peace Corps men come home, are they permitted to purchase foreign cars to bring back to our country?

Mr. GROSS. I suppose if Members of Congress can purchase foreign cars while on foreign junkets, they can. I do not know. I cannot answer the gentleman's question as to whether they can import Mercedes-Benz automobiles or not. Members of Congress who have taken trips abroad and bought automobiles ought to be able to answer.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The places where these people go do not manufacture cars. In fact, they manufacture nothing.

Mr. DOLE. They may have an opportunity on the way to or from to buy foreign automobiles.

Mr. GROSS. They go through Paris and London, do they not, to and from their assignments?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, they do not.

Mr. GROSS. Where do they go?

Mr. GALLAGHER. They go to Nigeria and Libya and Peru and Bolivia.

Mr. GROSS. And they also go to Africa.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. They also go to Africa.

Mr. GROSS. And they go through Rome, do they not?

Mr. DOLE. What about the recruiters? I know last year there were stories about Norman Snead receiving \$75 a day. It never transpired, but is there any extra payment for well-known recruiters in this program?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that, but I know they had a swimming coach hired on a consultant basis very conveniently during the months he was not employed at Alabama University. He was teaching Peace Corps members how to swim in Puerto Rico although they already had a swimming coach on the permanent Peace Corps payroll.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman, but do not take quite all my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No. I will take just about 2 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from Iowa, but if there are any further requests, I will be constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is granted 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Since the gentleman is making these charges by innuendo, I think it would be incumbent on him to produce the proof, if he has any, at this time about these Peace Corpsmen purchasing automobiles.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kansas did not say they did; he asked the question.

Mr. DOLE. I did not say they did.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The innuendo was they are profiting by their travels, and I think the United States is profiting by it as well as the participating countries and not them.

Mr. DOLE. If that is the inference the gentleman draws, it is his privilege; however, I am only seeking information. With reference to the Peace Corps generally, let us not forget we have troops all over the world and could properly refer to our young men and women in the Armed Forces as the heart of our Peace Corps. Certainly they also do good in the world, but it is often overlooked. It is difficult to find out anything except the public relations type material as set out in the second annual report to Congress. This is the type booklet we use in running for reelection. It contains everything good about the Peace Corps and little else. It is simply a campaign-type document. Almost every time you turn on the radio somebody is singing praises about the Peace Corps. Nearly every time you pick up a paper, there is a glorified story about the Peace Corps. When will the cost reach

a billion dollars, or better yet, when will the committee thoroughly and objectively study the actual progress of this program? Popularity of a program, based on a massive public relations effort does an injustice to Peace Corps members and the general public.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of praise here, but very little specific criticism. If there is anybody who knows anything bad about the Peace Corps, here is the place to say it. If there are unfavorable facts to be cited they should be brought out and discussed.

Mr. GROSS. All right, I want to offer a little of that criticism here and now. I cannot for the life of me understand why we have a single member of the Peace Corps in Indonesia to help Dictator Sukarno. I cannot understand why the Peace Corps is in four British territories around the world. Why are we supplying Peace Corps representatives and paying them to help the British? Presumably they have their own Peace Corps; if they do not, they ought to have one. What are we doing in British territory? Why is the Peace Corps in Ghana with one of its largest contingents? Ghana is ruled by Nkrumah, a Communist-loving dictator. I have no words that would properly describe that tyrant.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Not at this time. His newspapers are constantly branding the Peace Corps members as spies and subversives. What business have we with any Peace Corps members in Ghana until that situation is straightened out?

The Peace Corps does not need all of this money. Let them take the Peace Corps out of countries and put them into countries, if this program must be continued, which have governments that are representative of the people.

There is also a Government-financed drive in this country to provide jobs for members of the Peace Corps when they return. I have yet to hear of any drive to provide jobs for volunteers in the Army or Navy or Marine Corps. Why spend money on a drive to provide jobs for members of the Peace Corps when they come home when we do not do this for members of the armed services? What makes members of the Peace Corps such special characters?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think there is a recruiting office in most of the cities of the country.

Mr. GROSS. Are they supplying discharged servicemen, who were volunteers in the armed services, with jobs? Can they go there to get jobs? You are setting up a machinery in this country to make sure that every returning Peace Corpsite who has served only 2 years will be helped to get a job.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think these people have rendered a great service, and when they return to the United States,

with the experience that they have, they are qualified for a job.

Mr. GROSS. Why do we not have a campaign to provide jobs for the volunteers in the military services, when they return home?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have. I introduced a cold war Peace Corps bill to take care of that.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me where you have such a service; a special setup to provide jobs to armed services volunteers after their discharge?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Every city helps returning veterans to get jobs.

Mr. GROSS. Why not send the Peace Corps to the employment offices? Why a priority for them over a young man who has volunteered to fight and die for his country?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We are trying to keep down unemployment.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Can the gentleman say whether there was any information provided the committee that if the full appropriation including the increase involved is granted, what will be the increase in the number of employees at the higher levels in the agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In so doing, and in response to a criticism that was made earlier, I would like to include in the RECORD the factual side of certain allegations about volunteers purchasing foreign cars cheaply. The Peace Corps volunteers do not get the \$75 per month until they return to the United States.

Mr. Shriver wisely urged that the pay be withheld so that they could not bring back a lot of purchases. They do however bring back an experience that will enrich our country.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard it alleged that the Peace Corps is just one more mushrooming administrative superstructure in the executive branch. As a long-term supporter of the Peace Corps, I must admit that I, too, was concerned about the possibility that it would become a victim of that disease which plagues so many agencies—burgeoning bureaucracy. As a result, I have watched its administrative development closely, and I am pleased to be able to point out that exactly the opposite appears to be the case.

The Peace Corps has done an outstanding job of controlling its administrative development and restricting what growth there has been to essential areas. A few historical examples should show what I mean. In fiscal year 1962, some 33.3 percent of the Peace Corps' total obligations were for administrative costs. In fiscal year 1963, this figure was reduced to 28 percent. And in the current fiscal year, administrative expenses constitute less than 20 percent of the total Peace Corps budget. This does not strike me as an example of mushrooming administrative costs.

I have also been impressed with the specific trends within this general picture. On June 30, 1962, there was one Peace Corps staff member to every four volunteers. One year later, there was one Peace Corps staff member to every seven volunteers. And the Peace Corps' estimates for June 30, 1964, anticipate a ratio of 1 staff member to every 10 volunteers. I doubt whether any other agency can match that record of increasing efficiency in administration.

Just in case anyone thinks that these comparisons are all the result of statistical gamesmanship, let me call your attention to one simple fact: The size of the Peace Corps staff has declined, in absolute as well as in relative terms, in recent months.

The Peace Corps has selected and trained over 7,000 Americans for service to their country and now supports their activities in 46 nations around the world. The global scope of its operations and the many problems which face an agency which is without precedent in the U.S. Government have made its task doubly formidable. Yet the Peace Corps chose to meet its challenges with imagination and dedication rather than to rely on the dubious technique of a large staff supported by a fat budget.

The Director of the Peace Corps is a businessman, and I am delighted that he is running his agency according to sound business principles. Under his direction the Peace Corps is serving as a shining example of efficient operation at minimum cost.

I want to refute the argument that the Peace Corps has improperly expanded since June 30, 1963, during the period it has been operating under continuing resolutions.

For fiscal year 1963 \$59 million was appropriated for the Peace Corps. Between \$43 and \$44 million of this amount was available for program expenses, the operating portion of the Peace Corps' budget.

Under the continuing resolutions the Peace Corps may obligate funds at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate.

As of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1964, the Peace Corps had obligated only \$10.7 million for program expenses.

As of October 30, this had risen to \$13.3 million.

If the Peace Corps continued to operate under continuing resolutions for the rest of fiscal year 1964 and to obligate funds at the rate indicated by the above figures, it would end up at the end of fiscal year 1964 having obligated about \$40 million for operations, which is \$3 or \$4 million less than first, what was appropriated for this purpose for fiscal year 1963; and, second, what the continuing resolutions would authorize.

During the last quarter of fiscal year 1963, the Peace Corps obligated for operations almost \$16 million of program funds. The actual figure is \$15.7 million. Thus, its \$10.7 million of program obligations for the first quarter of fiscal year 1964 is about 30 percent less than its rate for the last quarter of fiscal year 1963.

Administrative expenses for the first quarter of fiscal year 1963 were \$4.5 million, roughly the same as for the last quarter of fiscal year 1964.

These are not just numbers. As of June 30, the Peace Corps had a total of 1,110 employees—755 of these were in Washington and 32 at its training site in Puerto Rico. By September 30, the number of employees in Washington had been cut by more than a hundred to 647, a decline of nearly 15 percent. The number of employees in Puerto Rico had been reduced by nearly 25 percent.

Overseas, the story is similar. The number of foreign employees—clerks, accountants and the like—declined from 158 to 141. The number of American staff rose slightly from 165 to 199. This increase, however, represents arrival overseas of employees whose employment commitments had been made during the last half of fiscal year 1963 in anticipation of the arrival overseas at the end of summer training of the additional volunteers the costs of whose entry into training were authorized and appropriated last year.

Mr. Chairman, this record of restraint is typical of the way the Peace Corps is administered. I think it demonstrates fully that the Peace Corps merits the confidence and respect which an overwhelming number of the Members of this body have for it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I think it is interesting to note that the number of American staff members rose slightly 165 to 199, but the number of foreign employees fell from 158 to 141.

They do eliminate staffing when it is not needed.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for bringing out that very important point.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman probably ought to make a point which is that Mr. Shriver in his testimony to the committee stated that the Peace Corps does not ship cars overseas or return them. That point should be made in response to the question which was previously raised.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; that is right. I thank the gentleman for bringing that point out. I think it answers the inuendo that has been made about these dedicated Americans, that they may have some hidden motive for volunteering their services and their lives in doing a service that could materially affect their lives by exposing themselves to disease and living with poverty in the disease-ridden villages throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this about what the Peace Corps does: Last month a mayor in a city of South America who had never been to his capital before, came down through the mountains with a petition signed by over 400 people saying that he heard from another villager that an American volunteer

Peace Corpsman was there helping them drill water wells. This was the first trip that he ever made to his capital. And, what he wanted was just one volunteer.

Mr. Chairman, the impact that these volunteers have made throughout the world has just been tremendous. This is the reason why we are now asking for a moderate increase in the number of volunteers, not the staff, so that the image of America can be further projected throughout the world with such credit to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] has brought out the fact that we are gradually reducing the number of employees in Puerto Rico. The training center has been reduced by 25 percent.

What we are trying to do and what the Peace Corps is trying to do is to reduce the number of staffing and increase the number of volunteers so that the benefit-cost ratio to the U.S. taxpayer will reflect that we could not have a greater or better investment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making a very fine statement.

In my opinion Sargent Shriver is a dedicated public servant and one of the finest administrators in the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I heard Sargent Shriver say not long ago that he wanted to work these dedicated young men and women who have been volunteers into the administration of the Peace Corps and eliminate the "bureaucrats," as he calls himself.

I would like also to advise the House that the University of Oklahoma has trained and furnished some of the volunteers who have been sent to various places throughout the world. One girl went to Brazil and went high into the mountains to work among the Indians where the tuberculosis rate was extremely high. She herself contracted tuberculosis, but to this day has refused to come home and will not come home until she is ordered to do so by someone in higher authority.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, an enthusiastic supporter of the program from the beginning, I am more convinced than ever of the importance of the Peace Corps. Accordingly, I oppose the pending amendments.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think it would help the House if the gentleman would tell us what amendment he is objecting to.

Mr. BARRY. With pleasure. I am objecting to both amendments. I alluded to paragraph 1 of the minority report where the minority claimed they did not have any evidence of perform-

ance before them despite the three volumes received by every member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Three volumes that clearly set forth the record of the Peace Corps.

In paragraph 2 of the minority report, the impression is given that some sort of bureaucratic bungling forced a reduction in stated goals. Not so. Good administrators should set their sights as high as possible. Once you begin work, you adjust the program in the light of experience and reality.

Moreover, part of the reduction of the number of volunteers resulted from higher standards imposed by the Peace Corps. This is to its credit. Recognition of the need for higher standards is something we should applaud. Improved recruiting techniques will help to overcome the losses which occurred when standards were raised.

Paragraph 3 is just plain wrong. It talks about 100 volunteers for secretarial and clerical duty abroad which the Peace Corps can now take on.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is well known as a staunch defender of the public purse. However, this paragraph of the minority report if enacted would cost Uncle Sam money. In fact, it would prevent the saving of \$250,000.

During the Peace Corps hearings I asked Mr. Shriver about the 100 clerical persons to be recruited. He stated that in Kuala Lumpur, for example, instead of having two American girls there who were paid secretaries, receiving from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year, they would have two Peace Corps volunteers receiving the normal Peace Corps honorarium.

Then I asked Mr. Shriver what would be the estimated savings under this innovation. Mr. Shriver said, "If we do this, which I hope we can, we will probably save \$250,000 of the taxpayers' money."

Yet the minority report appears to be against the hiring of 100 secretaries as volunteers.

Paragraph 4 has already been answered.

The last paragraph has already been alluded to by the gentleman from New Jersey. I can think we should be enthusiastic about programs that serve America well. Toward the end of this paragraph, the language is somewhat lurid. The remarks of former Congresswoman Church concerning enthusiasm in the Peace Corps is a point it would be well to pay a great deal of attention to.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] this: He mentioned members of the Peace Corps sent to Indonesia. Mr. Virgil M. Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, of his beloved State, had this to say about the Peace Corps trainees. I quote:

Along with the trainees, they are learning—learning how to teach languages in the new method, how to teach new languages, how to teach area studies better, and how to adapt old and test new methods. The project is deepening the international dimension of the State University of Iowa. This international dimension is being shared,

in various ways, with the people of the State, the eastern area in particular.

Experience is the best teacher, and the volunteers' experiences in the developing nations of the world will provide the platform for their education of how things really are.

Incidentally, the Peace Corps volunteers who are going to Indonesia are being trained at the State University of Iowa—a fact which should make the gentleman's chest swell with pride. At the University of Iowa, the Peace Corps volunteer will learn the language, politics, customs, culture, and traditions of the host country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can argue with President Hancher as quickly as I can argue with the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. Apparently the gentleman in his own State is not supported insofar as his views of the Peace Corps are concerned.

In conclusion, I should like to refer to a statement of Sargent Shriver which I think sums up exactly what the Peace Corps is to us:

We, as a nation, were in danger of losing our way among the television sets, the supermarkets and the material abundance of a rich society. Our debt and gratitude to the developing and emerging nations of the world is that they have reminded us of our own traditions, and given us a treasured opportunity to sacrifice and work once more for those principles which created our own Nation. By letting us participate in their struggles they have given us a chance to find ourselves.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the leading paper in my own State of Rhode Island, the Providence Journal, recently summed up the basic character of the Peace Corps. It said that "unlike Topsy, the Peace Corps is not going to just grow."

The Journal knows that many Government agencies have a tendency to grow like Topsy, but they are also aware that the Peace Corps can be distinguished from the usual Government agency. First, Sargent Shriver and his staff turn back unused money from last year's appropriation to the Treasury, and then before the taxpayers recover from this unusual example of fiscal responsibility, Mr. Shriver comes to the Congress and says the Peace Corps will not need all

the money asked for in its original budget. He says the Peace Corps wants to maintain its high standards and therefore will select fewer people. These are just two examples of how Mr. Shriver has made himself the taxpayers' best friend.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps has established itself as the no-waste, no-nonsense agency. The people know that they are getting their money's worth from the Peace Corps. It is a sound investment. Now it would seem somewhat strange if we were to go to the people and say we no longer feel it necessary to invest your dollars in a wise manner. We are not going to invest more money in the big-return Peace Corps. That would not be good business.

We have a worthwhile product in the Peace Corps. More than 7,000 of our citizens are showing that American ingenuity is the key to success in the underdeveloped world. They are proving that the force that motivated earlier Americans is not dead; and they are showing us that same force can be the foundation for progress in other parts of the world.

We are not giving anything away in the Peace Corps. We are investing the initiative, adaptability, and hard work of American volunteers in an effort to create stability in the areas of the world that are being shaken by social and economic revolution. It is in our interest to do so. The Peace Corps is an economical and efficient way to do it.

The Providence Journal says the Peace Corps owes its reputation to the quality of its performance. That is true. That is the only reason we support it. The Peace Corps is effective in carrying out the mandate Congress has given it. We should not obstruct the very purpose for which we created the Peace Corps. It seems the least we can do is to continue with even greater emphasis a program that has done exactly what we wanted it to do.

The Providence Journal calls the Peace Corps the pride of the United States and a marvel in the world. The people are not given to such love of Government programs easily. They know when they are getting their money's worth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as one of the coauthors of the minority report, I believe it practical to return this debate back to the point at which it originated. We have two amendments before us. I oppose the Gross amendment and support the Thomson amendment. As a matter of practical arithmetic, here is the situation. The Peace Corps is placing people in the field at the rate of 150 a month. At the present time there are 7,176 Peace Corps men in the field. In the 8 months remaining of the year, they could add 1,200. That would give them approximately 8,400 people. Multiplied by the \$9,000 per man that we are told it would cost, they cannot possibly spend more than \$75 million. The gentleman from Wisconsin proposes that we authorize \$31 million—

a substantial sum to meet any possible contingency. I would also like to point out instead of being criticized for having minority views, we ought to be complimented for constructive suggestions. We want to help the Peace Corps and serve the taxpayer by authorizing realistic sums. We want to help the Peace Corps by maintaining financial responsibility. There is no possible way that the Peace Corps in good or bad projects could spend \$102 million. The only way they could do it would be to lower their standards and we do not want them to do that. An authorization of \$102 million is practically a blank check. It does not take into account realistic manpower utilization. Furthermore, the proponents of the program must bear in mind that we have yet to receive a thorough inspection and appraisal of the entire Peace Corps operation. It would seem the cause would be benefited far more by careful scrutiny and congressional control than by lavish blind praise and dispensing of unlimited funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, that is a great idea. Save the Peace Corps by choking it to death. That is the plain intent of the amendments. A vote for the amendment is a vote to kill the Peace Corps. Mr. Chairman, a statement was made in the debate that a newspaper in Ghana was attacking the Peace Corps. Let me inform the gentleman from Iowa that the newspaper in Ghana he referred to recently carried a prominently displayed article calling the Peace Corps a godesend. I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will look it up and read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, my concern is the level of these programs and the fact that in our entire society we do a great deal of this missionary-type work. The bulk of it has been done traditionally in the private sector. The question is, what is the relationship between the governmental sector and the private in doing missionary-type work. In the committee hearings and in the reports and in the debate one has no concept at all of how much is being done dollarwise or otherwise in the private sector and whether or not the Peace Corps itself is geared to encourage further efforts in the private sector. Let me illustrate. In regard to the student exchange program where I once had the details, we all hear about the Fulbright scholarships. One would almost think the only student exchange programs were through the Federal Government. For every one dollar in Federal Government student exchange programs there were \$10 in the private sector, and I suspect the ratio is somewhat similar in this great missionary work. It is a problem of the use of such personnel as we have. The work is great, but the issue is how much should be done through the governmental mechanism and how

much should be done through the private sector.

As I said during the debate on the rule, regrettably the committee has not the information presented to us to evaluate whether this program should be doubled or cut in half or whatever.

I think the matter should go back to the Foreign Affairs Committee so that we can get the kind of data we need to enable us to vote with intelligence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, 40 Peace Corps volunteers from Montana are helping America to show the world that a free society can produce the kind of men and women, who by their own initiative, perseverance, and just plain hard work, can make the world a better place.

These Americans are proving in every corner of the globe that progress is the result of hard work. Through their example developing nations have seen that it is not American dollars which really do the job, but rather the ability to get down to the grassroots and do the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, it is not difficult to imagine the impact 7,000 Americans are having on the underdeveloped nations. In the words of a church official in the Philippines "one Peace Corps volunteer is worth a whole boatload of corn." One has to agree when he sees that a single Peace Corps volunteer in Pakistan saved a million-dollar rice crop. This single Peace Corps volunteer is costing the American taxpayers \$75 a month in addition to a small living allowance. Certainly he is well worth the investment.

This great return on a small investment can be magnified many times in the areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa where Communist lies fool millions every day. Peace Corps volunteers are serving in the very nests of the Communist agitators in these areas. By their presence alone they expose the fraud being perpetrated by the Communists.

Mr. Chairman, these Americans are our greatest asset in the pivotal area known as the developing nations. We are fortunate to have citizens such as these. We are fortunate they are willing to serve. And we are fortunate they are serving so well. I hope we give them the support they need.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON]. There are a few figures that I think are important. In 1961, in August—and I shall speak only in round numbers—there were about 500 members in the Peace Corps. A year later, in 1962, there were about 3,500 members. Again a year after that, in 1963, there were about 6,600 members. Today, in mid-November, there are about 7,200

members in the Peace Corps. If that progression is to be continued, and if we assume that a fair standard of cost is \$9,000 per year per Peace Corps individual, then it is quite apparent that there will be enough money at the level proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that is, \$81 million, to carry on the program for the balance of this fiscal year.

If Members support the amendment of the gentleman, they will be granting an increase over expenditures in the last fiscal year of more than 40 percent, which is certainly a rather large increase for any program.

I am convinced after studying the matter carefully that the reduction proposed will not injure the program and will in fact tighten it and make for a more effective Peace Corps operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some very unusual discussions with respect to the pending matters. I am opposed to the amendment and the substitute and support the committee bill. It strikes me as somewhat unreasonable to say that the Peace Corps is doing a good job and because it is, it should not be expanded or should not be given the opportunity to expand and do a better job. It seems rather unreasonable to me to argue that because nothing can be said in criticism about the program that it should be cut down or discontinued.

I find it very difficult to understand the reasoning that says because taxpayers' money is not being spent fast enough by the Peace Corps in the first 6 months of this fiscal year, therefore this authorization should be cut down and the program not given an opportunity to expand or continue its good work. It has been implausibly argued that it is impossible to get people into the Peace Corps at a rate faster than that which they are now being recruited.

But there is given no evidence to support this allegation. I say the Peace Corps should be given the opportunity to recruit more.

There are almost 7,200 people in the program and the Peace Corps says the target is 11,340 people. The recruitment growth record of the Peace Corps is admittedly excellent. Progress under the program has been worthwhile and there are more pending applications than ever. In the nonmilitary, noneconomic area, this program has had a great effect and tremendous beneficial impact both for the host country and the United States. For these reasons we should give the Peace Corps opportunity to expand, by our action in voting down the amendment and the substitute, and voting for the committee bill.

Furthermore, and in conclusion, if people cannot be brought into the program all the funds authorized cannot be spent. Therefore I cannot see any reason why we should not support the amount of the authorization in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I follow rather closely the views of my colleague from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. I feel that this has been a good program. As one who has been as careful as any Member of the House, I believe, about the fiscal stability of our country—I yield to no one in that respect—I feel that this is one area where if you are a real economist, where if you want to get the most for your dollar, you should support this program.

I want to give a little personal illustration, if I may, and I hope you will pardon me for doing so. It happens that Mrs. Harvey and I were sponsors of one of the first sort of "guinea pig" students who came to Indiana, came to the United States, from one of the South American countries. This young man lived here with us during the year 1943-44. He has since gone back to his South American country and today I think is one of the great forces in that country for stability and survival of a representative form of government such as we ourselves believe in. He is a great and effective foe of communism. This young man has written to me and said in no uncertain terms that in his humble judgment this particular type of effort and program is the best that we could possibly support; we are getting more for our money, we are getting more in return than we could by any other way.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will support this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to the substitute. I have tried to find the logic in both proposals. Apparently no one disagrees that the Peace Corps has been a success. As a matter of fact we point with pride to the unused funds that it has returned to the Treasury because this agency did not attempt to obligate all of its funds. Are we going to say that we will penalize the agency by cutting back its funds?

Both the amendment and the substitute minimize the planning that has gone into the Peace Corps. Does the amendment intend to cut the amount back to \$81 million and provide that none of that money shall be for administrative expenses? It is not clear to me where the reductions would be made as between operational costs and administrative costs. Further, does the gentleman from Iowa, in his substitute, intend that the Peace Corps should stand still and not progress, that it shall not have any planning?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let there be no misunderstanding. I opposed the Peace Corps originally and I oppose it now. I intend to vote for the substitute amendment, and if that fails, I shall vote for the amendment. In any event I shall vote against the passage of the bill.

We are engaged today supposedly in a conflict with world socialism. It is proposed by this Government-subsidized program to socialize missionary activity of the type that heretofore has been done by religious, lay groups, foundations, and other organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself on that score with the wisest remarks that have been made this afternoon, made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

If we were to believe some of this talk, international philanthropy on our part was originated by this administration, and youthful zeal and idealism is a creation of this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I reject both premises. I think it is particularly ironical that the comments offered by my very esteemed friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], about the Philippine Islands should have been made. Why, 60 years before the New Frontier was ever heard of there was a job done over there. And, while it was done under the occupation of the American Government, it was done principally and primarily by the private sector of our Nation and of our people. That support of the private sector was encouraged and not disregarded by the American people and Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, lest there be any possible misunderstanding of my own position, I feel that this is a deservedly popular program. It deserves our continued support. For that reason I rise in opposition both to the Gross amendment and to the Thomson amendment.

The Gross amendment, I think, would be particularly undesirable. It would imply not only that we disapprove of what we have been doing, but that we feel the existing level of volunteer effort should be cut back.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think a program that has proven as valuable as this one to our own country, and to the countries where we provide our help should be cut back.

Mr. Chairman, a more serious question is the Thomson amendment, which I believe also should be opposed. This amendment would provide money sufficient to maintain only 9,000 volunteers, instead of an amount sufficient to support 11,300 volunteers. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is a real possibility that we can find as many as 11,300 well-qualified volunteers. I think a cut of over 20 percent from the amount requested would be undesirable. It would be an indication that we have our doubts regarding the selectivity which will be used hereafter, even though we must generally concede that a good job has been done up to this point.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think we should oppose any cut in the authorization. We should positively oppose both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the Gross amendment and the Thomson amendment.

During the hearings, those who attended the hearings, heard a detailed justification for adding the additional volunteers to the Peace Corps. The original proposal was for 13,000 Peace Corps members. The reduction offered by the Director was down to 11,300.

Take a look at the report, on page 4. Members will note that the two areas of the world which are in greatest need of Peace Corps volunteers are Latin America and Africa. The additional funds are needed to send volunteers to those areas.

Mr. Chairman, those who say that these additional volunteers cannot be recruited cannot show me any evidence in the presentation made by the Peace Corps that indicates that they cannot be produced.

Mr. Chairman, I say again that the two areas where there is a crying need for volunteers are Latin America and Africa. Those who took the time to read the report written by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], and his Subcommittee on Latin America after their visit to Latin America in 1962, will remember that they made a recommendation for an increased Peace Corps in Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, I say both of these amendments should be defeated. I think the Peace Corps has done a good job in turning back money at the end of fiscal year 1962 when they returned to the Treasury the sum of \$1.9 million, and again in 1963 when they returned \$3.9 million. They obligated only as much as could be used effectively and turned back the rest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, for years Members have advocated, and I agreed with them, the proposition that more work should be done at the grassroots level in these underprivileged countries. That is where the Peace Corps works. It reaches the grassroots. It is doing a tremendous job and I hope both amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

The substitute amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 94, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On the first page, beginning in line 6, strike out "\$102,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,000,000".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose here would reduce the amount of the authorization by \$10 million. It would reduce it from \$102 to \$92 million.

In my opinion, and applying the best standards we have as to the cost of the program, this would make possible in the Peace Corps more than 10,000 people at the end of this fiscal year. This would make possible, Mr. Chairman, an increase greater than we have had in previous years.

As I pointed out a few moments ago, from 1961 to 1962 we increased from 400 to 3,500, from 1962 to 1963 we moved from 3,500 to 6,600. My amendment would still make possible a Peace Corps of over 10,000 people, an addition of more than any we have had in previous years, and, again having in mind that we are now speaking in mid-November, certainly more people than can be carefully added to the Peace Corps in the remainder of this fiscal year.

The Director, Mr. Shriver, has pointed out, and I applaud this, that the Peace Corps has been quite selective in the people that it has chosen to enroll. I hope this policy is continued and I believe it will be, but with this selectivity certainly 3,500 or more people to be added in this fiscal year gives more than enough leeway. Here is proposed less than a 10-percent cut in the program. If people believe in governmental economy, if they believe in economy which yet permits a good program to be carried forward at adequate levels, then this amendment ought to be supported.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House has just acted on this issue. The arguments on both sides have all been given in the discussion of the Gross amendment and the Thomson amendment. I am sure everybody recognizes that the Adair amendment is just another cut of \$10 million. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 108, noes 124.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAIR and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 120, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the great universities of this country that cooperate with this program are universally in favor of it. I am pleased to read the following item from the UPI ticker tape:

WASHINGTON.—An official of the University of Oklahoma reported today the Peace Corps in Bolivia was a resounding success.

Dr. Thurman White, dean of the university's extension service, made the report to the Oklahoma congressional delegation. Taking note of recent criticism that the Peace Corps was "long on public relations and

short on accomplishment," he said the exact opposite was the case.

Dr. George Cross, president of the university, called the Peace Corps one of the best programs to be initiated by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take this opportunity to discuss briefly a few of the aspects of the Peace Corps which have particularly impressed me because they have been unexpected dividends. In supporting the Peace Corps when it was little more than an idea, I expected a great deal of it, but my expectations were confined to what I considered realistic levels and realistic areas. I expected that most of the Peace Corps volunteers sent overseas would be effective, well-motivated people who would make a small contribution to the development of other countries. I expected that their knowledge and understanding of the world we live in would be broadened and deepened and that the understanding of the United States on the part of the people with whom they came in contact would be enhanced. And I expected that these important, if limited, ends would be achieved at a lower cost than through most Government programs. If these expectations had been met, I would have been satisfied.

But instead, the Peace Corps has presented a far more striking picture. For one thing, it has appealed to the people of this country on a scale which I had not imagined. Many people felt that once the initial flood of applications had abated, the young people of this country—and the older ones as well—would continue to apply, but in a flow that amounted to little more than a steady trickle. But applications for Peace Corps service have been received at an increasing rate—over 20,000 in 1962, almost 30,000 so far in 1963 with over a month to go. And new records continue to be established.

These impressive figures on quantity are more than equaled by measures of quality. Of some 7,000 volunteers sent overseas by the end of last month only about 6 percent had been terminated early, and many of those had returned before the end of their term of service for reasons beyond their control. The Peace Corps is to be congratulated on its unprecedented achievement in developing so sound a selection process for dealing with such a large volume of people. And I am even more heartened to learn that selection standards are being tightened still further and that Mr. Shriver and his staff deliberately lowered their year-end goals for the past year in order to insure that the quality of the Americans sent overseas as Peace Corps volunteers was maintained or even increased.

I received more than I dared to expect, too, in impact of the Peace Corps, both in this country and overseas. Not only are the volunteers themselves enriched by the experience of Peace Corps service, but hundreds of communities throughout the United States have become deeply involved in their activities overseas. The activities of dozens of American universities have been broadened through the training of Peace Corps volunteers, and the families, friends, and organizations of the volunteers and are receiving

new insights into ways of life quite different from ours.

Today, isolationism has become an anachronism, and the Peace Corps has done more than any other program I know of to remove its last vestiges from the most remote corners of this country.

The impact of the Peace Corps abroad has also been greater than I had imagined. The reputation of the volunteers at work has spread far beyond the people with whom they work directly, and even beyond the bounds of communities as a whole. A measure of their impact lies in the fact that the Ramon Magsaysay Award—the Asian equivalent of the Nobel Peace Prize—was given to the Peace Corps volunteers at work in 11 Asian nations. This was the first time this award has been given to a non-Asian group.

Finally, my expectations have been more than fulfilled in the economy with which the Peace Corps program has been implemented. In these days of rising costs, it is immensely gratifying to find that the average cost of a Peace Corps volunteer has remained at a level of \$9,000 since the program began. It is even more gratifying to note that the proportion of the budget allocated to administrative expenses has declined steadily, and that the Peace Corps has been as good as its word in turning funds which were not clearly necessary—but which could certainly have been spent with relative ease—back to the Treasury.

These are just a few examples of areas in which the Peace Corps has more than justified the support of those of us who were enthusiastic in its initial stages. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not often in the course of my work that I get so much more than I bargained for. The Peace Corps clearly deserves to be authorized the full amount recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (b), insert the following sentence immediately after the first sentence: "Supplies or equipment provided volunteers to insure their capacity to serve effectively may be transferred to the government or to other entities of the country or area with which they have been serving, when no longer necessary for such purpose, and when such transfers would further the purposes of this Act."

(b) Strike out subsection (c) and substitute therefor the following:

"(c) Volunteers shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. The readjustment allowance of each volunteer shall be payable on his return to the United States: *Provided, however,* That, under such circumstances as the President may determine, the accrued readjustment allowance, or any part thereof, may be paid to the volunteer, members of his family or others, during the period of his service, or prior to his return to the United States. In the event of the volunteer's death during the period of his service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the Act

of August 3, 1950, chapter 518, section 1 (5 U.S.C. 61f)."

(c) In subsection (f) (2), strike out "termination payments" and substitute therefor "readjustment allowances".

(d) In subsection (g), add immediately after "may determine" the following proviso: "Provided, That not to exceed one hundred volunteers in the aggregate may be assigned to carry out secretarial or clerical duties on the staffs of the Peace Corps representatives abroad".

(e) In subsection (h), strike out "and for the purposes of" immediately after "tort liability statute," and substitute therefor "the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.), the Act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, section 4 (5 U.S.C. 73b-5), and".

(f) Add a new subsection at the end of section 5 as follows:

"(k) In order to assure that the skills and experience which former volunteers have derived from their training and their service abroad are best utilized in the national interest, the President may, in cooperation with agencies of the United States, private employers, educational institutions and other entities of the United States, undertake programs under which volunteers would be counseled with respect to opportunities for further education and employment."

SEC. 3. Section 6(1) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteer leaders, is amended by striking out "termination payments" and substituting therefor "a readjustment allowance".

SEC. 4. Section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the compensation of persons engaged in the United States in activities authorized by the Act, is amended by striking out "so" in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. Section 10(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to general powers and authorities, is amended by inserting immediately after "or otherwise" in paragraph (3) "and transfer such property to the government or other entities of the country or area with which the volunteers are serving, when such transfers would further the general purposes of the Act".

SEC. 6. Section 13 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), strike out "Peace Corps" and substitute therefor "President".

(b) In subsection (b), strike out all that appears between "shall not" in the first clause thereof and "be considered" in the second clause thereof.

SEC. 7. Section 19 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the Peace Corps seal, is amended by striking out the short title and substituting therefor "Exclusive Right to Seal and Name", by inserting "(a)" before "The President may", and by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) The use of the official seal or emblem and the use of the name 'Peace Corps' shall be restricted exclusively to designate programs authorized under this Act.

"(2) Whoever, whether an individual, partnership, corporation, or association, uses the seal for which provision is made in this section, or any sign, insignia, or symbol in colorable imitation thereof, or the words 'Peace Corps' or any combination of these or other words or characters in colorable imitation thereof, other than to designate programs authorized under this Act, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both. A violation of this subsection may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General, United States attorneys, or other persons duly authorized to represent the United States."

SEC. 8. The Peace Corps Act, as amended, is amended to add after title II thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE III—ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 301. (a) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of this Act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower, and to encourage less developed countries or areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to meet their needs for trained manpower.

"(b) Not more than \$300,000 may be used to carry out the purposes of this title in fiscal year 1964. Activities carried out by the President in furtherance of the purposes of this title shall be limited to the furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower. None of the funds available to carry out the purposes of this Act which are used in furtherance of the purposes of this title may be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof; nor may such funds be used to pay the costs of developing or operating volunteer programs of such organization, government, or agency, or to pay any other costs of such organization, government, or agency.

"(c) Such activities shall not compromise the national character of the Peace Corps."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two concerning the language on pages 5 and 6. On page 5 of the bill, beginning on line 19, it is stated:

The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of this Act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower, and to encourage less developed countries or areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to meet their needs for trained manpower.

I have no objection to that statement. I would like to see the other countries get into this program and get off our backs so that we might save the taxpayers of this country a little money. Then on page 6 it is stated:

Not more than \$300,000 may be used to carry out the purposes of this title in fiscal year 1964.

I shall not read the remainder of paragraph (b), but it stipulates that none of these funds shall be used for certain purposes.

Is it the understanding of the chairman of the committee that no part of

this \$300,000 is to be used to finance an international secretariat or to finance any of these international organizations that are presently in existence in foreign countries or that may be brought into existence? For what purpose will the \$300,000 be spent?

Mr. MORGAN. None of these funds can be used to pay the salaries of any international secretariat. On line 7 it says: "furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower."

We could furnish them Peace Corps personnel to help set up a program, but none of this money, as I read the language, may be allotted to pay the salaries of any international Peace Corps secretariat or contributed to an international organization for any purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I have an amendment; but with the assurance and the understanding of the chairman and other members of the committee that this money is not to be used to finance an international secretariat I will not offer the amendment; or to finance an international organization in a foreign country that is in existence or may be organized for this purpose. But I will say to the gentleman that as one member of the committee I am going to be very much interested in what happens to this \$300,000 that is here earmarked.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is it possible under this amendment for the Peace Corps to furnish to the international Peace Corps secretariat personnel and that personnel be paid out of the Peace Corps funds?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentlemen from California that I do not like the section as it is, or the title as it is presently written. I will leave it to some other member of the committee to answer that question.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Iowa will remember that I first raised the question about this in the committee because I am just as opposed to having an international secretariat and an international peace corps as is the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman will remember that I said I thought we ought to be able to do this on a bilateral basis. But I think in all fairness and all honesty, as the section is written, to answer the gentleman's question, and the section was written as a compromise as the gentleman knows, that we could furnish a man or two men to any organization which was engaged in what is set forth that we want to foster, up to the amount of \$300,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is what concerns me. Why should we be financing people to go to foreign countries to organize so-called peace corps? Why do they not come at their own expense to this country and find out how this organization is set up?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to further develop the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], because I think this is important. I think both the gentleman from Iowa and I are driving in the same general direction.

If the gentleman will remember, the people did come from Puerto Rico and we did not send anyone anywhere else. Puerto Rico is presumably a part somehow of this country, a commonwealth associated with the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, we paid some of their expenses to get them to that middle level manpower meeting, as it was called.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Iowa will remember that the objective is to try to get these people to set up peace corps of their own.

I think we understand some of this compromise language, that this is to be a 1-year, one-shot operation. At least, that is the way I understand it. We cannot pay their expenses under the language now. West Germany is setting up a peace corps. I had some conversations with some Germans about it. They are very enthusiastic about it.

I will assure the gentleman from Iowa that as far as I am concerned I am in general sympathy with the gentleman's objective and that I am considering this a one-shot operation in order to help some of these countries get started.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman will yield, we will take a good, close look at it next year?

Mr. HAYS. I can assure the gentleman that we certainly shall, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 565, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TFX CONTRACT AWARD INVESTIGATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that the TFX contract award investigation is scheduled to resume early the week of November 18. As you are now well aware this investigation has been in progress since last February to attempt to ascertain if political influence was exerted in the awarding of this \$6 to \$7 billion aircraft contract. During the course of the investigation the possibility of conflict of interest has arisen, involving some of the highest officials of our Government. We have already witnessed the resignation of the Secretary of the Navy, Fred Korth.

I would also remind you of a promise made to the American people by Candidate Kennedy when he was seeking the highest office in the United States. In a speech on October 17, 1960, at Wittenberg College Mr. Kennedy said that he would impose "A single, comprehensive code on conflicts of interest—drawing a clearer line between propriety and impropriety—protecting the public against unethical behavior."

Candidate Kennedy continued:

The next President must set the moral tone, and I refer not only to his language.

Mr. Kennedy was elected and was influential in imposing a single comprehensive code concerning conflict of interest which became effective in January of 1963.

I now urge the President to examine carefully the activities of Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric in light of this new comprehensive code, title 18 U.S.C. 208, or for that matter the previous law—title 18, U.S.C. 434. I am confident that if Mr. Kennedy will carefully make such an examination, he will conclude that the "clear line between propriety and impropriety" has been violated by Gilpatric.

I would like to review for you, Mr. Speaker, the relationship between Mr. Gilpatric and the General Dynamics Corp. prior to his Government service and also some of the activities between Gilpatric, the Cravath, Swaine & Moore law firm and General Dynamics after he took a leave of absence and became Deputy Secretary of Defense. I feel confident that continued investigation by the Senate investigating committee will reveal an even greater degree of conflict

of interest in this matter, and I urge that the committee pursue every facet of Gilpatrick's participation in the TFX contract award, so all avenues of conflict of interest possibility will be revealed.

Mr. Gilpatrick was a partner in the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore. Mr. Gilpatrick said in his testimony that the law firm had worked for both the General Dynamics Corp. and Boeing Co. This was refuted and denied by the Boeing Co. They said that all Mr. Gilpatrick had ever done for them was appear as a witness in a court case and had received no attorney's fees whatsoever from the Boeing Co. Mr. Gilpatrick was in charge of the General Dynamics account for his law firm. He intends to return to this law firm when he leaves Government service. But the interesting thing about the relationship between the law firm and the General Dynamics Corp., which was one of their largest accounts, was that they received in legal fees from 1958 to 1960 \$126,000. In the period between 1961 and 1962 the law firm received \$142,000. From the General Dynamics Corp. and in the first quarter of 1963 the law firm received \$31,500. So it was a very lucrative account for Cravath, Swaine & Moore. When Mr. Gilpatrick took a leave of absence from his law firm and became Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Moore of that firm took over the General Dynamics account. Mr. Moore and the law firm were so highly thought of that General Dynamics made Mr. Moore a member of the board of directors of their company. Because of the closeness of the relationship between Mr. Gilpatrick and the General Dynamics Corp., I doubt very much if he could render an objective judgment on any contract in which they might be involved. I do not think there is any doubt but what there is a clear-cut case of conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Gilpatrick.

It is my opinion that not only should Roswell Gilpatrick be fired—he should be prosecuted under the full terms of the United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call your attention to the fact that the General Dynamics bid was \$415 million higher than the Boeing bid on the TFX contract. There is an amazing coincidence between this amount and the \$425 million loss General Dynamics suffered on its jet transport venture.

AWARD TO CARL VINSON

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.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next Monday will be a day in history. It will be the 80th birthday of the Honorable CARL VINSON, a great son of Georgia, a great and towering son of the United States.

Hubert F. Lee, for 34 years editor of Dixie Business, published at Decatur, Ga., has beaten the gun by declaring our beloved colleague the Man of the Year

1964. The editorial staff of the Dixie Business magazine has made a Great American Award since 1955, when Dr. Charles F. Kettering was so designated. In 1962 the award went to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

The following announcement has just been made by Editor Lee:

Bernard M. Baruch and Representative CARL VINSON have been named "A Great American" for 1963 and 1964, respectively, by the editors of Dixie Business magazine.

Mr. VINSON is announced a year in advance as he will have served a half-century of "distinguished public service" in the Congress in 1964.

Mr. Baruch, in a letter, wrote Lee:

"Thank you so much for the honor you bestow upon me by naming me the 'Great American' for 1963. As I look over the list I feel very pleased indeed, particularly to be between two such fine men as Colonel Glenn and CARL VINSON. VINSON has been a wonderful American, especially in the last trying years."

To all of which CARL VINSON's colleagues in the House will join in a chorus of "Amen."

DISCLOSURE OF ALL EVALUATIONS OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE TO THE EMPLOYEE INVOLVED

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to require Federal departments and agencies subject to the Civil Service Act to disclose all evaluations of employee performance to the employee involved. In introducing this measure, I am joining with my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM, in urging the enactment of such legislation. My bill is identical to H.R. 5178 which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] introduced some time ago.

This legislation is intended to eliminate the practice prevalent in some Federal agencies of basing promotions upon confidential supervisory evaluations hidden from the employee.

An instance of such a practice was recently called to my attention. In this case, a Federal employee apparently had been denied promotion for 3 successive years despite excellent evaluation reports in the employee's official file. Efforts by the employee to determine the reasons for the denial of promotion were unsuccessful. Through an administrator error, however, the employee was shown a confidential evaluation report which contradicted the official comments on work performance that were a part of the official file. When this confusing contradiction was called to the attention of the appropriate officials, it was explained that the employee "was not supposed to have seen this material."

It is my understanding that this practice of duplicity is followed in a number of Federal agencies and that, in fact,

the U.S. Public Health Service has dignified it by issuing a printed questionnaire for the convenience of supervisory personnel.

Certainly, I believe the Congress has been correct in its efforts during the past several years to strengthen the quality of supervision in the Federal Civil Service. However, practices of this kind not only grossly disregard the rights of employees, but I feel, weaken the quality of supervision wherever they occur.

Candid, complete, and carefully considered performance evaluations are imperative in the interest of both the employee and for the efficient operation of the Federal office with which he is associated. It has been part of the sound administrative policy for many years for supervisors to counsel and advise employees concerning their work performance. In this way, more satisfactory performance can be obtained and the employee can be assured reasonable promotion opportunity. To foster any other system weakens the entire structure by discouraging honest and effective supervision. At the same time, it undermines employee morale when it is known that duplicity can be practiced with impunity and the right is denied employees to profit from or respond to critical evaluations of which they are unaware.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this legislation would substantially strengthen the Federal service and would operate to the mutual benefit of employees and Federal agencies by restoring fairness in promotion evaluation. It is my earnest hope that it can be given congressional attention at the earliest possible time.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ARA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the publication, recently, of a book entitled "Adjusting to Technological Change." Two of the three coeditors happen to be active citizens of my State, representing two vital forces in Michigan's economy and its community of leaders—Edward L. Cushman, of the American Motors Corp., and Nat Weinberg, of the United Auto Workers. As members of the highly respected Industrial Relations Research Association, they have worked together to assemble eight chapters written by distinguished experts on the problems and challenges of technological change.

Two of these chapters have been contributed by other Michigan analysts: one, on "Cooperative Approaches to Problems of Technological Change," by Charles Killingsworth, professor of labor and industrial relations, at Michigan State University. Professor Killingsworth discusses the resolution of con-

flict between management's desire for flexibility and labor's desire for job security, as affected by changes in technology in the auto, rubber, steel, longshoring, and railroad industries.

The other chapter is on "Technological Change and the Community," co-authored by Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, formerly with Wayne State University in Detroit, and the Area Redevelopment Administration. Dr. Sheppard recently joined the Washington staff of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, a foundation which is also based in Michigan.

Dr. Sheppard and his fellow author, Dr. Sar Levitan—formerly with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress—have provided a succinct portrayal of the role of a program such as the Area Redevelopment Administration, which unfortunately receives very little attention these days. I would like to cite a few aspects of this role.

First:

Possibly the most significant element in the package of tools provided under the Area Redevelopment Act is the emphasis on motivating depressed communities to mobilize their resources to plan constructive development programs which help stimulate economic growth.

Second:

In large part, the effectiveness of the area redevelopment program will depend upon the response of local communities to the opportunities and stimuli provided by the Federal Government. One vital response consists of the efforts of such communities to engage its key segments in grassroots research, discussion, analysis, and planning.

One example of this type of response can be found in the overall economic development program written and submitted by Detroit, in its striving to diversify that area's economic base. The need for Detroit is to generate enterprises in the nonmanufacturing industries, and the local leaders, from business, labor, education, and government, have pinpointed specific types of facilities not adequately available in Detroit that are needed to attract such nonproduction job-creating opportunities. Among these are:

First. Research campuses for the direct and indirect use of large and small firms in need of research facilities, and for attracting additional industries with similar needs.

Second. Development of port facilities, in coordination with the area's extensive expressway system and airport facilities.

Third. The redevelopment of the "core city" in order to allow Detroit to share in the country's growing tourist and convention business.

Without ARA, Detroit would not have had the necessary missing link to start that large area planning and acting to provide for such projects.

Without ARA, the area would not have created an industrial development corporation, with responsible representation from the large auto companies, the lending institutions, the utilities, the unions, and so forth.

Without ARA, the banks and participating businessmen would still be look-

ing for the missing \$1.8 million that was needed to build a \$10 million hotel facility to help make Detroit a modern tourist convention center. The last big hotel built in Detroit was constructed about 40 years ago, and the existing room capacity did not include enough facilities of a quality necessary to put Detroit in a first-class category. Instead of being defensive and apologetic about such projects, Detroit—and ARA—should be boasting about their contribution to the expanding tourist industry of America.

Without ARA, Detroit would not now be submitting a proposal to analyze the feasibility of a research park, in line with its previously submitted overall economic development program—a proposal backed by such reputable authorities as Booz, Allen & Hamilton, local officials in planning, corporation officials in Detroit and elsewhere around the country, and by Theodore Levitt of the Harvard Business School. Willis Hawkins, of Lockheed Aircraft, in commenting on the potentials of Detroit in this field of activity, has said:

In order to be effective * * * science must develop products or initiate services that will create employment.

Without ARA, an up-to-date study of the problem of Detroit's port facilities would not have been completed and acting as a catalyst to start some concrete, positive action on this problem.

Without ARA, the neglected challenge of launching a truly effective coordination of attacks on the "inner city" issue would never have a chance, not only in Detroit but elsewhere around the Nation.

And while it is a bit early to comment in detail, I am counting on ARA to pick up the suggestion of President Kennedy relating to the need for an interstate program for the upper Lake States to carry out a comprehensive attack on that region's economic development problems and opportunities. No other agency exists that can immediately pick up the ball to take bold ideas and get them off the dime.

AN ADDRESS BY HON. ROY A. TAYLOR, 11TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Veterans Day, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the 11th District of North Carolina, Hon. Roy A. TAYLOR, made a very timely and inspiring address to the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Asheville, N.C. The occasion was the honoring of the 22 million veterans who have fought to preserve the liberty and freedom of this great country but it should also serve as a challenge and inspiration for all good Americans. I am pleased to have the

opportunity to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VETERANS DAY SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN ROY A. TAYLOR

This is a day full of significance for the American people and I am deeply grateful for the honor which you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to speak on this occasion. This is the 45th anniversary of a memorable day in human history. We meet here on this Veterans Day to honor the memory of those young American citizens who gave their lives on the field of battle in defense of this country. We honor them by teaching our children that it is a privilege to wear our country's uniform. We honor them by preserving the principles of freedom and justice for which they fought. We honor them by developing a sense of national purpose and rededicating ourselves to American ideals. We honor them by making the light of liberty burn so brightly that it can be seen by the entire world.

Millions of people today are looking to America for leadership sufficient to stop communism, preserve freedom, and secure world peace. Some citizens have proposed that our chief aim today should be sheer national survival, but since America is the world's chief home and hope of freedom, survival alone is not an adequate goal. We cannot abandon lofty ideals for all mankind in favor of compromise of safety or of comfort. We need a renewed understanding and a new dedication to our national purposes.

Our forefathers stated the goals and purposes of America, "to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessing of Liberty."

To give these goals uniform application we should extend our vision to all mankind. In this day of big government and totalitarian states we must preserve and promote the private aspects of freedom, the right of men to choose their own ideas and pursuits and to be free from governmental interference, the right to do what they like with their own.

Also, we must promote the public aspect of freedom—that is, the obligation of the Government to help secure for all people rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Today, America faces serious problems and we veterans should take the lead in finding a solution to these problems. The most alarming change since World War II has been the trend in social and economic thinking toward communism. We know that communism is wrong and ignoring it will not cause it to go away. The struggle is a struggle of ideas but the underlying issue is clear. The issue is whether individual man after groping his way through centuries of repression is to be thrown back into the grasp of totalitarian forces.

We wonder why communism has spread, but since World War II it has spread across China, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and into the Middle East and into Africa and into Cuba, just off our shores.

Many other countries have been divided in the struggle of communism versus freedom. Today we have an East Berlin and a West Berlin; a North Korea, and a South Korea; a North Laos and a South Laos; an East Germany and a West Germany; North Vietnam and South Vietnam; West New Guinea and East New Guinea; Communist China and Nationalist China; a divided Pakistan, a divided Congo, a divided Arab Republic, and now a divided India.

These are indeed challenging times but we have survived great challenges before as the date November 11 indicates.

I am glad to report that the tide of the cold war is now turning in favor of the free

nations. Communism is losing its appeal as more and more people understand its true nature and objectives. Its inefficiency is underscored by the inability of collective farming to produce food sufficient to feed the people of Russia and China.

Castro is no longer a symbol of popular demand for economic and social reform. The space gap is being closed and we are leading Russia in intercontinental ballistic missiles and rockets by about 5 to 1.

International communism is no longer a single coordinated world movement as its two leaders, Russia and Red China, are quarreling among themselves. We know that freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have not had to string barbed wire or put a wall around America to keep our people from leaving. In fact, if it were not for immigration restrictions, people from all nations would flock to our shores.

Sometimes I receive a letter from a discouraged citizen who has lost faith in this country, its leaders, its people, and its future. He is no longer willing to trust anyone.

Now, I do not approve proposals made and many trends in our Government. As a Congressman, I reserve the right to say "No." I believe that we have traveled too far down the road toward centralization of power in the Federal Government. I agree with Woodrow Wilson that: "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power—not the increase of it." To maintain liberty, we must work for it, fight for it, sacrifice for it, pray for it, pay for it, and vote for it. The job will never be finished.

But my faith in America is unlimited. Changes that need to be made will be made. The people will see to that. The rank and file of our citizens today live in better homes, have a higher per capita income, have more leisure time, greater opportunities for education, health, long life, happiness, and community service than at any time in the past.

It is faith in tomorrow which has carried this Nation forward. America is still the land of dreams and its possibilities are limited only by the breadth of our vision.

Mothers today all over the world are praying that their sons and daughters might have the opportunities which we take for granted in this country. The things that made America great are still with us. The last three letters in the word American are still c-a-n.

In closing, may we keep America free—a Nation fit for heroes—serene in the knowledge of its past—confident and strong and ready for the future.

CANAL ZONE CRISIS: PLAN FOR ACTION—SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on October 22, I dealt briefly with relations between Panama and the United States under the title of "Canal Zone Crisis: Plan for Action." Nothing since then has happened to cause a change in those views, that I have repeatedly stressed that where there is responsibility there must be authority and that the Panama Canal enterprise

cannot be successfully maintained, operated, sanitized, and protected with less authority than that provided in the 1903 treaty.

Despite the clarification that has been presented to the Congress and assertions by the Department of State that the long-range interests of the United States will be safeguarded, the pressure for a major revision of the 1903 treaty has been maintained in Panama by the President of that Republic, by its national assembly, and by former Panamanian officials.

In addressing the National Assembly of Panama on October 2, 1963, President Chiari revealed that the relations of his country with the United States had become a "permanent demand" by Panama for additional "benefits from the canal enterprise," called for immediate negotiations for a new canal treaty, and warned that delay would risk creating "delicate situations."

Later, on October 9, former Foreign Minister and treaty negotiator, Dr. Octavio Fabrega, emphasized that there are four basic points in the Panamanian treaty revision demands:

First. Revision of the scope of U.S. authority, power, and control over the Canal Zone;

Second. Elimination of the "perpetuity" provision in the 1903 grant of the Canal Zone Territory;

Third. Greater benefits for Panama from canal revenue, even if this involves an increase in transit tolls; and

Fourth. Retrocession to Panama of all lands and waters within the Canal Zone that have been proved unnecessary for the operation of the waterway.

In the course of his address, Dr. Fabrega disclosed that of the four major treaty revision demands, the one that has found least resistance on the part of the United States was return of lands and waters not needed for the operation of the canal. This, I suppose, explains the readiness of elements in the Department of State to transfer pier 6 and 7 at Cristobal and corridors across the zone, including the Thatcher ferry bridge, and its connecting highways, to Panamanian jurisdiction.

As to the demands for retrocession of parts of the Canal Zone considered by Panama as "unnecessary" for the operation of the canal, President William H. Taft, as long ago as December 5, 1912, declared in an Executive order that "all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary" for canal operations. Moreover, the titles to all Canal Zone land was acquired by the United States from its owner through purchase. Nor, Mr. Speaker, should our officials overlook that under the conditions of modern warfare, our Government should not think of reducing the Canal Zone territory but rather of its extension, including the entire watershed of the Chagres River.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers threatening the position of the United States in the isthmus are understood by our citizens in the Canal Zone charged with the heavy burden of maintaining and operating the Panama Canal. They are not

understood by the mass of our citizens in the United States because of the failure of the mass media and its publicists to deal with the problem either forthrightly or objectively. Instead, some of the mass media's widely read publicists, who have recently written from Panama, in their fallacious propaganda have descended so far as to condemn our Canal Zone citizens as "ugly Americans" and "bad-will ambassadors," to support the sinister influence in our Government that seeks to pacify through coddling Panamanian radicals, and to advocate further erosions of U.S. rights, power, and authority over the Panama Canal.

All the facts in the isthmian situation, Mr. Speaker, call for prompt action by the Congress as the only way to save the Panama Canal. To this end, I call upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House for prompt and favorable action on House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

I urge passage by the Senate of H.R. 3999 to stop these giveaways. I ask the prohibition by statute of any public funds for the display of any flag in the Canal Zone other than that of the United States, and I urge adoption of House Resolution 451 reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine. These actions by the Congress and the House, Mr. Speaker, will be a start on the long road to a restoration of normal and indispensable conditions for meeting our treaty obligations for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

As partial documentation for the foregoing, I include recent news stories from Panamanian newspapers and the Washington Post as part of my remarks:

[From the Panama American, Oct. 28, 1963]

MORE PANAMA FLAGS TO GO UP IN CANAL ZONE

Beginning November 3 more Panamanian flags are to be flown in the Canal Zone, side by side with the U.S. flag at the Gatun and Miraflores locks through which pass daily an average of 30 ships of many flags.

Twin flagpoles are being placed at the south end of Miraflores Locks and at the north of Gatun locks. More flagpoles are to be placed elsewhere.

The work, according to a Balboa Heights spokesman, "is being done as materials are available and as work forces can get at the jobs."

Reliable sources said the flags would be raised on November 3, although the Balboa Heights spokesman said that "no dates have been scheduled for the flags to be raised any place."

The spokesman said the additional Panamanian flags are being raised in accordance with the joint communique issued by the high-level Panama-United States Commission on January 10 last.

Today the Balboa Heights spokesman confirmed that "flagpoles are being placed, or are to be placed, at selected locations throughout the Canal Zone where it is appropriate for flags to be flown by civil authority."

The spokesman said the flags will be raised "routinely, as the flagpole work is completed."

"Some could go up tomorrow, some perhaps on November 3, some perhaps not until later. It all depends on the completion of the flagpole work," the spokesman said.

Meantime, efforts to prevent the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone con-

tinue in the U.S. House of Representatives where a resolution barring the flying of any flag other than the U.S. flag in the zone is being studied.

At last report, the resolution, known as the Cannon resolution, through its sponsor, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Mississippi, was being considered by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The resolution is one of three submitted on the same subject. The other two were submitted by Representative DANIEL K. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa.

It is believed that the Cannon resolution would pass the House by a substantial majority but that it would encounter stormy going in the Senate. Should the Senate pass the resolution, it is believed that President Kennedy would veto it.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Oct. 2, 1963]

CHIARI CALLS FOR NEW CANAL TREATY NOW—BITTER DEBATE MARKS OPENING OF ASSEMBLY—OPPOSITION WALKS OUT AFTER LOSING OUT ON ELECTION OF OFFICERS; SESSION LASTS 4 HOURS

President Roberto F. Chiari called yesterday for immediate negotiations with the United States for a new treaty on the Panama Canal, saying "our two countries cannot delay the solution of their differences without risking delicate situations."

The President addressed the National Assembly at its installation session to report on his administration's accomplishments over the past 12 months.

On the domestic front, Chiari said the Government is tightening the belt to cut down a \$7 million deficit appearing on the books as of August 31. He appealed for Assembly support of the administration's 1964 budget, which he said will be realistic.

Only slightly more than half the membership of the Assembly stayed to hear the President's message after a stormy installation session that culminated with a walkout by 22 opposition deputies, which left the floor to 31 pro-Government deputies.

What should have been a ceremonial session of about 90 minutes' duration, lengthened into almost 3 hours of acrimonious debate over the procedure to be followed in voting for officers of the Assembly. Diplomats, Government officials, and Canal Zone civil and military authorities who were invited to the session squirmed through the lengthy discussion. Then, after the issue had been decided in favor of the administration, came the President's message, which took 73 minutes.

The opposition called for secret balloting in the election of officers. The Government side insisted on a rollcall vote. Administration supporters said the opposition's strategy was that in secret balloting some of the Government deputies might cross party lines and side with the opposition's candidate for the Assembly chair, Alberto Arias.

The opposition fought tooth and nail over the issue, each of its members taking the floor to argue that the Assembly bylaws called for secret voting. The Government deputies held their ground and in the end a rollcall vote was approved.

The opposition walked out en masse.

From then on, the Assembly's business developed smoothly and Ricardo Arango, Demetrio Decerega and José G. Duque were elected President, First and Second Vice President, respectively.

Relations with the United States took two pages of the Presidential message.

President Chiari said:

"Our relations with the United States have developed in a plane of soundness and calmness in permanent demand for recognition of our rights to obtain fair benefits from the canal enterprise, better treatment for Pana-

manian workers and adequate solution of points which cause dissatisfaction.

"Panama knows of no other position, there being no intention on its part of harming the rights which the Government of the United States acquired for the construction, operation, maintenance and defense of the Canal.

"President Kennedy believed, in good faith, that with the creation of a high-level Commission, composed of representatives of both Presidents, a solution would be found to the problems affecting relations between the two countries. It turned out otherwise. The results, 1 year after its installation, afforded such little encouragement, that I took the decision to suspend the conversations and this was done by mutual agreement. Upon discontinuing the meetings of the Commission, both nations face, once again, the delicate problem of their relations arising from the existence of the Canal in Panamanian territory. Half a century of tireless efforts, which have failed to resolve our dissatisfactions, should serve as clear and precise indication of the need for utilizing means different from those already employed in order to attain an honorable solution.

"I believe sincerely, and I say so with utter frankness, realizing the responsibility of my words, that we have arrived at the point and hour when our two countries cannot delay the solution of their differences, without risking delicate situations. I have the deep conviction that if Panama and the United States set aside the interminable and even well-nigh fruitless discussions over what should be the correct interpretation of existing treaties, and decide to tackle the analysis of their discrepancies with realistic judgment and in the light of the principles and norms of international law, now universally recognized, they will find adequate means for resolving, once and for all, a stable relationship which will permit them to harmoniously fulfill the common destiny imposed upon them by the existence of the canal. A satisfactory formula must be found that will place the relations of the two countries on a plane of clear and fair understandings which will enable Panama to obtain the largest economic benefits, without lessening the rights accorded to the United States of America. Both nations made possible the Canal enterprise, both have common interests in its operation, and it is only fair that both should share in the fruits of their effort and of their contribution."

The President cited services taken over from the U.S. Economic Mission, the land reform program, the coming elections, and increased social security payments as factors contributing to a share rise in Government expenditures. A sharp curtailment of spending is the only way to cope with the situation, he declared.

"There is a limit to taxes," President Chiari told the Assembly, "and it would be a dangerous policy to resort to more and more taxes in order to balance expenditures."

The Chief Executive spoke with pride of his administration's accomplishments in the field of education. He pointed out that school enrollment in the country has increased from 174,000 students 3 years ago to 208,000 last July. Yet, he pointed out, 33,000 school-age children still have no classrooms.

In the agricultural field, Chiari singled out for special mention the recently launched agrarian reform program, which he said is slowly winning over the trust and confidence of peasants. He noted, however, that there are elements purposely working against the land reform activities.

Chiari reported also on Panama's Alliance for Progress program, covering the next 7 years. It won't be until February or March of next year, he said, when the first credits are expected to be made available for putting the economic and social development plan in motion.

The President's message was sprinkled with references to Alliance for Progress assistance, particularly in school construction.

One other topic of national interest was included in the Presidential message—the 1964 elections. Chiari renewed assurances that voters will go to the polls without hindrance from the Government and that his administration will respect and sustain the voters' will as shows at the polls.

In his comments on the national guard—which he said has his confidence "without reservations or limitations"—the President called for an increase in manpower.

Chiari concluded his message saying that he blamed his own shortcomings for the fact that "we have not been able to do more so that the Panamanian people may lead a better life," but he declared he is satisfied he has done all he could.

It was 2:40 p.m. when the President finished reading his state of the nation report. The Assembly meeting, which had started at 10:35 a.m., was adjourned immediately. The first of the working sessions, which will last 2 months, is scheduled for this afternoon.

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Oct. 10, 1963]

FABREGA: NEW TREATY "MUST"; ARNULFO ARIAS: PANAMA CANAL ISSUE "FALLACIOUS"

Two prominent Panamanians spoke out yesterday on the subject of Panama-United States relations, one to say that the full revision of the 1903 treaty is the only solution to differences between the two countries and the other to charge that the Panamanian Government is using the "fallacious canal issue" to hide its own ineptitude.

The pronouncements came from Dr. Octavio Fabrega, a former Minister of Foreign Relations and treaty negotiator, and Dr. Arnulfo Arias, a former President of the Republic who has all but announced he will run in the 1964 elections.

Addressing a joint meeting of the Rotary and Lions Clubs of Panama at the Hotel El Panama last night, Dr. Fabrega said there are four basic points involved in the revision of the canal treaty: (1) A once-and-for-all definition of the scope of authority, power, and control of the United States in the Canal Zone, which has become so "americanized" that the United States treats it as part of its territory; (2) elimination of the perpetuity feature of the canal concession; (3) fair distribution of the canal benefits, which might involve an increase in the transit tolls; and (4) the return to Panama of lands and waters within the Canal Zone which have proved unnecessary for the operation of the waterway.

Fabrega said that of the four revision issues, he has found the least resistance on the part of the United States toward the return of lands and waters not needed for the operation of the canal.

Reviewing the negotiations conducted recently by a joint Panama-United States commission on points of dissatisfaction between the two countries Dr. Fabrega blamed the lack of success of the commission on the "fourth floor" of the U.S. State Department. This, he said, is where U.S. policy toward Latin America is handled. Fabrega said the "bureaucratic clique" that runs this section of the State Department has more power than the White House and the Congress because it "delutes" policy directives that come from the White House and the State Department.

On the question of revision—of the 1903 treaty, Fabrega said Panama's position is justified because the conditions which brought about that treaty have changed radically. The canal, he pointed out, no longer is a military adjunct but a commercial enterprise. It might have been justified to ask Panama to sacrifice itself for the sake of the common defense while

the canal was purely a defense artery, but now that it has become a commercial enterprise there is no justification for a powerful nation to profit from this country's biggest natural resource: its geographical position, Dr. Fabrega declared.

He cautioned, however, that the treaty question should not be a banner for agitation on the Panama or United States side. As much harm to the cause of good relations is done by Panamanians who call for immediate nationalization of the waterway, he said, as by Canal Zone residents who argue that Panama is not entitled to benefits from the canal because had the United States not built the waterway this country would still be ridden by yellow fever.

But Dr. Fabrega insisted that the longer the revision issue is put off the bigger the risk that "grave situations" will develop which may not be subject to settlement, as in 1959, except by force.

Meanwhile, Dr. Arias, in his first formal campaign statement, said that Panama-United States relations should not be the subject of "street demagoguery or electoral opportunity."

He added: "It is a most grave mistake, for the Panamanian Nation, for the American Hemisphere, and even for the West, for the canal affairs and its feasible good-faith solutions be unscrupulously turned into carnival banners. All the more so, when those who are so acting seek not to be patriotically true to Panama, but to submerge in the canal waters the accumulation of ineptitudes, grafts, and squanderings of moneys during 4 years sadly wasted away. Four years of unfulfilled pledges; of successive and evident failures which have crowned, both on the national and the international planes, the record of the present administration."

Arias said political groups which have no popular support "do not hesitate to take recourse to the overused canal argument, trying in vain to put on the present Panama-North American contractual relationships the blame for responsibilities which are wholly attributable to the present administration."

He warned that this "anti-Yankee" campaign opens the door to subversive agents of Castro communism and Soviet imperialism.

"We say responsibly," Dr. Arias declared, "that with the resources available from the stipulations of the treaty in force with the United States over the Canal Zone—although this does not imply permanent acceptance on our part of the present status—Panama has been in a magnificent position to face and resolve most of its chronic national and social problems. Conversely, these problems have become considerably more acute since 1951, although, once in a while, the administrations in power have resorted to the familiar argument of monetary demands to the White House" (1951 was the year in which Dr. Arias was overthrown for the second time).

Dr. Arias' statement said the Panamanian people are fed up with "the canal tale."

"From 1951 on," he said, "there has been a lack of overall vision of our problems as fatherland, as nation, and as state. The ruling groups have waged against the United States and Zonians in general resentments which often are justified, but which not always are justly or patriotically set forth. . . . Our future progress will depend on the rational development of our great productive possibilities, beginning with what the canal and our geographic position provide for us economically."

Arias declared that President Kennedy's new Alliance for Progress policy is incompatible with the previous forms of concessions in perpetuity which still prevail in some aspects of Panama-United States relationships over the canal.

"The United States," the former President said, "is, in addition to our partner, our inseparable ally in hemisphere security in the specific understanding that the Panama Canal and the Panamanian people gain in importance as strategic-political objectives for Havana and the Kremlin."

The statement concluded: "Face to face against the dark forces of reaction, whether extremist or oligarchial, the Panameñista Party and Dr. Arnulfo Arias at the forefront as the legitimate spokesman for the ideals of the disillusioned majority of citizens, prepare to wage the decisive battle."

The "decisive battle," of course, is the 1964 presidential election.

[From the Panama American, Oct. 10, 1963]

NEW TREATY BEFORE HARMONY—FABREGA

Former Foreign Minister Dr. Octavio Fabrega said last night the complete revision of the 1903 treaty is the only solution to differences between Panama and the United States.

Speaking before a joint meeting of the the Rotary and Lions Clubs, the former treaty negotiator warned that the longer the revision issue is put off, the greater the risk that "grave situations" will develop which may not be subject to settlement, except by force.

Fabrega told his audience there are four basic points involved in the revision of the canal treaty:

A once-and-for-all definition of the scope of authority, power and control of the United States in the Canal Zone, which has become so Americanized that the United States treats it as part of its territory.

Elimination of the perpetuity feature of the canal concession.

Fair distribution of the canal benefits, which might involve an increase in the transit tolls.

The return to Panama of lands and waters within the Canal Zone which have proved unnecessary for the operation of the waterway.

Fabrega saw justification in Panama's position in regard to the 1903 treaty revision question, pointing out that conditions which led to that treaty have now changed radically.

Emphasizing that the canal was no longer a military adjunct but now a commercial enterprise, Fabrega declared it might have been justified to ask Panama to sacrifice itself for the sake of the common defense while the canal was purely a defense artery.

But now that it has become a commercial enterprise, he said, there is no justification for a powerful nation to profit from Panama's biggest natural resource—its geographical position.

The former Foreign Minister cautioned that the treaty issue should not be used as a banner for agitation on either the Panama or United States side.

As much harm, he warned, is done to the cause of good relations by Panamanians who call for immediate nationalization on the waterway, as by Canal Zone residents who claim that Panama is not entitled to benefits from the canal because the country would still be wracked with yellow fever if the United States had not built the canal.

Fabrega, who was one of the Panama representatives during negotiations carried out recently by a joint Republic of Panama-United States commission on points of dissatisfaction between the two countries, blamed the lack of success of the negotiators on the "bureaucratic clique" of the U.S. State Department.

Fabrega, who said the "clique" was located on the fourth floor of State Department where Latin American policy is handled, charged it was more powerful than the White House and Congress.

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

UGLY AMERICANS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

PANAMA CITY.—If anti-American sentiment in Panama ever reaches the point where it menaces the Panama Canal, Communist propaganda would be only partly to blame. The real culprits would be some strange American policies and the unknown ugly Americans who shaped them.

By the count of one U.S. diplomat, 99 out of every 100 Panamanians believe U.S. canal policy is grossly unfair. Given that beginning, a competent demagog could someday build animosity to the danger point.

Actually, Panamanians have displayed remarkable self-restraint so far, considering the way Uncle Sam forgets about the Alliance for Progress and reverts to big city imperialism here.

Why? Mainly because of inordinate influence wielded by some civilian employees of the canal, who must be ranked among the ugliest Americans anywhere.

The trouble stems from the 1903 treaty that gave the United States the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone under terms so favorable that it seemed a triumph of Yankee trading comparable to the purchase of Manhattan Island.

In fact, it is no such thing. The Panamanian Government of 1903, newly independent from Colombia after a revolution engineered by Teddy Roosevelt, was under Washington's thumb. It's understandable that Panamanians want substantial treaty revision.

Their biggest complaint concerns money. In view of nearly \$60 million revenue produced by the Canal Zone last year and the U.S. defense installations jammed into the Canal Zone, Panama's \$1,930,000 annual share of canal tolls is chicken feed. Panamanians rightly regard their country's unique geographical position as its one great national resource and resent getting short-changed for it.

Questions of prestige are more subtle. Although a sovereign country seldom signs perpetual agreements, the 1903 treaty gives away the Canal Zone forever. Panamanians want a token time limit, perhaps 50 or even 99 years. By then, the canal probably would be abandoned.

The State Department would gladly grant such concessions except for anti-Panama sentiment in Congress. For instance, congressional opposition scuttled a modest concession to let Panama handle its own canal freight.

This congressional intransigence is the handiwork of the Zonians: U.S. residents of the Canal Zone, all canal employees, who operate one of Washington's most effective lobbies by playing on justifiable congressional fears about this vital waterway's security.

Moreover, the Zonians themselves are bad-will ambassadors, more irritating to Panamanians than official U.S. policy. At his worst, the Zonian brags about not understanding a word of Spanish and not crossing into the Republic of Panama for years on end.

That's not all. A U.S. employee of the canal receives 25 percent more pay than a Panamanian in the same job. Because of security, such high-paying jobs as canal pilot (\$19,000 a year) are limited to U.S. citizens, and a U.S. employee gets 10 days more vacation annually than a Panamanian.

Apart from Canal problems, there's plenty to worry about here. Panama has Latin America's typical headaches—shantytown slums (called Hollywood in Panama City), an undeveloped interior, a ruling oligarchy wrapped up in moneymaking and petty politics. Topping this off is dependence on one "crop"—the canal.

Furthermore, Communists recently won student elections at the University of Panama and Communist-infiltrated labor unions are causing trouble on the banana plantations. U.S. Intelligence sources estimate that 200 trained Reds have slipped in from Cuba. If they ever launch a concentrated terror campaign, Panama's 3,000-man national guard would be hard put to contain it.

THE NEED OF A SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM SECTION IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1963, historic ground-breaking ceremonies were held in the Capital of our Nation for the Shevchenko memorial statue which will be unveiled next May 30. These ceremonies were unprecedented both in attendance and performance. Close to 3,000 Americans of diverse backgrounds participated in the groundbreaking at the Shevchenko site on P and 23d Streets NW. Washington had not seen such a ground breaking for decades.

MEMORABLE EVENT REPORTED WIDELY

Along with other Members of Congress, it was my privilege to participate in this unforgettable ceremony. The banquet which followed the ground-breaking ceremony overflowed in attendance and cultural presentation. The 1,000 people who attended the function at the Mayflower Hotel witnessed renditions in honor of Taras Shevchenko that also were impressively new and inspirational. The entire memorable event was reported widely, and as part of my remarks, I ask that the following indicative reports in the New York Times, September 21; the Washington Sunday Star, September 22; the Washington Post, September 20, 22; and the Buffalo Evening News, September 17, 19, 23, be printed here:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1963]

U.S. PAYING TRIBUTE TO UKRAINIAN HERO

WASHINGTON, September 20.—A Ukrainian poet and national hero, hailed by Moscow as a prototype of Communism, will be honored by United States officials tomorrow as an Eastern European freedom fighter.

Congressmen, Government officials, and more than 2,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent will attend groundbreaking ceremonies for a \$250,000 memorial to Taras Shevchenko, who died in 1861.

The ceremonies are expected to produce a sharp reaction in the Soviet press. Moscow has been fighting with Washington over Shevchenko's memory.

A statue of the poet stands in the city of Kiev in the Ukraine. Moscow holds that Shevchenko was a foe of imperialism and a Bolshevik before his time.

In the United States, however, he is portrayed as a 19th-century fighter against Russian tyranny.

In 1960 Congress held hearings on Shevchenko's life and works, and authorized the use of land for the memorial.

Donations from Americans of Ukrainian descent defrayed the cost of erecting the me-

morial, to be executed by Leo Mol, Ukrainian-born sculptor.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 22, 1963]

PARK IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEDICATED TO UKRAINIAN POET

Fourteen thousand square feet of Washington soil were dedicated yesterday to the memory of Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet and 19th century fighter for freedom.

The tiny park at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW., set aside by Congress as a memorial to the Ukrainian patriot, was dedicated in ceremonies attended by some 2,000 persons.

The ceremonies were conducted in English and Ukrainian.

Despite the sounds of an occasional accent, the audience was typically American in dress, in language and in outlook, but for two pretty girls in Ukrainian.

"This statue," said Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, "will be a symbol of their early twenties selling souvenir buttons, conversed easily in freedom for the Ukraine and all the captive nations."

He told briefly of the life of Shevchenko, who died in 1861 at the age of 47 after a life in which he was a serf, a soldier, a prisoner of the Russians and only briefly a free man.

The decision by Congress to provide space for yet another statue in an over-stated city was a minor victory in the cold war, according to information provided by the public relations firm which represents the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, Inc. The Russians, according to the firm, have attempted to claim the poet and his writing for their own purposes—hailing him as a Bolshevik who died before his time.

However, the speakers at yesterday's ceremonies made clear that in their opinion Shevchenko had drawn his inspiration from the ideal of the West and particularly the ideals of the American Revolution.

Last night some 700 persons of Ukrainian descent attended a banquet in the Mayflower Hotel in which Shevchenko freedom awards were presented to 4 U.S. Senators, 5 Representatives and 1 former Representative.

Recipients of the awards were Senators Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut; Javits and Keating, Republicans, of New York; and Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Representatives Dulski, Democrat, of New York; Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio; Jones, Democrat, of Missouri; Lesinski, Democrat, of Michigan; and Madden, Democrat, of Indiana; and former Representative Alvin Bentley, Republican of Michigan.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 20, 1963]

William Shust, who did so well by "The Egg" at Arena Stage, will join Philadelphia's Kobzar Choir for Saturday night's Ukrainian Congress Committee's banquet following ground breaking of the Shevchenko Memorial, 22d and P Streets NW.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 22, 1963]

UKRAINIAN POET LAUDED AT CEREMONY

More than 2,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent gathered yesterday at ground-breaking ceremonies for the construction of a \$250,000 memorial to Taras Shevchenko, a 19th century Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter.

The memorial, which will consist of a 14-foot statue of Shevchenko by Leo Mol, a Ukrainian-born sculptor, will be located on a plaza in a small triangular park bounded by 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW.

Shevchenko, who was born in 1814, spent only 9 of the 47 years of his life in freedom. Freed from serfdom in 1838, he was arrested 9 years later for being a member of a radical political society and spent the rest of his

life either in penal exile or under strict police supervision.

In a speech at the groundbreaking ceremony, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, said that Shevchenko "belongs to all mankind. * * * We honor him as a fighter for freedom and as a champion of all the persecuted and oppressed." Dodd added that Shevchenko is regarded by his people with "something of the special reverence that we in America reserve for Thomas Jefferson and George Washington."

Dodd was one of four Senators, five Congressmen, and one former Congressman who received Shevchenko Freedom Awards from the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America at a banquet after the ceremony.

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, another award recipient, said that Shevchenko was "the greatest Ukrainian of his day," and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, noted that the poet "shared as well as sensed the sufferings of his countrymen under the oppressive yoke of Russian imperialism."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Sept. 17, 1963]

DULSKI TO ADDRESS DINNER HONORING UKRAINIAN POET

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Representative DULSKI, of Buffalo, will be main speaker at a banquet here Saturday in connection with ground breaking for the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter.

Erection of the statue in Washington was authorized by Congress in 1960 and Americans of Ukrainian descent have raised over \$250,000 to cover the costs. Sculptor of the statue is Leo Mol, native of Ukraine who now resides in Winnipeg, Canada.

Between 2,000 and 3,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent from throughout the United States are expected to take part in the ground breaking and later attend the banquet.

Mr. Shevchenko was born in 1814 in serfdom, gained freedom and risked prison and exile to fight for individual liberty from serfdom and for Ukrainian independence from Russian imperialist rule. He died in 1861.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Sept. 19, 1963]

DULSKI TO RECEIVE UKRAINIAN AWARD

WASHINGTON, September 19.—Representative DULSKI, of Buffalo, and Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, are among nine Members of Congress who will be honored by Americans of Ukrainian descent on Saturday.

Mr. DULSKI is main speaker at the banquet in connection with the ground breaking for the memorial statue here to the Ukrainian poet and national hero, Taras Shevchenko.

The legislators will be presented Shevchenko Freedom Awards given jointly by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Sept. 23, 1963]

DULSKI PROPOSES LIBRARY IN HONOR OF UKRAINIAN POET

WASHINGTON, September 23.—Representative DULSKI, of Buffalo, has urged that a Taras Shevchenko Library be established at the Library of Congress as an additional tribute to the Ukrainian poet and national hero.

Mr. DULSKI made his proposal as he addressed a banquet here Saturday in connection with ground breaking ceremonies for the Shevchenko memorial statue, authorized by Congress in 1960. Americans of Ukrainian descent have raised more than \$250,000 to finance the memorial.

RICH AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION

These events and the forthcoming unveiling of Shevchenko's statue represent

a rich contribution to our American knowledge and understanding of the powerful forces for freedom in Eastern Europe and thus for the world. Our leaders, such as President Kennedy, former President Eisenhower, Members of Congress, and numerous other officials have in various ways acknowledged this contribution on the part of 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian background. The contribution brilliantly reflects the interests of all Americans who seek the liberation and freedom not only of Ukraine but of all the captive nations. Calculated slurs against the constructive efforts of imagined minorities and tiny groups are expressions of arrogant ignorance for which there is no room in our tradition.

THE COUNTERPART OF IGNORANCE IN THE
U.S.S.R.

Arrogant ignorance by a few in this country as concerns the freedom stature and universal significance of Shevchenko has its ready counterpart in the distortions that have poured out of the Soviet Union since the 86th Congress took the initiative on this vital project. There can be no doubt that we successfully blunted the propaganda scheme of Moscow to exploit the Shevchenko symbol for its own colonial ends. For the edification of some, I request that these samples be printed at this point in the RECORD:

The American-German forgers of the works of Shevchenko and their hirelings, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, are trying to prove the allegation that the great Ukrainian poet was a nationalist who condemned the union of Ukraine with Russia and denounced Bohdan Khmelnytsky. This is a shameless lie and a dirty slander on the ardent champion of friendship between the two brotherly nations.

The Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, who are kept by the imperialists of the United States, are trying to prove that Shevchenko allegedly wished to see Ukraine after the pattern of the United States. To prove this, they cite his poem, "Yurodyvy," ("God's Fool") in which the poet wrote:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe
your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Wash-
ington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the
man!"

In these words Shevchenko contrasted the reactionary, rotten, autocratic order of serfdom with the political order defended by George Washington. Today all the righteous laws in the United States have been buried; there exists a reign of the most highhanded reactionary social forces, a ruthless enslavement of the workers, and racial and national discrimination. The American reactionaries and their hirelings, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, will never succeed in turning the poet-revolutionary into a partisan of the American bourgeois order. (D. Ostrianyn, *Komunist Ukrainy*, Feb. 2, 1961, Kiev.)

The clear meaning of his (Shevchenko's) poems has been distorted by Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in order to make Shevchenko out to be an enemy of Russia rather than of Russian autocracy. The poet drew a clear distinction between the two Russias—one reactionary, the other progressive and revolutionary. He never joined the nationalists, thoroughly cognizant of the fact that the Ukrainian people could win national lib-

eration only with the overthrow of the autocracy, and for this the union of all of Russia's progressive forces was necessary. (Yevgeni Kiriliuk, *U.S.S.R. magazine*, January 1961, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C.)

The peoples of the Soviet Union, and with them all progressive mankind, are getting ready for a worthy observance of the immortal memory of the genius lover of freedom. * * * But our enemies are not asleep. The American imperialists, relying on those docile servants * * * the Ukrainian nationalists * * * are planning to take advantage of the 100th anniversary for the monstrous, disgusting, and provocative purpose of slandering the homeland of Shevchenko, Soviet Ukraine, and our people with a flood of anti-Soviet insults, provocations, muck, lies, and distortions.

The nationalist scribes, of the breed of Zaitsev, Dontsov, and Dobriansky, are displaying an extraordinary adroitness in the matter of falsifying Shevchenko, and the blasphemous distortion of his works, attempting to present our great poet as some kind of advocate of the modern "American way of life."

This is the purpose of the brochure, "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shevchenko, 1814-61," published as official matter of the U.S. Congress.

The peoples of the world will firmly slap the dirty hands of the American politicians and nationalist Judases who are trying to besmirch the bright acme of pure human spirit, the spirit of truth and freedom, the spirit of goodness and anger, the spirit of generosity and eternity, the spirit, image, and word of Shevchenko. A great role in this noble act of defending the temple of mankind for the bourgeois speculators and blasphemers will be played by Soviet writers and literary experts. This is a fight, together with Shevchenko, against man-hating ideology of imperialism and nationalism. His is a fight which also exposes the deceit and falsehood of all talk of peaceful coexistence of two ideologies. (Mykola Bazhan, *Literaturna Ukraina*, Apr. 16, 1963, Kiev.)

THE MEANING OF SHEVCHENKO FOR THE UNITED
STATES

Mr. Speaker, at the ground-breaking event and after, many addresses and articles have been presented on the meaning of this project for us Americans in the current, titanic struggle with Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. At this time I should like to append as part of my remarks those made by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, on the occasion of the Shevchenko ground-breaking ceremony. Mr. LESINSKI was responsible for the publication of House Document No. 445—"Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko, 1814-61"—a valuable documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero. Also, I request that immediately thereafter the moving article written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris under its original title "Wanted—Another Washington" be printed as part of my remarks. Dr. Harris' perceptive article appeared in the October 13 issue of the *Sunday Star* and in other papers:

REMARKS BY HONORABLE JOHN LESINSKI, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM MICHIGAN, AT GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES FOR THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL STATUE, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, I deem it an honor and a privilege to join with you this afternoon in saluting Europe's freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko.

It was also my privilege to participate in obtaining approval of the U.S. Congress of the resolution authorizing the placing of

Shevchenko's statue in this great city of Washington toward which the world today looks as the symbol of freedom and democracy.

Taras Shevchenko was the greatest Ukrainian in his day, and one of the most famous in modern history of the Ukrainian people. He was distinguished as a man of letters, an eminent poet, and a fervent patriot of unblemished character. But more than that, he was a voice crying for freedom from the dark depths of slavery and serfdom. During his lifetime, the Ukrainian people were almost as severely oppressed by the Czarist Russian regime as they are today under the Russian Communists in the Kremlin. Today, as 45 million Ukrainians enslaved by the Russian Communists work unceasingly to obtain their freedom, they look to Taras Shevchenko as the symbol of true liberty and take inspiration and incentive from his life and works.

As we pay tribute to Shevchenko today, we remind the people of the Ukraine that we have not forgotten their unfortunate plight. And in so doing, we give hope and comfort to the people in the other captive nations who suffer the same fate of enslavement by Communist masters. While the winds of the cold war seemingly are becoming warm, we must constantly remember these unfortunate people and not let ourselves be deluded by empty promises and false hopes. As I mentioned during the observances of the Captive Nations Week, if the Kremlin masters truly seek peace in the world let them give the people of the Ukraine and the other captive nations their freedom to live under governments of their choice.

Tyranny and oppression can never still the desire for liberty nor can they silence a ringing voice of freedom, for so long as that desire for human liberty, a better life and the brotherhood of man remains alive and strong in the hearts of free people throughout the world, such voices will be heard through the years, as has been Shevchenko's. So that in dedicating this monument to Shevchenko, we give added volume to the voice of freedom.

I am pleased to have been able to participate with you this afternoon honoring this great patriot.

[From the *Washington (D.C.) Star*, Oct. 13, 1963]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—ANOTHER WASHINGTON
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

An outstanding Ukrainian poet who was a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln published a want ad that resounds across a hundred years. He died just after the man who saved the Union entered the White House to face black days. His name is Taras Shevchenko. His was, and is, the enduring voice of his valiant land in its age-long struggle for freedom. During his lifetime, most of which was spent in the slavery of serfdom, the Ukraine was bound by the shackles of Czarist tyranny. Shevchenko, in his inspired poetry, helped mightily to keep alive the dream of an independent Ukraine.

With volcanic anger, defying the Russian handcuffs, his eyes were riveted with hope upon the American rebels who had revolted against the unjust exactions of a royal master and by their victory inspired all who longed to breathe free. Against her oppressors Taras Shevchenko poured hot words that still roll like molten lava. Recalling hopefully what the rebellion under the calm leader from Mount Vernon had brought to pass, he cried out—

"Ah, you miserable and cursed crew,
When will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous
law—
But, some day we shall surely find the
man."

Had the brave heart in the middle of the 19th century who penned those eloquent words known that in the middle of the 20th century even greater slavery than he had envisioned would fall upon his valiant land, as the ruthless Kremlin masters of deceit squeezed out for their own gain the very life blood of his noble people, who can doubt that Shevchenko would turn in burning wrath upon the modern descendants of Genghis Khan? Who can doubt that he would hurl at the most sinister conspiracy against human decency ever to plot for the domination of the planet the phrase he coined so long ago—"You miserable and cursed crew." And, who can question that he would hail the one free world power which has pledged its moral and material might that instead of bestriding the earth, the time will come on God's calendar when the Ukraine prophecy will come to pass and the vile tyranny will breathe its last—an inevitable day when the anguished query, "When shall we get ourselves a Washington?" will be answered as it becomes clear to all the earth that the Red tide is not the wave of the future.

A pledge already broadcast around the planet, that the flame of Shevchenko's faith will be kept blazing, is about to be reiterated in the form of a statue in Washington, Capital of the free world. In this city splendid a prominent site has been assigned for that purpose by the United States. It is a grassy plot, appropriately in close proximity to the worshipful tower and spire of a stately Christian church. There will rise in the months just ahead the sculptured likeness of this fiery patriot of freedom. Costing more than a quarter of a million dollars it is to be a gift of prophetic faith by Ukrainian Americans. The 86th Congress acted in the spirit of George Washington when it gave the green light for this project in spite of the bitter denunciation of today's despots, who have the unbelievable audacity to suggest that if the Ukrainian poet were living today he would join the marauders who mowed down the innocents in the streets of Budapest.

At the recent groundbreaking ceremony 2,000 people crowded the available open-air space to listen rapturously as some of the poet's winged words were recited and prayers offered, and messages brought by American leaders of the Ukrainian cause, representatives of the national churches whose fires of faith are kept burning in millions of lives in this land of the free and also by educators and U.S. Government officials. The joyous burden of all the utterances of that high hour was a Jubilate that here was to be erected a spire of the spirit tall enough to be seen by the whole world.

For the years to come this statue will be an altar of intercession for the emancipation of all the captive nations. It will be an impressive proclamation that America writes across the present fetters which now keep the nations of Europe from their own right of self-determination, the stern judgment, "temporary status." This statue will publish the fact that America is well aware that the U.S.S.R. is not a nation, but a colonial empire claiming sovereignty over non-Russians numbering more millions than there are Russians, including the Ukraine, an area greater than Poland and Yugoslavia combined. Today's attempt at accommodation with the free world and the lessening of tensions, can never erase the memory of atrocities heaped upon this land after the Bolsheviks rudely stopped the jubilant ringing of liberty bells following the revolution of 1917.

This significant addition to the monuments of this monumental city, where everything is in view of all America, will be a witness to the Republic's refusal to be deceived by the double talk of Communist jargon as it prostitutes even words to say one thing

with a meaning just the opposite. The statue will point to the greatest historic hoax of all times as the Red regime flays the almost-dead body of Western colonialism while it plots to take over the world in the vastest and vilest colonial empire ever conceived. The statue will tell the truth regarding Soviet colonialism which makes its pious denunciations of the often-benevolent Western brand give an air of utter unreality to the United Nations. The lines of this monument, erected to one in whose heart the love of freedom flamed in an enslaved land, will go out to all the earth as millions come reverently to a spot henceforth forever sacred to lift a prayer that this torn and tortured world may be delivered from the abomination of abominations. Its unveiling this coming May will be the signal for a march on Washington by tens of thousands who, loving freedom and hating tyranny, and remembering their honored poet's ardent hope for another Washington, will cry with glad and grateful hearts—Shevchenko, we are here.

A MONUMENT AGAINST IGNORANCE

The Shevchenko statue will in every respect be a tower of progressive knowledge for many of our citizens; it will be a monument against ignorance regarding the U.S.S.R., Soviet Russian imperialism, the patriotic freedom forces of Eastern Europe, and the universal importance of the poet, Shevchenko. One newspaper has recently demonstrated in its erratic editorials a profound lack of knowledge concerning this all-important subject. Furthermore, it has acutely limited the publication of replies to its abusive charges. Representative of replies to these editorials is the one submitted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, which was deleted in parts and which I quote in full as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1963.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

I trust you will afford me the same fair opportunity of replying to your October 18 editorial on "The Shevchenko Affair" as you did in July 1959, concerning an editorial on the Captive Nations Week resolution. Your opposition then was based on a medley of factual inaccuracies; bearing the same trait, your present opposition to the Shevchenko statue sounds almost desperately vindictive and, to say the least, is unbecoming to an organ of your reputation.

Two questions immediately arise after reading this misleading piece. One, why this editorial at this time? Second, how expert have your writers become on this project in the span of 3 weeks? The factual answers to these questions are sufficient to indicate the degree of editorial irresponsibility reflected in this self-indicting performance.

It is very easy to pontificate and hide behind juggled words after a given event. But where were your sheltered writers these past 3 years while the subject was widely reported and discussed in this country and in the Soviet Union? The New York Herald Tribune, the Evening Star, the Chicago Tribune, and many other papers satisfactorily covered the subject in 1960; and, as in the case of the Captive Nations Week resolution, for a period of 7 months the organs of Moscow and puppet Kiev registered a malicious opposition similar to yours now. In fact, it appears that your own writers don't bother to read the Post itself. Reports on the project and the open congressional hearing were published on April 2 and September 14, 1960; March 7, 1961; October 18 and 26, 1962. Where were your interest and comments then? If the element of dictated pressure has characterized anything, it certainly has this contradictory editorial.

As to the second question, it is actually amusing to compare this editorial with the one on "Poetic Injustice" that appeared in your September 23 issue. In the latter, the 3-week experts start out in this vein:

"We yield to no one in our esteem for the Ukraine and that country's poet and hero, Taras Shevchenko." They even admit that "we have never read a line of Mr. Shevchenko's verse." Three weeks later the reader is fed the supposedly studied and quite absurd conclusion that a "statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans." Earlier, Shevchenko was a "country's poet and hero"; now, he's "the pet of a small minority." With such capricious thinking, one can well imagine the abusive interpretations they've formed by references to his poetry out of historical context. Shevchenko scholars in the United States and Canada have devoted lifetimes to the historic works of this immortal freedom fighter; your writers, with brazen self-contradiction, have rendered their expert judgment—all distilled in 3 weeks.

If there is anything "offensive in various ways" to the intelligence of our American people and to their unity against the Soviet Russian threat, it is this brand of irresponsible editorializing. Your fictitious points on some "errant private passion" of certain Americans, the "misguided and careless reception" by Congress, and other specimens of groundless rhetoric not only violate available facts but have been openly exploded while your editorial writers slept these past 3 years. Solid reasons for the statue are clearly set forth and explained in House Document 445, which was circulated throughout the country and inspired worthy contributions for the statue from Americans of all backgrounds. What did you do with your copy 2 years ago?

On how to fight communism, the record of your notions is scarcely an enviable one. Taking just the two issues mentioned here, it is most revealing how, in fact, your protests have coincided with Moscow's. The reasons, of course, are different. Moscow is fearful of any outside support given to the powerful force of nationalism among its captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; you've been too blind to understand this.

Thank God we have countless Americans who do. As just one among numerous examples, you might profit from reading Dr. Frederick Brown Harris' recent column in the October 13 Sunday Star, wherein he states: "For the years to come this statue will be an altar of intercession for the emancipation of all the captive nations. * * * This statue will publish the fact that America is well aware that the U.S.S.R. is not a nation, but a colonial empire claiming sovereignty over non-Russians numbering more millions than there are Russians * * *." The statue is obviously not for those who would appease Moscow by burying or distorting truths which are essential to our own national interest. In its wisdom Congress has recognized this; let us hope that in time and beyond consistent error you will, too.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

RESOLUTION FOR A SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM LIBRARY

Mr. Speaker, in view of the growing and intense interest in the works of Shevchenko and the universal significance of the poet himself, we can perform a most valuable educational service in the national interest by establishing in the Library of Congress a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library. This section would contain all the essential works devoted to the struggles and aspirations of

Shevchenko's Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations for freedom and independence. Such a concentrated library would greatly satisfy and advance the interest and knowledge of all Americans who have been inspired by what has developed since Congress authorized the statue in 1960; it would be a treasure of literary riches that base the President's own observation on Shevchenko:

His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

For these purposes and in our national interest—which is the interest of world freedom—I submit this joint resolution to establish a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress:

H. J. RES. —

Whereas in March 1961, President Kennedy declared: "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian Poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage"; and

Whereas in March 1963, the President paid fitting tribute to the world-renowned Shevchenko Scientific Society in these words: "My congratulations on the 90th anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, and on your sustained program for support for distinguished scholarship. Among your members have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt. May you continue to extend the frontiers of human knowledge in the years ahead"; and

Whereas in September 1960, President Eisenhower approved and signed a resolution of Congress providing for the establishment of a lasting memorial to Shevchenko's works in behalf of world freedom and justice; and

Whereas, with understanding and vision, the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored this outstanding freedom light by authorizing the erection of a Shevchenko statue on public grounds in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the initiative of Congress successfully nullified the exploitation of Shevchenko as an historic symbol by both Moscow and its colonial puppets, and the vehement attacks of the latter against these farseeing acts have clearly proven the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming Shevchenko as a towering beacon in the march of freedom; and

Whereas for our times and struggles the universal significance of this revered poet and national hero was permanently established in a galaxy punctuated by other luminaries of freedom, such as his contemporaries Abraham Lincoln, the Italian Mazzini, the Pole Mickiewicz, the Hungarian Petöfi and others from different nations and soils; and

Whereas for our time and beyond the supreme importance of Shevchenko's works rests in his early and heroic opposition to traditional Russian imperio-colonialism and in his courageous advocacy of the freedom of all captive nations in the Russian Empire, including the freedom of Jews and all peoples in bondage of suppression and slavery; and

Whereas our expanding American interest in the classic contributions of Shevchenko and their universal import can only receive full educational satisfaction by an accessible concentration of his voluminous works and all related studies at a facility of national convenience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a section in the Library of Congress be established and appropriately designated as the Shevchenko Freedom Library. This library section shall contain all the works written by Taras Shevchenko, both in the original and translations, and all volumes related to his immortal contributions and contents therein. The establishment of this section shall be effected with the expert cooperation of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Appropriations shall be made for the accomplishment of these purposes.

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SUBMARINE OFFICERS AND MEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Chief of Naval Operations conference room in the Pentagon this morning was the scene of a very moving and impressive ceremony.

Several weeks ago I received a letter from Mrs. Ollie (Martha) Saunders, of Huntington and Verdunville, W. Va., describing her feelings on watching the newscasts of the loss of the submarine *Thresher*. Mrs. Saunders was impelled to do something to honor the memory of the men lost on the *Thresher*, and also to pay tribute to all others who had sacrificed their lives at sea. She started to hand-crochet a huge American flag. When the flag was completed, she brought it to Washington to present it to the Navy to honor the memory of these brave men.

This morning, Mrs. Saunders, accompanied by members of her family, presented her crocheted flag, and it was received by Vice Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations in Charge of Fleet Operations and Readiness.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the substance of the remarks delivered at this ceremony be printed in the RECORD:

Representative KEN HECHLER, Admiral Ramage, and distinguished guests, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I take great pride in presenting to you Mrs. Ollie Saunders, of Huntington and Verdunville, W. Va.

Mrs. Saunders is the wife of Rev. Ollie Saunders, of the Verdunville Baptist Church, who would be here with us today were it not for the fact that he is in the hospital in Logan.

Here assembled are many members of the Saunders family, gathered to share in commemorating those dedicated men who served our country on the submarine *Thresher*. With us today is Mrs. Saunders' son, Homer Saunders, of Huntington, W. Va., who served in the U.S. Navy in World War II; Mrs. J. W. Casto, of Covington, Va., a daughter of Mrs. Saunders who worked for the Navy during World War II; Mr. Carl Little, Mrs. Saunders' son-in-law, who works in Huntington, W. Va., had four brothers in the U.S. Navy, two of whom were killed in

action; and two of Mrs. Saunders' grandsons, Don Saunders, age 10, and Greg Casto, age 8½.

Admiral Ramage, you as a winner of the Medal of Honor know personally better than most of us the true meaning of the words "duty" and "sacrifice." You know full well the risks it takes to serve in line of duty on a submarine.

The year 1963 is the centennial year of West Virginia's admittance to the Union. We in West Virginia know and appreciate also the meaning of the word sacrifice, because West Virginia is up at the top of the list when it comes to war volunteers and men who have been killed and wounded in wars in defense of the United States of America.

Mrs. Saunders is a true West Virginian who understands dedicated service, and who has captured the spirit of the men who served on the submarine *Thresher*. She has with the loving effort of many hours of work crocheted this American flag, inspired by the news of the dedicated sacrifice of the men on the *Thresher*. There was a prayer in every stitch of this crocheted flag.

Admiral Ramage, I am honored to present to you Mrs. Ollie Saunders, of Huntington and Verdunville, W. Va.

Mrs. OLLIE (MARTHA) SAUNDERS. Admiral Ramage, I present to you this 50-star American flag in commemoration of the 129 brave men who lost their lives on the submarine *Thresher* and all who have lost their lives at sea, and also on behalf of all the men now in the U.S. Navy who are helping preserve peace in the world.

Vice Adm. LAWSON P. RAMAGE. Mrs. Saunders, on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy, and most especially the families of the men on the *Thresher* and all others in the Navy, we express our heartfelt appreciation for this wonderful flag. We appreciate the time, the effort, and your prayers which have all gone into the crocheting of this flag.

It is a great honor to have assembled here today many outstanding submarine officers of the Navy. This flag which you have presented to us will be placed in a special section devoted to the *Thresher* in the Naval History Display Center at the Navy Yard. It will stand there as a tribute to those great and gallant men who have gone down to the sea in ships and on ships.

All of us in the Navy will ever value this as a symbol of the love, affection, and abiding faith which we hold for our brave men of the Navy.

THE PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL CERTIFICATE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, again I rise, as earlier this year, to respond to the murmurs of criticism which I have heard in recent weeks, aimed at the present President of the United States—a disabled veteran of World War II—who it is claimed is trying to reap political advantage not only from his status as a veteran but also in sending to the family, a next of kin of a deceased veteran—the Presidential Memorial Certificate. It is fitting that I reiterate the statements given in my earlier address and include also such comment upon recent

developments—critical of the issuance of the certificate.

There seems to be building up a resentment against the status of the President as a disabled veteran, his deep interest in veterans' affairs, and his feeling of closeness to our former fighting men and their families.

There seems to be implied in this undercurrent of carping a strange theory that somehow the President is making political capital of his veteran's status and his interest in their affairs.

This sniping reminds me of the sniping on the great battlefields of World War I. It was always the courageous fellow advancing in front of all the other soldiers who drew the heaviest enemy fire.

This seems to be happening now to the President.

Now it is undeniable that he is a veteran, and—a disabled veteran—others have called him a war hero. But never has he himself referred to his combat record as anything but that of a citizen doing his best, the same way most veterans regard their wartime contribution.

As evidence to support this outlandish political theory, it is pointed out that President Kennedy participated personally in the 1961 Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery; that he has seen fit to honor the memory of deceased veterans by issuing a memorial certificate to the next of kin; that he twice proposed that Congress increase the compensation rates of the service-connected; that, following enactment of this increase, the veteran received a notice with his check stating "President Kennedy has signed a law"—that veterans were similarly reminded of the President's role in the acceleration of insurance dividend checks.

It is undeniably true that President Kennedy has felt deeply his kinship with veterans. He was the first President to play an active part in the national observance of Veterans' Day. Not since 1954, when this holiday was so named, did a Chief Executive personally participate in the ceremony as he did in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the President for his personal participation in the Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, for by doing so he is relating service to one's country with the history of our Nation, with our national character, purposes, and present-day problems. This is a most fitting, a most proper usage of the prestige and power of the head of state.

I would say that his leadership of the national ceremonies did much to lift this great day of dedication out of the obscurity and apathy into which it had declined.

I would say that it is absurd to grumble and to point out that President Kennedy's predecessor did not do likewise.

Likewise, it is absurd to look behind the President's issuance of a memorial certificate for a political motive. This

is a decent, thoughtful, human act. I am appalled to hear it referred to as a "politically inspired action."

The critics also mutter darkly about inserts mailed out with insurance dividend and compensation checks. The facts are simple. The insert used with the regular 1961 Government life insurance dividend said that the payment was "part of the President's program." This was done to clearly call attention to the fact that it was an advance payment made on the assumption that policy premiums would be continued for the entire year, or else an overpayment would take place. It was the first time dividends had ever been paid in advance. Normally, they are paid over an entire year at the anniversary date of each individual policy. At the time, the press was full of news about the President's program to advance the economy and of the part to be played by paying GI dividends ahead of time. Therefore, this wording was used to identify the checks, and so prevent needless, delaying queries from individuals.

Similarly, a notice went out with payment of service-connected compensation checks of October 1962, following enactment of the law which provided for an increase in the service-connected compensation rates. The purpose was to explain that the veteran's check was augmented by a 3-month retroactive increase, and to forestall a deluge of telephone calls, letters, and personal visits inquiring about the extra amount.

Again, press attention at the time had focused on the President's action in signing the compensation increase, a measure he had twice urged Congress to pass. The VA so identified the check. In effect, it was simply a quick, easily understood method of saying "this is the compensation increase you have been reading about in the newspapers."

The criticism of these inserts seems to be based on an unusual theory of the President's freedom of speech.

It is permissible, so this theory goes, for the President to talk to the American people on radio or television. He may also deliver a speech, address, or remark in person. It is acceptable for him to give interviews and be quoted extensively in newspapers, magazines, or books—both hard cover and paperback. The President may also direct a message to the public via posters or signs.

However, if a Presidential message—or even bare mention of his name or office finds its way into envelopes that are mailed to individuals or groups, then complaints are heard about "political motivation and partisan machinations."

May I add that the use of the name of the President of the United States in announcing actions of the Federal Government is common practice. The President, after all, is the Chief Executive. Illustrative of this practice is the enclosed announcement to all Federal civilian employees. It mentions a new low-cost group life insurance plan "developed as a part of the program of this admin-

istration." It bears the personal signature of President Eisenhower:

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 17, 1954.

To Federal Civilian Employees:

As a result of favorable action by Congress, we are now able to provide the benefits of low-cost group life insurance to Federal employees. The proposal to provide this protection to employees through private insurance companies, with Government assuming a portion of the cost, was developed as a part of the program of this administration to improve the Government's personnel system.

I urge all eligible employees to give serious consideration to this worthwhile program which will help provide economic security for their families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PLAN AT A GLANCE

What are the benefits?

Life insurance at low cost without requiring a medical examination.

Payment of double indemnity for accidental death.

Payment for accidental loss of one or more limbs or eyesight (dismemberment).

Life insurance after retirement at no cost to you.

Free insurance if you are 65 years of age or older.

Am I eligible?

Yes, unless you (1) are a noncitizen employed overseas, or (2) fall within the small group of employees excluded because of the nature and type of employment, such as part time, seasonal, or intermittent employment.

Who pays for the insurance?

You pay 25 cents per \$1,000 of insurance each biweekly pay period by payroll deduction until you reach age 65. If you are paid on other than a biweekly basis, the cost is proportionate. (See table following.)

The Government helps to pay the cost of this insurance by contributing half as much as you do.

How do I become insured?

If eligible, you will be automatically insured unless you fill out standard form 53 (waiver of life insurance coverage) which is available at your personnel office.

For how much will I be insured?

The amount of insurance depends upon your annual basic salary. (See table following.)

You may not choose a lesser or greater amount of insurance.

If you are 65 years of age or older, or when you become age 65, the amount of your insurance will be reduced by 2 percent for each month you are over 65 until a reduction of 75 percent is reached. The remaining 25 percent stays in effect.

Must I name a beneficiary?

No. Your life insurance will be payable in the following order: (1) widow or widower, (2) children, (3) parents, (4) estate, (5) next of kin. Your personnel office will have the proper form for you to use if you wish to change this order or name someone else.

What if I retire?

Your life insurance is provided without further cost, if you retire on an immediate annuity either for disability or after at least 15 years of creditable service, at least 5 years of which are civilian. Your double indemnity and dismemberment protection stops.

What if I leave Government service?

Your life insurance continues in effect 31 days during which you may buy, without a medical examination, an individual life insurance policy at standard rates.

May I cancel my insurance under this plan?
Yes, at any time.

Insurance schedule

If annual basic salary—	Amount of insurance	Amount of deductions per pay period			
		Weekly	Biweekly	Semi-monthly	Monthly
Is not more than—					
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0.13	\$0.25	\$0.27	\$0.54
\$2,000	2,000	.25	.50	.54	1.08
\$3,000	3,000	.38	.75	.81	1.63
\$4,000	4,000	.50	1.00	1.08	2.17
\$5,000	5,000	.63	1.25	1.35	2.71
\$6,000	6,000	.75	1.50	1.63	3.25
\$7,000	7,000	.88	1.75	1.90	3.79
\$8,000	8,000	1.00	2.00	2.17	4.33
\$9,000	9,000	1.13	2.25	2.44	4.88
\$10,000	10,000	1.25	2.50	2.71	5.42
\$11,000	11,000	1.38	2.75	2.98	5.96
\$12,000	12,000	1.50	3.00	3.25	6.50
\$13,000	13,000	1.63	3.25	3.52	7.04
\$14,000	14,000	1.75	3.50	3.79	7.58
\$15,000	15,000	1.88	3.75	4.06	8.13
\$16,000	16,000	2.00	4.00	4.33	8.67
\$17,000	17,000	2.13	4.25	4.60	9.21
\$18,000	18,000	2.25	4.50	4.88	9.75
\$19,000	19,000	2.38	4.75	5.15	10.29
Is above \$19,000	20,000	2.50	5.00	5.42	10.83

A FINAL WORD ABOUT THIS INSURANCE PLAN

This plan will provide an added measure of family security at low cost. It is, however, term insurance and does not carry cash surrender or loan privileges. You should not look upon this plan as a substitute for regular individual insurance policies purchased through your own insurance agent. This leaflet outlines the principal features of the plan for your general information only. Each insured employee will receive a certificate outlining in more detail the benefits and terms of this group insurance.

SPECIAL DIVIDEND, 1961

The enclosed check or statement is a special dividend on your Government life insurance policy. This dividend is an extra one being paid in 1961, and represents your share of gains and savings in the insurance fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

Always keep your choice of beneficiary up to date.
(VA form 9-5976 (NR), May 1961.)

NOTICE SENT TO INSURED TO HAVE DIVIDENDS LEFT ON DEPOSIT

The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy. These advance payments are made on the assumption that your premiums will continue to be paid for the remainder of your policy year. If premiums are not so paid, this dividend will constitute a partial overpayment which will become an indebtedness against your insurance.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

(VA form 9-5974 (NR), February 1961.)

NOTICE

President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans. The increase is included in the enclosed check. This check also includes a retroactive payment equal to a 3-month increase as provided by the new law unless special action is necessary. In that case you will get your adjustment check in the near future.

The table on the back of this notice shows some of the new wartime rates. Compensation based on peacetime service is paid on approximately 80 percent of the amounts shown.

Degree of disability	Old rate of payment	New rate of payment ¹
10 percent	\$19	\$20
20 percent	36	38
30 percent	55	58
40 percent	73	77
50 percent ²	100	107
60 percent	120	128
70 percent	140	149
80 percent	160	170
90 percent	179	191
100 percent ²	225	250

¹ The amount payable for all checks received after the first one.
² Veterans disabled 50 percent or more may receive an additional allowance for dependents. The law does not change the amounts paid for dependents.

[U.S. SEAL]
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
HONORS THE MEMORY OF

This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at the State level in Illinois a certificate of grateful appreciation is issued to each draft board member—signed by the secretary of state, for their patriotic services to the State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the foregoing facts, it is not necessary to defend the President against his critics, but rather to apologize to him and to the thousands of widows and children of deceased veterans who have received from the President a memorial certificate honoring the memory of their loved ones. I am appalled to think that partisan politics and mudslinging are being indulged in in an attempt to sully this patriotic program attesting to the gratitude of a grateful nation through its President.

Before presenting the facts about the memorial certificate, I would like to call attention to an article that appeared on the first page of the Houston Chronicle on Thursday, August 1, 1963, entitled "Yes, Adrienne, It Is Indeed a Story—A Big, Big Story."

(By Bill Porterfield)

To the BUREAUCRAT UNKNOWN:
For you it was a routine clerical procedure, repeated, no doubt, thousands of times a year. The checking of records, the printing of the name on a form certificate stamped with the President's signature, the mailing to the widow or the mother. You did it with machine-like precision, and with just about as much feeling as a computer cracking out statistics on birth and death rates.

You didn't wonder or weep over it. No matter. It arrived at its destination—a tiny house at 4111 Basl in North Side Houston—and performed its magic.

Adrienne Lloyd, 71, took it from the mailbox, noted the White House return address, and opened the envelope with trembling hands. She read the citation:

"THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA HONORS THE MEMORY OF EARL E. LLOYD

"This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless

consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

Earl Lloyd was her husband. He never fired a shot at the enemy, never left his country. He died in Veterans' Administration hospital here 11 years ago, at 60, of natural causes.

But he was Adrienne's bugler boy, her stateside sergeant when she was young and blonde and beautiful and danced the tango at the Khaki Club in Fort Worth. She was touched that, after all these years, the President would remember an ordinary doughboy of 1918.

Her life was once full. But for years now, with her dogs and cat and boarder, it was virtually empty. But this. Wasn't it wonderful?

Adrienne did something she never has done before. She got up her courage and called her newspaper. Would they be interested to know about her late husband's commendation from the President? Would a reporter want to come out and talk with her about it? Or was she wasting the editor's time? Perhaps it was a small thing, but she was so proud. Was it worth a story?

"Profumo, Race Riots," "Communist Threat," "Nuclear Threat," "Overkill," "Buddhist Revolt," "Stocks Rise," "Stocks Fall," "Auto Crash," "Police Brutality," "Lost Dog," "Drowned Child."

Yes, Adrienne, yes.

I am impressed with a program that touches a lonely widow's life with the rich remembrance of things past. I am impressed, too, that a tough-minded editor, awash in a sea of cold facts and hard news, also saw this program as a warm human interest story—one big enough for his front page.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I am depressed to see this program being criticized. I can only conclude that the critics—if they are sincere—simply do not have the facts.

For given the facts, the only criticism that can be leveled against this program is, "Why did not someone think of it sooner?" The fact that President Kennedy began this program is a tribute to his humanity and his sense of identification with people.

The Veterans' Administration assists in this program by identifying the next of kin eligible to receive the certificates. These are mailed from Washington in White House envelopes.

How does the Veterans' Administration actually identify these eligible next of kin?

There are actually three methods:

First, in deaths occurring after March 1962, notices are normally received in one of VA's regional offices, which in turn checks the next of kin from the veteran's records. A certificate is then mailed without any action on the next-of-kin's part.

Second, in deaths occurring before March 1962, a certificate may be issued upon request of the next of kin.

A third method was later developed because of the widespread interest in the President's program, and because of the growing volume of inquiries from relatives of veterans who died before March 1962.

At the White House and at VA offices throughout the country people wanted to know how they could receive a certifi-

cate honoring the memory of their loved ones. The VA decided to let these thousands of widows know how they could apply for a certificate.

How was the VA to do that, however? Take full page advertisements in newspapers? Buy time on radio and television?

It seems to me that the Veterans' Administration showed good sense by doing neither. Instead, it made arrangements with the Treasury Department for a letter and an application card to be inserted with compensation and pension checks mailed to persons receiving death benefits. Such a mailing is being made to next of kin. The mailing is scheduled a few States a month to even out the clerical workload.

This method has the advantage of being directed to those people most likely to be interested; that is, the next of kin of deceased honorably discharged veterans.

In addition, the President of the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., recently expressed her appreciation for the initiation of the memorial certificate letter, and asked that her entire organization be "blanketed into" the program without waiting to apply via a VA letter in a benefit check.

Mr. Speaker, as so often happens, when a critic is caught off base, he is caught way off base. This is one of those times. Not only has the VA come up with a good idea, they have also come up with an inexpensive idea.

Should VA be deluged with requests for certificates in the form of letters and telephone calls, it would be very costly indeed. Each one would have to be individually checked out to see that the deceased veteran was eligible and that the next of kin was eligible, and so forth. Records would have to be searched, correspondence dictated, and so forth. In all, it would cost about \$2.50 per request.

The method used by the VA relies upon automatic data processing equipment, for the applications are on punchcards. It has the cooperation of the Treasury and Post Office Departments. It eliminates the need for dictation of letters and search of records, and it cuts the cost to 22 cents, versus \$2.50 per application.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any more of the Members time in answering the political attacks upon this Presidential Memorial Certificate.

I would only hope that these carping critics could see some of the letters—many of them from their own constituents—that have come to the President and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In all, more than 480,000 certificates have been issued. The favorable response has been overwhelming. The universally expressed sentiment is that this is a document that will be treasured.

Exposed to the genuine and deep appreciation of these widows and children and other next of kin, I am convinced that these critics would see the memorial certificate program as one that should be above politics and political smears. I would hope they would see it as in the best tradition of American gratitude to-

ward those who served, a program that should be continued under all administrations.

WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE DISPOSAL IN URBAN AREAS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill, H.R. 9078, which is designed to encourage greater cooperation and efficiency in the planning and construction of community water systems and to improve the adequacy of water and sewerage systems in urban areas. It would amend the National Housing Act in several important respects, and in view of the severe drought which recently plagued many parts of the country, including my own State of New Jersey, I would urge upon our colleagues the importance of taking constructive action along these and other lines to strengthen our water systems, especially in heavily-populated urban areas.

Title I of this bill would remove the population restrictions upon communities seeking assistance under the public facilities loan program in the case of loans for water and sewerage projects. Currently communities of 50,000 population or more, or communities whose combined population exceeds 50,000 joining together to provide sewer and water facilities on a joint or cooperative basis, are not eligible for such loans. This title would also grant adequate authority to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to defer, more effectively than at present, the interest payments on public facility loans for projects planned to meet anticipated growth needs.

Title II of the bill would provide that individual or subdivision development housing projects authorizing individual wells and septic tanks be ineligible for FHA or VA insurance or loans in areas where the installation of public or community water and sewerage systems is economically feasible.

The provisions of title III would authorize a program of FHA mortgage insurance for land development costs, including costs of providing adequate community water and sewerage systems. The objective of this additional mortgage insurance coverage would be to stimulate private investment in well-planned and sound land development and to reduce the use of private wells and septic tanks by residential land developers and builders.

The proposed legislation is based on a detailed and well-documented report entitled "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewerage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas," which was adopted last year by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations,

of which I am a member representing the House. The Commission directed its attention to the problems of achieving satisfactory water supply and sewerage disposal services in urban areas and the need for adjusting governmental policies and practices to accommodate current and anticipated increases in population and water use in these areas. The Commission focused attention on the problems of inadequate investment, uneconomical water utilities development and fragmented responsibility. Among its findings was the fact that public investment in water and sewer facilities is inadequate, but sewerage treatment and water quality are more pressing problems than water supply and distribution.

Water problems were found to be most critical in the suburbs. It was found that a large part of the difficulty arises from reliance on individual water supply and waste disposal systems. The indiscriminate use of wells and septic tanks encourages urban sprawl, often endangers public health, and rarely provides a permanent solution to the problem of obtaining and disposing of water.

Local communities seeking to provide adequate sewerage and water systems find that they cannot get Federal public facility loans to supplement other sources of financing if the population is over 50,000—or 150,000 in area redevelopment areas. The community also finds that loans are not available when it joins with other communities to build a sewerage or water system serving a total population greater than the prescribed limit, even if its own population and the population of the other cooperating communities are individually within the existing legislative limitation.

The present 50,000 population limitation of the public facility loans program has several major disadvantages with respect to meeting governmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas. First, it directly discriminates against communities of 50,000 population or more by not permitting them to receive public facility loans. Second, it encourages fragmentation, duplication, and inadequate long-term facilities by prohibiting bond action under the Federal loan program by a number of communities within a metropolitan area to meet water and sewer needs.

Congress has agreed that the public facility loans program should be used to assist communities to provide public facilities which have growth capacity sufficient to supply the services that will be needed by the increased population of the community in the foreseeable future. At present, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has authority to postpone repayment of the principal on financial assistance extended under the public facility loans program. Section 501(c) of the Housing Act of 1961 authorized the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to defer payment of interest on 50 percent of a public facility loan for a period of up to 10 years if the loan does not exceed 50 percent of the development cost of the project financed by the loan, and if the Administrator determines that the applicant for the loan

will experience above-average population growth. However, in its present form this deferred interest provision has been inoperable and has not been utilized since it was enacted.

To make the use of this deferment of interest provision feasible and effective, section 202 of the bill I have introduced would remove the present provision that interest can be deferred on only 50 percent of the loan made under the public facility loans program, and would remove the requirement that 50 percent of the development cost of the project be financed by private borrowing or other means. In addition, the requirement that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator find that the applicant will experience "above average" population growth has been modified to require that the applicant will experience "substantial" population growth. Let me emphasize that these amendments would not in any way undermine the financial soundness of the loan. All of the existing requirements and standards in the public facility loan program for approval of loans would remain in full effect. Further, there would be no subsidies or additional costs involved. Any payments that would be deferred would have to be repaid, but over a longer period of time.

The Federal housing program as presently administered goes far toward encouraging provision of service by public or other adequate community water and sewerage systems, wherever such systems are available or economically feasible. In some areas, however, local laws and ordinances do not authorize the construction of public or adequate community systems, though the construction of such systems is made both desirable and economically feasible by the existing or anticipated population. In such circumstances, the Federal housing officials have been unable to assure the provision of public or adequate community water and sewerage systems to properties they insure despite the desirability and economic feasibility of providing such facilities. The enactment of this bill would stimulate the construction of public or adequate community systems, where such systems are economically feasible, by requiring the Federal Housing Commissioner and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse assistance to new housing unless such housing will be served by public or adequate community water and sewerage systems.

Under present Federal laws, a builder who takes the trouble to install community water and sewer systems to serve his houses finds that his extra expenses cannot be financed under FHA insured lending. With the anticipated major demand for suburban building sites in the next decade, it is imperative that an adequate supply of satisfactory new building sites be available at reasonable prices to individuals and small builders as well as to site developers. The sites should be supplied with essential utilities and community facilities and be efficiently planned for orderly urban development. They should also be planned and developed in the context of the community or area in which they are situated so as to insure protection of other

neighborhoods in the area and to promote sound and better coordinated community growth. To help stimulate private investment in proper land development and reduce use of private wells and septic tanks, this bill would authorize FHA insurance for site preparation and development, including costs of water and sewer lines and systems.

Although the public facility loan and FHA programs have stimulated the provision of adequate facilities for water supply and sewage disposal in many communities in the past, the limitations I have described prevent their full potential from being realized. The bill I have introduced would remove these limitations. Enactment of this legislation would help greatly to discourage uneconomical and unsatisfactory investment in water and sewerage systems in our growing urban areas. The modification of existing Federal programs to better meet the needs of our growing urban areas should contribute to more coordinated policymaking and economical investment in community water and sewer services and to the more orderly growth of our suburban communities.

The specific objectives embodied in this bill have received the specific endorsement of the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the bill at this point in my remarks:

H.R. 9078

A bill to amend the National Housing Act with respect to water and sewerage facilities and mortgage insurance for land development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—COMMUNITY FACILITIES

SEC. 101. The last sentence of paragraph (4) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after "project" the following: "(1) for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water, (2) for the provision of sewerage, sewerage treatment, or sewerage facilities, or (3)".

SEC. 102. The second paragraph of section 202(b) is amended to read as follows: "No securities or obligations shall be purchased, and no loans shall be made, including renewals or extensions thereof, which have maturity dates in excess of forty years. Subject to such maximum maturity, the Administrator in his discretion may provide for the postponement of the payment of all or a portion of the interest on financial assistance extended to an applicant under this section for a period up to ten years where it is determined by the Administrator that such applicant will experience substantial population growth and the project would contribute to orderly community development, economy, and efficiency; and any amounts so postponed shall be payable with interest in annual installments during the remaining maturity of such assistance: *Provided*, That in the case of any financial assistance on which payment of all or a portion of the interest is deferred, there shall be pledged for the repayment of one-third of the amount of such assistance the full faith and credit of the municipalities or other political subdivisions to be served by the project for which such financial assistance is provided: *Provided further*, That the guarantee re-

quired by the first proviso in this paragraph shall be in addition to any other security received for the financial assistance extended."

TITLE II—PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE FACILITIES

SEC. 201. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Water and sewerage systems

"SEC. 325. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no mortgage which covers new construction shall be approved for insurance under this Act (except pursuant to a commitment made prior to the date of the enactment of this section) if the mortgaged property includes housing which is not served by a public or adequate community water and sewerage system: *Provided*, That this limitation shall be applicable only to property which is not served by a system approved by the Commissioner pursuant to title X of this Act and which is situated in an area determined by the Commissioner to be an area where the establishment of public or adequate community water and sewerage systems is economically feasible: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section the Commissioner shall determine the economic feasibility of establishing such public or adequate community water and sewerage systems without regard to whether such establishment is authorized by law or is subject to approval by one or more local governments or public bodies."

(b) Section 1804 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) No loan for the purchase or construction of new residential property (other than property served by a water and sewerage system approved by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title X of the National Housing Act) shall be financed through the assistance of this chapter if such property is not served by a public or adequate community water and sewerage system and is located in an area where the Administrator determines that the establishment of such systems is economically feasible. For purposes of this subsection, the Administrator shall determine the economic feasibility of establishing public or adequate community water and sewerage systems without regard to whether such establishment is authorized by law or is subject to approval by one or more local governments or public bodies."

TITLE III—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 301. The National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE X—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 1001. The purpose of this title is to secure experience for, and demonstrate the feasibility of, a program of mortgage insurance which will assist in the provision of sites for residential and related uses in neighborhoods which are properly planned and improved to provide a suitable living environment, maintain property values, and contribute to sound and economic community growth.

"SEC. 1002. As used in this title—

"(1) the term 'mortgage' means a lien on real estate in fee simple, or on the interest of either the lessor or lessee thereof (A) under a lease for not less than ninety-nine years which is renewable or (B) under a lease having a period of not less than fifty years to run from the date the mortgage was executed; and the term 'first mortgage' includes such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances (including but not being limited to advance during construction) on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in

which the real estate is located, together with the credit instrument or instruments, if any, secured thereby, and may be in the form of trust mortgages or mortgage indentures or deeds of trust securing notes, bonds, or other credit instruments;

"(2) the terms 'mortgagee', 'mortgagor', and 'State' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 207 of this Act;

"(3) the term 'improvements' means water lines and water supply installations, sewer lines and sewage disposal installations, streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, storm drainage facilities, and other installations or work, whether on or off the site which the Commissioner deems necessary or desirable to prepare land primarily for residential and related uses; and

"(4) the term 'development' means the process of making and installing improvements in undeveloped or partially developed land.

"SEC. 1003. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to insure, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, any first mortgage (including advances in such mortgage during development) in accordance with the provisions of this title and to make commitments for the insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon; but no mortgage shall be insured under this title after June 30, 1968, except pursuant to a commitment to insure issued before such date.

"(b) To be eligible for mortgage insurance under this title a mortgage shall—

"(1) be executed by, and cover property held by, a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner and have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Commissioner;

"(2) cover the land developed and the improvements made with the assistance of the mortgage insurance unless they are in public ownership;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount satisfactory to the Commissioner but in no event to exceed 75 per centum of the estimated value of the security as of the completion of the development to be financed with assistance under this title;

"(4) have a maturity and contain repayment provisions satisfactory to the Commissioner, and bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for mortgage insurance and such service charges and fees as may be approved by the Commissioner) at a rate satisfactory to the Commissioner, but not to exceed 6 per centum per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time; and

"(5) contain such terms and provisions with respect to protection of the security, payment of taxes, delinquency charges, prepayment, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Commissioner may in his discretion prescribe.

"(c) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"(d) No mortgage shall be accepted for insurance under this title unless the Commissioner finds that—

"(1) the insurance would represent an acceptable risk to the Land Development Insurance Fund, as established by subsection (g) of this section, giving consideration to the experience to be obtained from, or demonstration effected by, the undertaking and to the expected contribution of the land development to sound community growth;

"(2) the land to be developed will meet the housing and related needs of moderate income families or will contribute to the orderly development of a well-planned residential neighborhood which will meet such needs;

"(3) the improvements will comply with all applicable State and local governmental

requirements and with minimum standards approved by the Commissioner; and

"(4) the land will be developed in accordance with a plan which—

"(A) provides reasonable assurance that the land will be part of a well-planned residential neighborhood which will (i) have a long economic life, (ii) be protected against undesirable traffic patterns and other adverse physical conditions, and (iii) be served by public systems for water supply and sewerage, and such school, playground, shopping, recreational, and other facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate: *Provided*, That where the Commissioner finds that a public system for water supply or sewerage is not feasible, he may approve an adequate privately owned system regulated with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return, or an adequate cooperatively owned system; and

"(B) has been determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to be consistent with a comprehensive plan for the area in which the land is situated meeting criteria established by the Administrator for such comprehensive plans.

"(e) The Commissioner shall collect reasonable premiums for the insurance of any mortgage under this title and shall make such additional charges as he may deem reasonable for the analysis of the land development plan and the appraisal and inspection of the property and improvements. On or before January 1, 1968, the Commissioner shall make a report to the Congress concerning premium rates and additional charges under this title which he estimates would be adequate to protect the solvency of the Land Development Insurance Fund and to provide income sufficient for the program established by this title to be self-supporting on a continuing basis.

"(f) The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p), of section 207 of this Act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this title, except that as applied to such mortgages (1) all references therein to the Housing Insurance Fund or the Housing Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Land Development Insurance Fund, (2) all references therein to section 207 or section 210 shall be deemed to refer to this title, and (3) any reference to an annual premium shall be deemed to refer to such premiums as the Commissioner may designate.

"(g) There is hereby created the Land Development Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title. The Commissioner is authorized to transfer to the Fund the sum of \$1,000,000 from the War Housing Insurance Fund created by section 602 of this Act. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this title may be charged to the Land Development Insurance Fund.

"SEC. 1004. Any contract of insurance executed by the Commissioner under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

"SEC. 1005. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Commissioner under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"SEC. 1006. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including regula-

tions with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, method of operation, and rate of return of private utility companies operating utilities financed with assistance under this title. As an aid to such regulation, the Commissioner may make such contracts with, and may acquire for not to exceed \$100 such stock or interest in, the utility company as he may deem desirable.

"SEC. 1007. The Commissioner shall adopt such regulations or procedures as he deems necessary reasonably to assure that the outstanding balance of any mortgage insured under this title shall not at any time exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate amount of (1) the value, as estimated by the Commissioner, of the mortgagor's interest in the land before development and (2) the actual costs of development, as such aggregate amount is allocated by the Commissioner at the time to the property remaining under the lien of the insured mortgage. For this purpose, the Commissioner shall require the mortgagor to submit from time to time during development of the land, and upon completion of such development but prior to final endorsement of the mortgage, the actual costs of development. Such certifications shall be accompanied by such data and records as the Commissioner shall prescribe. Upon the Commissioner's approval of a mortgagor's certification, such certification shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor. As used in this section, the term 'actual costs' means the costs exclusive of rebates or trade discounts, to the mortgagor of the improvements, including amounts paid for labor, materials, construction contracts, land planning, engineers' and architects' fees, surveys, taxes and interest during development, organizational and legal expenses, such allocation of general overhead expenses as are acceptable to the Commissioner, and allowance for contractor's profit deemed reasonable by the Commissioner if the mortgagor is also the contractor as defined by the Commissioner, and other items of expense incidental to development which may be approved by the Commissioner."

SEC. 302. Section 219 of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting "the Land Development Insurance Fund," after the "Apartment Unit Insurance Fund."

SEC. 303. The first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting before the last sentence the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the limitations and restrictions in this section, any national banking association may make loans for site preparation and development which are secured by mortgages insured under title X of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 304. Section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this section and to such extent as the Board may by regulation permit, any such association is authorized to invest in loans for site preparation and development which are secured by mortgages insured under title X of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 305. Section 212 of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after the third sentence of subsection (a) of such section the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to insurance under title X with respect to laborers or mechanics employed in land development financed with the proceeds of any mortgage insured under that title."

INCREASED INCENTIVE FOR ECONOMIC AND COMPREHENSIVE SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as a companion measure to H.R. 9078, I have also introduced a bill, H.R. 9080, to amend the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to increase the ceiling on grants for the construction of necessary sewage treatment works and to provide financial incentives for constructing projects which conform to comprehensive plans.

This bill, too, was first proposed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report, "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas." The report recommends Federal, State, and local action to obtain more satisfactory water supply and sewage disposal services in urban areas. H.R. 9080, together with H.R. 9078, would carry out major commission recommendations at the Federal level in this important intergovernmental effort to assure our people adequate supplies of clean water in the years ahead. The Commission's leadership in this regard has been most encouraging.

First, let me point out that the Commission concluded against recommending the establishment at this time of any new general program of Federal grants-in-aid for water supply and distribution comparable to the existing sewage treatment grant program. It reached this conclusion because local communities must provide water to survive and do not need Federal stimulation to act in this field. However, sewage disposal is quite another matter. The Commission found that the current Federal program of grants for sewage treatment construction has provided a significant incentive for increased investment at the local level and has spurred rather than stifled State and local initiative. However, it concluded that the Federal grant program does not provide adequate incentive for more economical and comprehensive sewage treatment facilities in metropolitan areas.

As presently authorized, a grant for a single project may not exceed 30 percent of the reasonable construction cost or \$600,000, whichever is less. In the case of a joint project in which several communities participate, the ceiling is \$2,400,000. These ceiling limitations are unrealistic when applied to the considerably greater expenditures which communities in larger urban areas must bear in installing necessary treatment works. In application, these grants approximate as little or less than 10 percent of the costs involved, and thus they fail to achieve what is at once a primary and necessary objective in efforts to control water pollution. The bill, which I introduce today, would bring these amounts more in line with the equities and purposes involved by increasing a single project grant maximum to \$1 million and a joint project meeting the needs of a number of communities to a grant maximum of \$4 million.

Federal sewage treatment grants can be an important tool for shaping a better metropolitan community. However, the Federal aid program does not provide sufficient incentives for more economical and comprehensive waste disposal development in metropolitan areas. Federal policy should actively promote the development of sewage treatment systems on a scale consistent with sound investment and planning practices.

At the present time there is no requirement, either legislative or administrative, that grants in metropolitan areas be denied to crisis-oriented, shortsighted, and uneconomical solutions to pollution abatement. As an incentive to more economical and coordinated waste disposal development, this bill would authorize an additional 10 percent grant to be made for those projects that are certified by an official State, regional, or metropolitan planning agency as being in conformity with an areawide plan of development. This would be an economical investment both for the Federal Government and the communities concerned because a single larger facility can usually be constructed at a lesser cost than several smaller ones. Similar incentives or, more commonly, legislative requirements, are now provided in the Federal open space, mass transportation and urban renewal programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the loan and grant programs of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

I believe that this legislation would greatly assist Federal and State officials responsible for implementing the Federal grant program for sewage plant treatment construction, in promoting areawide planning and the development of economical sewage treatment facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 9080

A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works and provide financial incentives for construction projects conforming to comprehensive plans

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) clause (2) of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by striking out "\$600,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such section 6 is amended by striking out "\$2,400,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000."

(c) Section 6 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant by 10 per centum for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area which has been defined by the Bureau of the Budget as a standard metropolitan statistical area and within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for

such purpose by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area."

TRADE WITH SOVIETS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a newspaper dispatch from London, dated November 12, which appeared in the November 13 edition of the Washington Post.

The headline states, that a NATO meeting is set to discuss trade with the Soviets. The dispatch goes on to say that Allied leaders of the NATO nations have called a meeting in Paris for early next week—the week of November 17—to seek a settlement of their differences over East-West trade policies.

Americans cannot help but be cheered by this announcement. It is especially good news to a group of us here on the Republican side of the aisle, who called on the President of the United States back on October 4, urging him to call such a meeting.

I would like to enter in the RECORD the statement which the Republican House task force on NATO unity, a subcommittee of the Republican House policy committee, sent to the President on October 4:

STATEMENT ASKING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO CALL A TOP-LEVEL NATO MEETING ON ECONOMIC UNITY

The recent Canadian-Russian wheat deal and a possible United States-Russian wheat deal point up the need for greater NATO unity. Both deals developed on a bilateral basis and apparently without due regard to their broad implications on free world security.

The Communists use trade as a weapon in the cold war, not merely in the commercial manner common among businessmen. They use trade to divide and conquer, create dissension among the free nations, make individual nations dependent and therefore vulnerable, as well as to fill their own strategic shortages.

In order to deal effectively with this problem and with similar problems in the future, we urge that the authority of NATO be increased so that it would have the responsibility and the authority to strengthen and develop free competitive practices in world commerce and to resist any monopolistic state-dominated trade warfare of the Communists.

NATO is united in moral purpose. It must also be united in economic power.

Article II of the original NATO treaty states that the NATO countries will "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them." Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson was the author of this important provision.

We urge the President to issue a call for an immediate top-level NATO conference to give considerations to these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere does the article in the Washington Post state whether the call for this meeting in Paris next week was issued by the President, or if it came from some other Allied leaders. However, it is certainly in the spirit of the statement which our Republican subcommittee issued back on October 4, and it is good news to us.

However, there are some portions of the November 13 article in the Washington Post which are not so encouraging. Some recent events, especially regarding the proposed sale of U.S. surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, are also discouraging.

I now offer for the RECORD the full text of the Washington Post article, so that we may proceed from this point to discuss putting our own house in order before attempting to assume a role of leadership at this up-coming meeting of NATO Allies:

BALL VISITS ERHARD—NATO MEETING SET ON SOVIET TRADING

LONDON, November 12.—Allied leaders have called a meeting in Paris early next week to seek a settlement of their differences over East-West trade policies, authoritative diplomatic sources said today.

The United States wants to unify the West's credit terms in dealing with the Soviet bloc. Some allies fear such a move will lead to a loss of sales to the Communist nations.

The meeting, scheduled for next Monday, will be held within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has been keeping an eye on trade with the Communist bloc.

Under Secretary of State George Ball, now in West Germany on his tour of European capitals for preliminary interallied trade talks, was expected to attend the Paris meeting.

MEETS WITH ERHARD

Ball met today with Chancellor Ludwig Erhard. He will travel to London this week, where he is expected to ask the British to refrain from granting excessively favorable credit facilities to the Russians.

Specifically, he is expected to seek greater formalization of a "gentleman's agreement" now in force, under which Britain's Export Credits Guarantee Department refuses to insure credits of more than 5 years, except in unusual circumstances.

The Department already has felt justified in extending the limit to 7 years in the case of aircraft exports, after learning that the American Export-Import Bank has agreed to extend 7 years' credit to purchasers of American aircraft.

Ball is also expected to seek an assurance that the British will not sidestep this gentleman's agreement by allowing the Guarantee Department to arrange what are known as special financial guarantees for big Iron Curtain orders.

NONE YET GRANTED

For the last 2 years the Department has given financial guarantees to private banks that have lent money to exporters to finance large capital goods orders. It says that no such financial guarantees have yet been granted for Iron Curtain orders.

Thus Ball's action appears designed to guard against possible future action of this kind in support of a big jump in exports to the Soviet Union.

The American move at this time is understood here to be inspired by the fear that America's allies in Western Europe may use the American-Russian grain deal as an excuse for stepping up their own trade with the Soviet Union."

Mr. Speaker, there are two portions of this dispatch to which I would like to call special attention.

The first is the proposed trip of Mr. Ball to Great Britain to "seek a greater formalization of a gentleman's agreement now in force, under which Britain's Export Credit Guarantee Department refuses to insure credits of more than 5 years, except in unusual circumstances."

To this point should be added for consideration the further statement that the British Department has felt justified in extending credits to 7 years, because the United States has done so. And, we should take into consideration the statement:

Ball is also expected to seek an assurance that the British will not sidestep this gentleman's agreement by allowing the Guarantee Department to arrange what are known as special financial guarantees for big Iron Curtain orders.

The second major point of this dispatch to which I call your attention is the statement:

The American move at this time is understood here to be inspired by the fear that America's allies in Western Europe may use the American-Russian grain deal as an excuse for stepping up their own trade with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the vacuum of leadership which has developed in the area of foreign policy under the Kennedy administration has set up a guideline for policy in dealing with our allies that can be summed up in the old cliché: "Do as we say, not as we do."

Here we are, faced with the prospect of the Under Secretary of State of the United States, visiting a foreign capital to urge a long-standing ally not to extend the "special financial guarantees" which we are, ourselves, about to extend to the enemies of the free world. This does not seem to me to be a very trustworthy and equitable manner of dealing with our allies, nor of meeting the threat of international communism.

To illustrate my point, I refer you to an article in the Washington Post of November 11, under the byline of Mr. Vincent J. Burke.

Mr. Burke says:

The Federal Government has decided to underwrite all the credit risks for American banks engaged in financing sale of \$6 million worth of surplus U.S. corn to Communist Hungary.

It is expected that similar credit guarantees will be extended to the pending \$250 million sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

These guarantees, writes Mr. Burke, will be extended by the U.S. Export-Import Bank, a governmental agency roughly paralleling the British Export Credits Guarantee Department.

Says Mr. Burke:

Actually, it is customary for the Export-Import Bank, a Government agency, to guarantee one-half of the short-term credit extended by private commercial banks on sale of big shipments of American goods abroad. The agency's chief purpose is to promote foreign sale of American products.

Departing from its usual 50-50 practice, the Export-Import Bank has agreed to guarantee all the short-term credit extended by banks to finance the sale of corn to Hungary.

This was done after the commercial banks refused to take the risk required under the agency's normal practice.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that what we are proposing to do is to extend 100-percent credit to a dead-beat government that may steal the whole granary?

It seems strange to me to be extending such preferential credit to a nation which has disdainfully refused to pay us back the lend-lease aid we granted it nearly a quarter century ago, and which is also today far in arrears in its payments to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, this Export-Import Bank credit means that:

First. If the Hungarians, or the Russians if these special credits are extended to the Soviets as Mr. Burke says is expected, should default, it will be the U.S. taxpayer, through the Export-Import Bank's funds, who will pick up the bill.

Second. The U.S. Government is ready and willing to take a credit risk that private bankers in the United States refuse to take.

Third. We have already granted preferential treatment to the Soviets, exactly the thing that Mr. Ball is going to London to try to prevent the British from doing.

Fourth. We are extending to the Communist government of Hungary, and perhaps will extend to Russia, 100 percent credit guarantees, while we will extend only 50 percent guarantees to our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I think my point is clear in this regard, and I will not belabor it further, except to refer the Members of the House to the excellent speech, given on the floor of the Senate on November 12, by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, which appears on pages 21573 to 21576 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In it he explores several matters regarding our sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and extension to them of unusual credit arrangements, in much depth and with excellent insight.

Among other things, Mr. MUNDT says:

I do not know what our free world friends think about a proposal that has now become a fact, whereby we are now selling American surplus grains to the Communists at a cheaper delivered price than that at which we are selling it to our friends in the free world.

I shall now move on to the second point of the Washington Post dispatch of November 13, which I called to special consideration—that it is now feared by the administration that our allies may use our wheat deal with the Russians to justify stepped-up trading of their own with the Soviet bloc.

It seems strange to me that these fears should be so late in coming. For the announcement of the deal was, in the first place, a reversal of what was assumed to be the U.S. policy, that is, to attempt to limit exports from the free world to the Iron Curtain.

On September 30, on the floor of this House, I said that the United States needs to clearly state its trade policy toward the Soviets. I pointed out 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," and that "it is not enough to merely expand trade with the Soviet Union in a vague hope unsubstantiated by fact that it will relieve tension."

I suggested that a complete reevaluation of our trade policy with the Communist bloc be undertaken and that we be sure that the sale of every commodity to the Soviets is aimed at strengthening, not weakening, ourselves and the free world.

Thus, I am greatly heartened by news of the NATO trade meeting to take place in Paris, but we must be consistent in what we say and what we do.

Bear in mind, in light of these U.S. credit concessions to the Communists, the words of the President of the United States on October 10 when he announced the possible sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

President Kennedy said it would be sold "by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms."

Now, only a matter of a few weeks later, we see newspaper reports of a Government agency ready to guarantee 100-percent credit for the Communists. That, too, Mr. Speaker, is a reversal of avowed policy.

During the past 3 years we have consistently told our NATO Allies one thing and done another. Let me mention just a few more cases.

The Washington Post, of October 20, printed a news analysis written by Staff Reporter John G. Norris. Mr. Norris said, in part:

Pentagon leaders have decided to seek a showdown with America's principal allies on a long-stalemated split over fundamental NATO strategy. . . . For although often overlooked among the other issues dividing Western Powers, NATO has been split over military strategy ever since the Kennedy administration proposed two major changes in 1961. One is called the forward strategy and the other the graduated strategy.

Mr. Norris goes on to explain that "forward strategy" is the idea of building up troops to meet any Soviet attack in West Germany, where they could fight a "forward battle"—presumably in Soviet satellite territory. The "graduated response" means that we would meet conventional force with conventional force as far as possible and withhold use of tactical nuclear weapons until required by the course of war.

We have held this position almost alone. Our allies did not think that Communist aggression would necessarily be confined to ground warfare—conventional warfare. Our allies of NATO felt a sharing of nuclear power necessary to meet aggression from the East.

The fact is that the United States is now forced to consider reducing its huge land forces overseas, because of the increasing expense of maintaining a huge military machine in West Germany.

Our NATO Allies have not completely fulfilled their earlier commitments to maintain these huge land armies. This has not been only because of the expense, but also because they are not convinced

that the Soviets will strike in conventional means and feel free world resources might be better used to build a nuclear force.

For, as Arthur Krock of the New York Times pointed out on October 15:

The Soviet ballistic missile system aimed at Western Europe is substantially increasing each year. The Soviet Union from time to time has found it convenient to threaten use of these missiles in an attempt to gain political objectives. The bombardment forces directly under NATO command are for the most part composed of manned aircraft which are becoming obsolete. Six years ago the United States offered to cooperate in the ballistic missile field with its NATO allies. The offer has only been partially fulfilled in the sale to the British of Polaris missiles and the supply of Thor and Jupiters to Turkey and Italy. These latter have been phased out because of obsolescence.

Mr. Norris again, reports in the October 2 issue of the Washington Post:

Behind top Pentagon plans to cut back the Navy's aircraft carrier program are some little known military factors—which under current political realities make some reduction in the U.S. Fleet inevitable.

Mr. Norris writes that a cutback in U.S. Navy forces is anticipated because Polaris submarines and Minuteman ICBM's have now increased our striking power, making even the present level of our surface-fleet strength unnecessary.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, that again, in the military field, we are telling our NATO allies to do one thing and then are doing, for ourselves, another. At the very moment we are considering cutting back our own land forces in Europe out of the necessity of the drain on our gold supply, we are chastising our NATO allies for failure to build up their land forces. At the very time we were urging our allies to accept an expensive surface-vessel fleet of 25 vessels, we were considering reducing our own surface fleet.

The reason we can consider such moves for ourselves is because we have increased our nuclear long-range striking force. It is the same type of striking force our allies in NATO desire to obtain. It is the same type of striking force we promised our allies 6 years ago, but which we have made no attempt during the past 3 years, to deliver.

A rebuff came from our NATO Allies last week at the meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. That Conference handed down its opinion that a mixed-man surface fleet of NATO nuclear vessels, such as urged by the United States, is "militarily wasteful."

At the same time we have been telling our NATO Allies to "do as we say and not as we do," we have been entering into bilateral agreements with the Soviet Union which are equally harmful to NATO unity.

We have entered into the hot-line agreement with Soviet Russia, which entirely excludes our NATO Allies. We have negotiated the nuclear test ban treaty, which excluded all other NATO members except Great Britain, from the negotiations. We have now reversed our avowed policy and entered into the wheat deal and other trade negotiations with Communist satellites.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, must leave a strange impression of us in the minds of our NATO Allies, who have been asked to trust us implicitly for 15 years, but in whom we show no similar trust. It seems that our recent policies have been aimed at weakening our allies and their trust in us and thus weakening ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody who would be happier than my colleagues of the Republican House task force on NATO unity, and myself, to see something tangible and constructive emerge from the meeting of NATO alliance partners next week in Paris.

Something tangible and constructive to the peace and freedom of the free world and the world as a whole will be achieved, if out of that Conference comes a realization throughout the Western World that trade is an economic weapon in the cold war which the Communists wield successfully as a heavy club and which we should recognize as an equally potent weapon in our hands.

But I must seriously question how much good can come out of the NATO Conference if the United States goes into the negotiations still laboring under the misconception that we can demand one thing of our Allies and do the opposite ourselves. We must accept our NATO Allies as equal partners in the defense and preservation of freedom in the West, or face further rebuffs and growing disunity among the members of the Atlantic Community.

The NATO Economic Conference in Paris should be used to work out a mutually acceptable program for all the members of NATO, and not be used merely as a sounding board from which we attempt to manipulate our Allies.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the administration to examine its position and to realize, as it goes into these vital Paris discussions, that we must be willing, ready, and able to honor our obligations to our Allies, to make no more demands on them than what we are willing to impose on ourselves and to realize that the Communists are still our enemies.

They have amply demonstrated that fact on the Berlin autobahn, in Cuba, in Vietnam, and through subversive activities in South America.

Let this meeting in Paris be the beginning point of a new era of NATO unity and cooperation. Let the lines again be drawn clearly between friend and foe and let our policies be again clearly defined with the end of strengthening our Allies and winning the cold war.

IMPORTATION OF MEATS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the report in this morning's press of an in-

vestigation of a connection between Bobby Baker and an American-owned packing plant in Haiti again dramatizes the acute need for this body to direct its attention to the question of importation of meats into the United States. The report discloses that before 1961 Haiti had not exported meat to the United States or Puerto Rico. There was not even a modern slaughterhouse in Haiti prior to 1959. In fiscal year 1962, United States and Puerto Rican imports from Haiti were 1,609,886 pounds and in 1963 there were 2,703,968 pounds from that source.

The swift rise of meat imports in the past 3 years to a point where imported beef now represents 10 percent of U.S. beef consumption, the elevation of tariffs on pork and pork products by the Common Market nations, the depressed state of the American livestock industry and the subsidization of feed grain production in the United States are elements of a problem swiftly becoming critical to a vast productive and still uncontrolled segment of American agriculture.

With the facts as they are it is most difficult to believe that any case at all can be made for the importation of Haitian beef whether the authority for such transactions was obtained through the intervention of Baker or someone less notorious.

The time is long past for close attention to this matter by the House.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTING BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal these days of the need for a statute requiring Members of Congress to give a public accounting of sources of outside income as well as a list of securities owned by them.

I am inclined to believe that we should do this individually without compulsion. While in most other walks of life this would be strictly a private matter, Members of Congress have a unique relationship with those they represent, probably like no other. This relationship would seem to carry with it an obligation to be entirely frank about outside financial interests, if any.

The Congress—as an institution of Government—depends upon the respect of the American people. They must be confident in the knowledge that individual Members vote in accordance with what they deem is best for their district, State, and Nation, and without regard to any conflicting personal interest. If a majority of the people of this country came to believe otherwise—no matter how erroneous their conclusion might be—our system of government would be threatened.

For the record, I take this opportunity to state that my income is solely

from that as a Member of Congress, and that I own no stocks, bonds, or other securities.

MORE MANAGED NEWS?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post on page 1 there is an article entitled "Economy Pledge Called Unattainable by RIBICOFF." The article refers to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and his questioning of Mr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

In general, the gentleman from Connecticut attacked New Frontier spending as being too high. Such remarks, coming from a Democratic Senator, can hardly be called partisan politics. I commend this article to my colleagues as another instance of managed news. I quote:

ECONOMY PLEDGE CALLED UNATTAINABLE BY RIBICOFF

(By Frank C. Porter)

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, said yesterday the administration is "painting itself into a corner" by making economy pledges it may not be able to keep.

RIBICOFF, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who supports the White House on most matters, said Government witnesses have been less than candid in urging passage of President Kennedy's \$11.1 billion tax cut program before the Senate Finance Committee.

In offering assurances that Government spending will be held down, RIBICOFF said, these administration officials "are playing right into the hands" of Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and other committee members critical of the tax bill.

BYRD has consistently held that taxes should not be cut until the budget is balanced.

RIBICOFF's remarks came during questioning of Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and an early advocate of tax cuts to spur economic growth and reduce unemployment.

Heller disputed RIBICOFF's contention that the administration is offering the tax bill as a panacea or economic cure-all. He said he supports a "balanced program" of which the tax measure is only a part.

Under a barrage of hostile questioning by Byrd, Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, and Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Republican, of Utah, Heller stoutly maintained his thesis that the Federal budget can be balanced best through expansion of aggregate demand by tax cuts even if it means further temporary deficits.

While he's in favor of "prudence in Government expenditures," Heller explained, reductions in Federal spending equivalent to the tax cut would cancel out the stimulative effect of the program.

This brought a left-handed compliment from Byrd. "You are the first Government witness to be frank enough to say you don't want to decrease expenditures," the chairman told Heller. "You actually want to increase them."

Heller said he saw little inflationary danger either in the tax program or in recent scat-

ter price increases. He did, however, issue an oblique warning about so-called administered price increases. The American public would have little sympathy, he said, for arbitrary price increases in the face of still higher sales and profits resulting from a tax cut.

"We have had several direct indications from major industrial executives * * *," Heller continued, "that they expect a tax cut to bring about volume increases and unit-cost reductions that will make it easier to hold current prices or even reduce them."

In another hearing, International Business Machines Corp. Chairman Thomas J. Watson, Jr., told the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower that passage of the tax bill would help to reduce jobless rolls.

He also suggested possible shortening of the workweek—a measure opposed by the administration and almost all businessmen—as well as the strengthening of area redevelopment and manpower retraining programs, earlier social security retirement benefits and worker relocation allowances.

It is good to note that Mr. Heller now considers puritan ethics as something he can live with. Personally, I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut, I would rather be a puritan than a heller.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut deserves credit for putting country above party.

PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL CERTIFICATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleague from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] made some interesting disclosures concerning the political aspects of the program of the Veterans' Administration to place the President's name in the homes of all deceased veterans of all wars.

Last August I had received a number of complaints from irate families of deceased veterans—some of whom had been gone 15 to 20 years—concerning the program. I made inquiry through the Comptroller General of the United States and received most revealing information, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., October 31, 1963.

The Honorable SAMUEL L. DEVINE, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: Further reference is made to your letter of August 31, 1963, requesting information on the cost and date of initiation of the Veterans' Administration program for providing certificates honoring the memory of deceased members of the Armed Forces.

The program was initiated by the Veterans' Administration as a result of a suggestion made by Mr. Benjamin B. Belfer, secretary-treasurer of the Minneapolis Joint Veterans' Council. As part of its implementation of the program, the Veterans' Administration designed a suitable certificate which was later approved by the President. Under the broad eligibility requirements established by the Veterans' Administration, the next of kin, relatives, or friends of deceased veterans of the Armed Forces with records of honorable service may obtain memorial certificates.

The first certificates were issued in March 1962 and were in memory of those veterans whose deaths were reported to the Veterans' Administration in March 1962. Since April 1962 the Veterans' Administration procedures have provided for certificates to be automatically issued to eligible next of kin, upon receipt of notification of the death of a veteran. Notices of such deaths are normally received in one of the Veterans' Administration regional offices which identifies the next of kin from the veterans' records and notifies the Veterans' Administration central office.

In April 1963, the Veterans' Administration expanded the program to include veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and peacetime veterans who died prior to March 1962. The Veterans' Administration arranges to notify the next of kin by having the Treasury Department insert an appropriate letter of explanation and an application for a certificate with the compensation and pension checks mailed to dependents of deceased veterans. Such letters and applications have already been mailed to about 434,000 next of kin residing in 11 States. The Veterans' Administration plans to mail an additional 841,000 applications, during the period October 1963 through April 1964, to those next of kin residing in other States and the District of Columbia.

From March 1962 to September 30, 1963, 478,635 memorial certificates were issued—250,820 were issued in memory of those veterans whose deaths have been reported since March 1962 and 227,815 were issued in memory of those veterans whose deaths occurred prior to March 1962 when applications were received from the next of kin under the expanded program. The cost of issuing memorial certificates during this period was about \$160,000, or an average cost of 33.5 cents for each certificate.

For the remainder of fiscal year 1964, an estimated 627,000 memorial certificates will be issued, of which about 437,000 will be in memory of veterans who died prior to March 1962. The cost of the program for the remainder of the fiscal year is estimated at about \$138,000, or about 22 cents for each certificate.

Memorial certificates are issued honoring the memory of deceased veterans who served during wartime and peacetime. Since the number of individuals who will serve in the Armed Forces in the future is not known, the total number of memorial certificates that will be issued cannot be determined. However, on the basis of the number of veterans who have served in the Armed Forces during wartime, the Veterans' Administration predicts about 19 million veteran deaths from fiscal year 1965 through 2010. Assuming that the program will be continued until the end of fiscal year 2010 and that memorial certificates will be issued, about \$4.2 million will be expended to honor these wartime veterans.

The above costs have been estimated on the basis of information supplied by the Veterans' Administration and include the cost of printing, supplies, and postage and the salaries for clerical personnel to type and process the certificates. The costs do not include the cost of special typewriters—about \$7,000—or other costs which are not readily determinable, such as applicable salary cost of high-level agency personnel and the cost of office space, searching the veterans' records for next-of-kin information, and certain processing involving automatic data processing equipment.

No specific appropriations have been made to defray the cost of the memorial certificate program. Expenditures to carry out this program are being made from funds appropriated by the Congress to the Veterans' Administration for general operating expenses for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 (75 Stat. 357, 76 Stat. 732, and 77 Stat. 74).

The certificate enclosed with your letter of August 31, 1963, is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

PROF. FREDERICK CHARLES BARGHOORN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American people in general and the academic community in our own country in particular and throughout the free world were shocked to learn yesterday that the Soviet Union has arrested Prof. Frederick Charles Barghoorn on a charge of spying.

It is my hope that this Congress will not sit idly by and watch this scandalous conduct by the Soviet Union with impunity.

There is no question in my mind that the arrest of Yale University Professor Barghoorn, who was visiting the Soviet Union as a scholar to assemble material for his new book, is nothing more than Soviet retaliation to our Nation's long-overdue move yesterday to restrict the travel of Communist officials from Soviet satellite nations in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot view the so-called thaw in American-Soviet relations with any confidence when the Soviets violate the basic precepts of civilized behavior by arresting American citizens like Professor Barghoorn.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have today introduced a resolution which would suspend all cultural exchange programs between the United States and the Soviet Union forthwith if the Soviet Union does not either release Professor Barghoorn by Monday or spell out a bill of particulars for his alleged violations and give him immediately the right to consult with the American Ambassador in Moscow.

Professor Barghoorn has been closely associated with the cultural exchange program as a member of the National Executive Committee of the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants.

It is my hope the Soviet Union will not force Congress to act on this resolution because there are many fine aspects in the cultural exchange program which offer hope for a better understanding between our two nations. For instance, I saw the Moscow Circus a few days ago and thoroughly enjoyed it. But I, for one, do not intend to sit idly by while the Soviet Union talks out of both sides of its mouth.

The arrest of Professor Barghoorn is symbolic in that it threatens every single American who would go to the Soviet Union for whatever may be the reason. I think the time has come when we here in Congress should serve notice on the Soviet Union that if we are to deal with Soviet officials, they must adopt a code of ethics which befits civilized behavior. It is an established fact that whenever

the United States has cause to arrest a Soviet citizen on charges of spying, the Soviet Ambassador is permitted to communicate with such a person under American arrest and a bill of particulars is immediately presented to a U.S. Commissioner during the arraignment.

It is not my intention to dictate to the Soviet Union how it is to operate its internal affairs, but certainly we are not asking too much when we demand that American citizens arrested in the Soviet Union must be advised forthwith of the charges on which they are held.

I think that every effort should be made to let the American Ambassador in Moscow meet with Professor Barghoorn right now before the Soviets succeed in breaking down his will and applying the devilish technique of forcing him into a false confession.

STATES RIGHTS

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

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 9 of this year, the Honorable GENE SNYDER, of Kentucky, addressed the Governmental Affairs School of the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce at Madison, Ind. Because of the importance of his remarks, I wish to make his address available to all the Members by insertion in the RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE GENE SNYDER, OF KENTUCKY, BEFORE THE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE INDIANA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT MADISON, IND., NOVEMBER 9, 1963

I appreciate the honor that is mine by your asking me to come and speak to you today. I am particularly interested in the subject which you have chosen for this meeting and which you have directed me to attempt to discuss to some extent. The subject of "States rights" which you have chosen for your discussion topic for this meeting—is a subject which means a lot of things to a lot of people. For example, to our Negro friends the issue of States rights connotes segregation. I do not share this thinking, and, of course, the best that I can do today is to try to discuss with you as best I can what States rights means to me.

During my short political career, I have been called upon to speak many times and on many of these occasions I have touched upon this issue of States rights but I do not believe that I have ever been called upon to discuss this as a sole issue—and so as I attempt to do so today, I ask for your indulgence with me, for, in this respect, this constitutes a new experience for me.

A little less than 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers formed a government. This was perhaps the only Revolution in all history that did not exchange one set of rules for another. Our Founding Fathers formed a government and they bound it with a Constitution—and I might say incidentally they intended that the Constitution was to be a watchdog over man's freedoms—not a cow to be milked. The several sovereign States then existing decided that it was for their best interest that they should form a compact, or a contract together, delegating some of the powers that then existed within each of the sovereign States to a Federal or central authority, which would be for the mutual best interest of all of the several States. In this connection, they delegated to this

Federal Government, which they set up, certain powers and authorities and reserved to each of those sovereign States all of the powers that they did not so delegate. Therefore it follows, I think, that the division of powers between the Federal Government and the several States must be controlled by the contract that was entered into between the States and the power of the Federal Government limited to this extent.

Realizing that the United States is a federation of States, bound together under a constitutional contract that established a balance of powers between this Federal Government and the sovereign State governments, I think it therefore becomes evident that the concept of balance is essential to the preservation of the form of government that was established by our Founding Fathers. I think it becomes obvious that if we allowed too much of the power to remain in the respective State governments that the union that was formed by the constitutional contract would become ineffective and disintegrate. But on the other hand, if the central government should acquire too much power, then the States would lose their authority and eventually their identity, and the central government would be the controlling monolithic type of State that we have seen develop—come and go—throughout all history. The kind of government that has not long existed in our civilization without being overthrown or toppled from stresses and strains within or without.

I do not think that the balance is necessarily a static sort of a situation and obviously history would indicate to us that it has not been static at all because we know that the Federal Government grew in power and authority from its institution until about 1800. Then I think the pendulum rather swung and the power movement was back toward the States until the Civil War. However, since the Civil War, that is, the past 100 years, we have seen the pendulum of governmental power swing again toward Washington, and at a vastly accelerated rate since about 1930.

As a consequence, we now have a Federal Government that is so big that it cannot be effectively managed, governed, or controlled by any one man, or group of men, regardless of their political astuteness; regardless of their knowledge; regardless of their ability; and regardless of their overall competence. Today, the size of the Federal Government, and the power that is exerted by the Federal Government, and the increasing power that is attempted to be exerted by the Federal Government threatens the very fundamental principles, the very fundamental nature of our Republic by undermining the sovereignty of the States—the sovereignty which existed prior, to the Constitution and which but for the relinquishment of some of this sovereignty and power, there would be no Federal Government. Second, the cost of this great mass in Washington, which I prefer to call the puzzle palace on the Potomac, has gotten to the point where it impedes the economic growth of our country by imposing an excessive burden of taxation on the economic resources that must support both the people and the Government and, third, the enforcement by the Federal Government of its policies which are now suggestive of the police state, violate both the spirit of the Constitution and the guarantees of personal freedom that we find therein.

I happen to be one of those who believe that the whole picture of government could be more properly brought into focus and within the concept of the Constitution if we would bring closer to home—that is, to our local, State, and city and county governments, those governmental services and functions that should properly be performed by our local government, but which have already been swept into this great mass of

bureaucratic entanglements that we now see in Washington.

Let us consider for a few minutes, if we can, the perhaps major influences that have promoted the great growth of Federal power.

I think that in the beginning the usurpation of the rights of the States by the Federal Government was in some areas that did not directly affect so many people, and, as a consequence, this rather slow movement toward Washington went unnoticed and unaided by the States. They were not so jealous of their sovereign right as perhaps they should have been—and, of course, the Civil War and the Reconstruction days damaged the States rights concept in the thinking of so many people. The trend toward a central government proceeded at a most moderate pace after the Civil War, but, of course, was stepped up immensely as a result of two World Wars and the necessary change that must be brought about under such great global conflicts—but I think there are probably some other more practical and ideological reasons for this great growth.

You know, there is an old story that says you cannot kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water—he reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he is hurt. If you will take that same frog and put him in cold water, and warm it up gradually, he never decides to jump until it is too late. But then he is cooked. And this is what we have seen transpire during the years; men being just as foolish as the frog who is put into cold water—men who have had their fundamental freedoms taken away from them by the Central Government which, if you had attempted to take away all of these freedoms, all of these rights of the local government, if you please, overnight—you would have gotten into a violent revolution. But under the so-called liberal concept, we have seen these rights being taken away from the States gradually under the guise of security or peace or progress, and we may well be at the point where we could paralyze an entire generation.

You see, because of the economic conditions which existed in the early 30's, a very practical development occurred which was the initiation on a large scale of Federal grants and aids or subsidies whereby the Federal Government took over and assumed full or partial responsibility for many services and activities, the performance and financing of which had been always within State and local administrative and fiscal capacity. Once we embarked upon this project, there were pressures from the various groups who were to profit or benefit from these various types of grants and aids to continue and increase such projects—and, of course, this device was appealing to the large majority of people who began to believe that somebody else was providing the money and it certainly was most appealing to State and local officials who were able, through political manipulation, to acquire these various emoluments, benefits, improvements and so forth for their own communities, to their own credit, without the necessity of taking that very dangerous political step of raising taxes or going into debt.

In other words, the Federal Government has literally bought its way into the area where State and local governments should function and these acts of purchase, if you please, of vote buying, if you please, have seldom been questioned by the Supreme Court who has construed the term "general welfare" as broadly as they wanted to so as to include everything in the area of government—thereby leaving the Federal Government free to move into almost any area that they so desired to spend money and exercise control.

In passing, let me say this—regardless of how many people may say to you that there are certain areas where you can receive Fed-

eral financing without Federal control—and regardless of how many people say it is written into the law, let me assure you that nobody in Washington really believes this. As a matter of fact, in the case of *Wichard v. Filburn*, decided in 1942, the Court said in effect that it was not only the right of the Federal Government to control those things which it finances, but that it was its duty. I agree with this very thoroughly, that it is utter fiscal irresponsibility for the Federal Government to spend your tax money and not control how it is to be spent. We only have to think back a few billion dollars to the time that the farmer was told that Federal subsidies to the farmer would not mean Federal control.

Then, too, there has been the ideological development throughout the past few years where it was popular to be considered a liberal—for I think so many people connote from the word "liberal"—liberty—when in truth and in fact the current application of this definition is a total distortion of our concept of liberty and reminds me so much of certain countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who refer to a people's democracy.

The 19th century liberal advocated liberating individuals from restrictions and controls of government whereas the 20th century liberal, quite to the contrary, advocates more controls and more government—not less government—advocates more regimentation of the people and business—not less support of the people by the government.

The Constitution is very dear to me and I think very positively that it was drawn to combat the centralist theory and to create a reasonable working balance between Federal and State powers and responsibilities. The Constitution very specifically delegates certain of the powers of the States to the Federal Government and very specifically reserves all of those rights which are not delegated to the sovereign States. Basically the Constitution delegates to the Federal Government those truly national tasks which can be performed only by and at the Federal level of government, such as national defense and foreign affairs and, second, certain other functions which, though they could be performed by the States, it would be adverse to the interests of all of our citizens generally if they were so performed. Examples of this would be the establishment of a national system of weights and measures, a currency system, a postal system, rules and regulations dealing with the commerce between States and commerce with foreign nations, procedures in regard to bankruptcy and naturalization and immigration. These matters were reserved to the Federal Government—to the Congress—not because they could be dealt with only at the Federal level, but because of the chaotic condition that we would find ourselves in if they were left to the several States.

And as I have said, the Constitution specifically provides for reserving to the States, that is, to the people—all powers not delegated to the Congress nor prohibited to the States. Let me say that this makes more sense today and it appears to me to be more necessary today than it was in 1787.

As a result of our permitting the Central Government to assume jurisdiction over and responsibility for functions which should belong at the State and local levels and which in truth and fact have been reserved to the States under the Constitution, we have seen the Federal Government get entirely out of hand in regard to size, as I mentioned earlier. Today 1 out of every 6 workers in the United States is employed by some branch of Government, either Federal, State, or local, and 1 out of 22.1 is employed by the Federal Government or some instrumentality or agency thereof. Of all spending for goods and services in the

United States, Government accounts, Federal, State, and local, for \$1 out of every \$5. But Federal Government spending alone accounts for \$1 out of every \$8.59.

Workers on public payrolls number 12.3 million. Fifteen years ago there were 7.1 million. The Federal Government's employees account for 5.3 million of these and, as a matter of fact, under the present administration, we have seen employment in the Federal Government—civilian employees—increase at the rate of 4,000 each and every month.

Taxes and other Government receipts amount to 35 percent of the total national income. The Federal Government is now collecting \$107.1 billion a year in all of its various funds as opposed to all local and State governments' income of only \$52.6 billion. One dollar out of every \$4.50 of personal income in the United States is accounted for by direct Government payments, with \$1 out of every \$8.56 by direct payments by the Federal Government. Of the total outlays for construction in the United States, the Government accounts for \$1 out of every \$4—with \$1 out of \$9.37 being the Federal Government. Spending by public agencies, Federal, State, and local, total \$165 billion a year, of which \$104.9 billion again is Federal Government agencies spending.

Another consequence of permitting the Federal Government to assume jurisdiction over the proper functions of the State governments is the fact that the Federal Government has its attention diverted from the truly national tasks. During the 1st session of the 88th Congress, we have seen so many examples of both the President and the Congress devoting their time to relatively small matters. We have bills that take up days of debate that involve strictly local and sectional issues; such as feed grains legislation, bills to control the raising of peanuts that are used for boiling, urban renewal matters, so-called depressed areas bills, mass transit bills, juvenile delinquency, and waste treatment. We pay a terrifically large price for the administrative and congressional time that is devoted to these matters which should be handled by local governments to the neglect of truly national matters which should take 100 percent of the time of the Federal Government. After spending over a \$100 billion to combat and contain communism around the world, we have allowed the Communists to take over Cuba. We have seen our relations get bad with Canada, France, England, Latin America. We have seen the situation deteriorate in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo. We have had some unpleasant experiences with Sukarno in Indonesia.

Everyone admits that defense costs are excessive, that there is waste because of insignificant matters such as the three branches of the Government failing to get together on the size of the belt loops. There is a sharp difference between the experts over the best defense and the debate continues today over missiles, manned bombers, and other matters—but we are making these truly national tasks a part-time job when they should be important enough as to require the full attention and energy of the Congress, the administration and all of those at the Federal level of Government. In the United States we have the abilities, the talents, the capabilities for competent national leadership—and our attention at the Federal level should be directed to these types of matters and not wasted on matters which are not really Federal business.

Under the big central government theory, it is necessary to retain punitive tax rates or go bankrupt. Under the big central government theory, the doctrine is advocated that government must support the people and this required an ever-widening array of benefits that these political theorists are

saying that the Federal Government should provide. In effect they say that the people are too stupid to buy for themselves. It is obvious that the only income of the Federal Government is the resources of the Nation and the resources of its people, but somehow or other, it seems politically advantageous to foster the illusion that somebody else is paying. As a matter of fact, it has even gotten to the point that certain of our political theorists in high positions no longer feel that taxes are for the purpose of raising revenue, but rather are for the purpose of redistributing the wealth.

And while I am touching upon taxes, I want to commend the Junior Chamber of Commerce for the position which it has taken at its national conventions in recent years in support of the Herlong-Baker-type tax reduction which definitely ties the tax reduction to a balanced budget. This approach is the approach of sound and sensible people.

There is another consequence of the permission of big central government. It is the technique of promoting centralism by asserting the imminence of crisis which requires Federal intervention. It has been a very useful tool in the hands of those who advocate big central government for a good many years now. Many times the crisis is not real and apparently one that is fiction serves just as well to support the theory that the Federal Government knows what to do, is ready to do it, and able to act in the alleged emergency—and further supports the theory that the States are unwilling or financially unable to act. In recent weeks we have seen the House and Senate pass the aid to higher education bill. If you read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find the debate on this issue—which involves subsidies for the construction of buildings on college campuses—to center basically around the very urgent need for assistance in this area. You would think from reading and hearing this debate that the institutions of higher education across this country are paupers and unable to construct a single building over and beyond a simple toolshed. However, if you will examine the debate in the House of Representatives, you may notice that during the colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAMMO], I very specifically asked the gentleman if he could point out to me any structure built on a college campus within the last 10 years that gives the appearance of having been built under an austerity budget. As I explained then, I am sure that there are some but I know they must be in the minority for every building that I have seen that has been erected on a college campus in the past few years, at least since the Second World War, does not give the appearance of an austerity budget and my request that some of these be named still remains unanswered.

The inaction on the part of local people is usually due to their realization that there is no emergency. We recently had testimony before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee of which I am a member, in regard to the Manpower Development and Training Act. As this bill was originally enacted, it provided for the Federal Government to pay the full financial load for the first 2 years and thereafter for the program to be handled on a 50-50 matching basis with the States. Only about five States considered it of sufficient priority to enact the necessary legislation in their State legislatures to participate in the program after it became a 50-50 program. A witness from the State of California indicated in direct response to some of my questions that it was necessary for the Federal Government to continue 100 percent financing of this program because we in the Federal Government knew what

was better for the people of California than the local legislature did—and further that it would be impossible or virtually impossible to get any appropriation out of the California Legislature for such a program because as he stated it, "in California you have to support your request for appropriations with facts." An obvious reference to the fact that so many people feel that you do not have to support the request for an appropriation with facts when you are dealing at the Federal level.

Another very serious consequence of permitting the Federal Government to assume the responsibility for local projects and allowing the Federal Government to grow so large is the fact that the Federal Government begins to extend its operations far beyond the scope of public functions into the field of private business. The Government competes on very unequal terms with its taxpaying citizens who are in private business. Private business must supply the capital and sustain the losses of its ventures whereas in the Government operation, there is no incentive of making a profit and as a consequence, losses are inconsequential. The Treasury supplies bank funds at interest rates below its own cost of borrowing in many instances. REA borrows money at 2 percent less than the Federal Government pays for borrowing this same money.

The framers of our Constitution thought that we could handle our own affairs but we have been constantly granting to big Federal Government more and more authority. It is obvious that the Government is a lousy businessman. It is obvious that the Government is an incompetent manager. It is obvious that Americans are good businessmen and excellent managers. Where we get the idea that Government can do it better—big government—the Federal Government—baffles me. All evidence is to the contrary. In this area of Government encroaching upon private enterprise, we find political theorists today that say that the public sector is destitute and the private sector is filthy rich. The public sector means government—and the private sector means individual enterprise. A high Government official says: "The choice our Government must make is a choice between the public interest and private comfort."

Another Government planner says: "We have not provided the public sector with enough money to keep up with the private sector. People are spending their money on pleasures and gadgets and automobiles that they do not need." In other words, the Government must take from the people the money they are unwisely spending and spend it for them, wisely. Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, says the combined debt of all Federal Government agencies and instrumentalities is \$1,242,000,000,000—6,642 for every man, woman, and child—or 27,500 for every family of four. Is the public sector which has incurred that much debt underprivileged? Consumer debt in the private sector is only \$56 billion or a little less than \$3,000 per capita—or less than \$12,000 for each family of four. The Federal Government's income has increased by about 20 times since I was born. The private sector's income only about four times. Whatever is or is not wrong with public services, it cannot be said that they have been deprived of money.

The big difference is that businesses operating in the private sector have two important incentives: one, they must compete and, two, they must have a profit. Take away these two necessities and you have a listless organism. The Government need not make a profit and it need not compete.

I would like to commend to your attention an article appearing in the September 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Big Government In United States Getting

Too Big?" This article very aptly points out that with increased spending goes a rise in the power over business and over the lives of our individual citizens. It points out how the present administration is asking that the vast spending power of Government be used to coerce communities and corporations into doing what the Government demands and the increasing demands on the part of bureaucrats is for still more power to be lodged in the Federal Government involving new programs, calling for new spending and new tasks for the Federal police to carry out.

Today the Federal Government is seeking the power to police all race relations, the power to investigate and haul into court all businessmen whose customers complain of discrimination, the power to grant or deny billions of dollars annually to projects and communities depending upon how they accept or fail to accept the rules laid down in Washington, the power to take away deposit insurance of banks or mortgage guarantees if Federal wishes are not complied with, the power to use the FBI in policing activities once considered local, the added power to regulate the stock market, the power to set up a youth corps to work in cities, the power to set up a conservation corps to work in the countryside, the power to aid mass transit plans in cities—all of this is in addition to the existing powers that include, among others, the power that goes with cash spending of \$120 billion every year; the power to enforce minimum wages and maximum hours of work; the power to police labor relations; the power to support farm prices and restrict output; the power to grant or deny subsidies in a wide range of fields; the power to grant or deny loans for many purposes; the power to condemn private property for an increasing range of Federal projects; the power to police private business practices in many areas; the power to regulate transportation and communications.

Today the Government, under the Area Redevelopment Act, has the money and the power to help local communities. This power can be used to help some communities while overlooking the plight of others—and so it is with these other projects that I have mentioned—Domestic Peace Corps, Youth Conservation Corps, mass transit, and all of these other various projects that they are looking for.

Under the conditions which we live today, every individual, every businessman, every corporation runs into the long arm of the Federal Government at nearly every turn. The Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission are constantly on the alert to detect evidence of mergers or pricing practices that the Government might think is illegal. The Federal Trade Commission polices advertising, labeling of products, and other activities of business. There is a proposal now before the Congress to create more power in supervising the design of packages. The National Labor Relations Board supervises union elections for bargaining power, keeps an eye on union contracts with employers. There is another agency to enforce the payment of minimum wages that I made reference to and to see that prevailing wages are paid in various regions by Government contractors. There is now legislation pending before the Congress to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to include certain fringe benefits in figuring prevailing wages. Rates of numerous kinds are regulated by the Federal Government—railroads, electric power companies, pipelines, interstate truckers, bargelines—you name it—and the Government is telling us where the airplanes can fly and they can pay or withhold the subsidy to the airline companies as they see fit. Radio and television stations operate under Government license and cannot turn a cold shoulder to a power-hungry Federal Government. Shipping lines and shipbuild-

ers quite often operate under Federal subsidy. About a third of the country's agriculture operates under Government controls in one form or another with price supports for an equal share of the farm community. Production controls are applied to many of the crops that are price supported.

The Government is involved in banking, with over a third of the home mortgages guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration. The bank deposits are guaranteed and supervised by the Government and building and loan associations are supervised by a different agency. We have the Export-Import Bank that makes direct loans to finance exports and various sorts of insurance guarantees for exports made by American firms.

Some of these are obviously proper Government functions—but many of them are not. If we stop and think for a few minutes, we will find that there are very few areas of our daily lives that are not now within the scope of the all-powerful Federal Government. Programs are piled on top of programs. Workers are retrained under the Manpower Development and Training Act. They are retrained under the Area Redevelopment Act. There are provisions under the Trade Expansion Act for the retraining of workers. Vocational education is given under the Vocational Education Act, under Smith-Hughes, under George-Barden—and I was told by a Member of Congress the other day, who has done some research into this area, that he has already found over 13 different programs under which a worker can be retrained and he believes that there are about 10 more. Obviously the answer is not the retraining of workers. The answer is jobs. So you retrain a worker under all 13 of these programs and without jobs, you have only trained him so that he knows what kind of work he is out of. But this gets us away from the point that I have tried to make in this discussion with you. I know that I have talked too long and perhaps rambled on away from the subject to some extent—and for this I apologize.

I am one of those who believes we are destroying the people we are trying to help in turning so many of our freedoms and liberties over to the Federal Government. I mean that when a farmer is paid for not farming, we are encouraging idleness, indigence, apathy, and decay. I mean that when any American gets sick and counts on the Government to pay, that there is no inducement for him to work and save for the rainy day. I believe that when shipbuilders and airline operators can always rely on a Federal subsidy that there is no reason for them to try for efficiency and improvement. This list could be expanded on and on and on—but I say that Washington's deepening intrusion into our daily lives is nobody's fault but our own. We keep asking the Federal Government to take over and do for us those things which traditionally we have been doing for ourselves. We make a lot of Fourth of July speeches but we still vote for Santa Claus. We seem to forget that government to perform increasing services has to get bigger and bigger and bigger—and we spoon fed, overtaxed and overweight get weaker and weaker and weaker.

The road that we are traveling with a big Central Government, with a welfare state, is the road of a dependent people. This great country is going in the direction of having so many of its people become dependent upon it.

The average age of the world's great civilizations is 200 years. The nations progressed through this sequence:

From bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to complacency; from complacency to

apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back again into bondage.

In 13 years our United States will be 200 years old. This cycle is not inevitable—but I say that it depends upon our determination to keep a proper balance between the rights of our local governments and the rights of our Federal Government—and to keep the maximum amount of authority on a local level where it can be dealt with more efficiently, more economically, and nearer the people whose future it controls.

I thank you.

INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR THE SUPERVISION OF DISARMAMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the resolution introduced by a number of our colleagues and myself—my resolution being House Concurrent Resolution 219—requesting the President to explore the development of an effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace. An identical resolution has been introduced by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and a number of his colleagues in the other body.

An old proverb tells us that a journey of a thousand miles is started with a single step. Our Nation has taken the important first step by supporting the test ban treaty. The treaty alone cannot insure a just and lasting peace but if the leaders of the major nations of the world press for such a peace with honesty and diligence we can achieve the goal of a warless world.

Recognizing that the potential for destruction has attained frightening proportions, the United Nations General Assembly at its 14th session unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

President Eisenhower stated to the 15th General Assembly:

Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples.

Subsequently, President Kennedy has affirmed:

Our primary long-range interest is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms.

Mr. Speaker, we must wage peace as diligently as we once waged war. We must explore every avenue, and direct our energies along those paths which promise a reduction of world tensions and mutual distrust. We must take the leadership in creating a climate for peace.

To implement our avowed goal of a permanent peace, we are requesting the President to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace may

best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two. Such machinery might include, first, an International Disarmament Organization; second, a permanent World Peace Force; and, third, world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, or such other international institutions as might be necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law.

This is not a "peace at any price" proposal. Rather, it is a logical and calculated step. Constant attention must be given to effective and adequate inspection and controls, and aggression in any form must be contained and eradicated.

The road to a peaceful world has indeed been a rocky one, and its pitfalls have frequently trapped the unwary. The mistakes made by gullible European leaders in the 1930's—sins committed in the name of peace—led not to peace, but to war.

We do not propose to make the same mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this body take the leadership in the quest for a lasting and effective peace. A long step in that direction would be the adoption of the resolution I discuss here today. I fervently trust it will win committee and floor approval before this session of the 88th Congress adjourns.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE PACIFIC AND SOUTHEAST ASIA AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we have a great deal at stake in countries such as South Vietnam, Laos, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Many Americans share this view today.

Our interest in the Pacific is of rather recent origin. It is always hazardous to point to a single event as a special turning point in history. But I will take the risk and point a finger at Pearl Harbor. The surprise bombing of our naval installation there did more than catapult us into the Second World War. It seems to me that it marked the beginning of a new era of American involvement and responsibility in the Pacific. It was not that we had had no prior contact with that part of the world. Rather it was that before the Second World War our interest in the Pacific had been somewhat casual and sporadic.

The limited contact we had with the countries of the Pacific was mostly cultural and economic. These were more important than our political activities. Other countries such as Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands established colonies. The United States, with the exception of the Philippines, was not inclined to build up a large oversea empire. Instead, as one writer has aptly described it, we introduced Christianity, Concord grapes, and cash registers. Our

traders returned to the American shores with silks from Japan, jade from China, and tea from Formosa. In spite of growing commerce, the Pacific was a long distance away. It was a strange and unfamiliar region where the languages and religions and characteristics of the people were completely different.

We did not make any great effort to learn about the Pacific. Our attention was focused for the most part on this country and its ties with the West. This orientation encouraged us to look across the Atlantic rather than the Pacific. We followed our ancestry back to the Greeks and the Romans and studied the history of Europe. The usual college student, it is probably safe to say, knew more about the distant moon than he did about Korea, and more about ancient Rome than he did about the China of his own day. It was to be many years before the Pacific would be more than a remote exotic region to the United States, and before the countries in the area would present as they do now some of the most vital of the foreign problems of our times.

The foreign policy of the United States in the Pacific during pre-World War II years was somewhat vague and, at its best, fragmentary in its application. We were primarily concerned with trade opportunities. It was an outlook that was reflected in the diplomatic efforts of the time. The very first contacts of this country with the Pacific were the trading voyages to Canton in the earliest years of our history. In 1853 Commodore Perry paid his famous visit to Japan and opened the islands to the commerce of the world. The United States long maintained an interest in China, and we tried to keep the door open to that vast land. We took possession of the Philippines in 1898, but assumed the responsibility with some misgivings. At the time of the Boxer Rebellion in 1900 we sent a small military force to rescue and protect Americans in China. President Theodore Roosevelt played an important role in the Japanese-Russian peace in 1905. He aroused the enmity of the Japanese because they felt the provisions of the treaty favored Russia. We were hosts in 1922 to Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan at the Washington Conference which set up a formula on the limitation of navies. However, it really was not until the late 1930's that the Pacific began to assume a position of major importance in American foreign policy. It was then that we became concerned over the expansion of Japanese power in the Pacific.

The Second World War had profound consequences. In the Pacific the positions of the former colonial powers, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands were seriously weakened. They never regained the influence they enjoyed before the war. On the other hand, the United States found itself involved more completely than ever in this area. We had shouldered the greatest part of the war effort in the Pacific and, when victory came, American influence was predominant. We were in China

helping to sustain the tottering Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek; we had regained possession of the Philippine Islands; and after the Japanese surrender we became the occupying power in Japan. The United States suddenly found itself in a position of unrivaled leadership in the Pacific.

There were those who believed that the efforts of the Second World War should prove to have been only a temporary involvement in the affairs of the Pacific. These people were hopeful that at the end of the war we might return to our preoccupation with America and the West. But it was not to be the case. Not only had modern means of transportation invalidated the idea that the Pacific was the Far East and far away. More important, the new global responsibilities of the United States made it impossible to disregard this key area of the world. Today, it is safe to say, Pacific affairs rate equally with European affairs in the attention it receives by our Government.

It seems to me that there are at least four basic reasons why the Pacific is important to us. In the first place, almost 60 percent of the people of the world live in the area of the Pacific, and we cannot afford to ignore such a large proportion of the world's population. Second, the Pacific is an area of turmoil and unrest, a fertile breeding ground for communism. It is worth while to remember that people are fighting small wars in the Pacific. Third, the Sino-Soviet split and rivalry has intensified the brash aggressiveness of the Communist Chinese, and they pose a serious threat to the independent countries in the Pacific. And, fourth, the development potential of the Pacific is tremendous. Japan has the world's fastest growing economy, and even the so-called backward countries are beginning to stir. These countries have a rich potential in human and material resources that we cannot risk losing to the forces of communism.

In this context, the tasks of U.S. foreign policy in the Pacific have been two. First, we have been helping to deter aggression and to maintain peace. We have worked to prevent threats to the independence of free countries in the Pacific. The United States has been willing and ready to respond to crises that may require our military power. Second, we have been assisting the peoples of the Pacific in their process of nation building. The military might of the United States has been a means and not an end. Its power has been used to protect the right of the countries of the Pacific to develop freely. And in this struggle for national development we have contributed generously in funds and material.

This, then, is the substance of the U.S. policy in the Pacific. The chief source of danger to our efforts on this front is communism, in particular Communist China. Compared to any of the other countries of the Pacific, Communist China is a strong military power. It has a very large army. The leaders seem to care little for human life. They have

shown a tendency to embark on reckless and even desperate ventures. They preach a doctrine that appeals to the disillusioned and downtrodden. Though the Communist camp has suffered a serious split, we cannot rule out the possibility that at some future time Peiping and Moscow will draw together again.

Turning to the other Communist countries in the Pacific, we find North Korea and North Vietnam driven dangerously by the same aggressive forces. They are small countries and not nearly so powerful as Communist China. Yet we see that North Vietnam has been able to mount campaigns of subversion and terrorism in Laos and South Vietnam. These attempts to undermine and destroy the independence of Laos and South Vietnam are a direct threat to the free world. The United States is firmly committed to oppose this threat and it has taken steps to see that aggression will not succeed in the Pacific.

We have been greatly concerned with the situation in South Vietnam. I recently spent a few days there. The United States is undergoing one of its severest tests in this small country. South Vietnam has been the major recipient of our assistance in the Pacific. The recent events there make it fitting that we examine the American policy toward South Vietnam. In order to put South Vietnam in the proper perspective, I think it is important to look back on its recent past. Vietnam was divided in 1954, after 8 years of terrible civil war. At the time there were very few who thought that South Vietnam had much chance of survival. It was beset by many problems. There were the armies of the rival religious sects; the economy was in complete ruin; and a flood of almost 800,000 destitute refugees had descended from the north. But South Vietnam was able to survive, and, in many ways, its recovery was miraculous.

South Vietnam, led by its President, Ngo Dinh Diem, effectively integrated the vast influx of refugees into its society; the armies of the rival religious groups were overpowered; major agrarian and educational reform plans were carried out; food production was increased impressively; and in general South Vietnam was making progress at a rate that would have been respectable even for a country enjoying peace. It was probably this very progress that brought on a sudden intensification of the guerrilla war directed from North Vietnam. In 1960 this campaign to reduce South Vietnam to ruin was openly announced from Hanoi. The response of the United States to the Communist challenge was immediate. We substantially increased military and economic assistance to South Vietnam. Throughout we have stressed the equal importance of political and social measures if victory was to be achieved. There were no illusions. It was understood that a quick and spectacular victory could not be expected and that it would take persistent effort by the Vietnamese and ourselves over a long period of time. Here I might make

the very observation that we have not been disappointed in the expectation.

To be frank, the war in South Vietnam was being lost in 1961 when we decided to begin our aid buildup. The attacks of the Vietcong guerrillas were increasing in frequency and intensity. Government officials were being assassinated in the countryside at the appalling rate of eight each day. And there was considerable fear that the Communists would soon be able to gain firm control of some of the more remote areas and set up a seat of government which the Communist bloc could recognize and aid.

The U.S. decision to intensify its support of South Vietnam quickly led to an improvement in the situation. We provided additional military equipment, technical advisers, and substantial financial help. By 1962 attacks by the Vietcong guerrillas declined steadily. Roads and rail lines were once again opened to traffic. Officials were no longer so vulnerable to attempts on their lives. And perhaps most important there were no areas where the Vietcong were immune to government penetration. There were many indications of progress, and there seemed to be reason for optimism.

Then suddenly the situation in South Vietnam took a sharp turn for the worse. I am speaking, of course, of the Buddhist crisis. The conflict between the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem and the Buddhists and their sympathizers placed a tremendous stress on a country that was already involved in a critical war with the Communist enemy. It was a very serious matter, and yet President Diem did not take the proper steps to eliminate the problem. He thought he could stamp it out. We made ourselves abundantly clear about our view of the situation. In its official statements the United States stood firmly for religious freedom in its foreign policy as well as in its domestic life. It expressed its deep concern about the Buddhist issue in South Vietnam, not only because of our belief in the ideal of freedom but also because the dispute could only help the Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

We hoped that this issue could be promptly and justly resolved. President Diem, however, did not take the necessary measures to defuse the highly explosive situation. The result was that on November 1 a sudden coup d'etat swept President Diem from power. A new provisional government was set up, headed by a military junta under Gen. Duong Van Minh. During the rebellion President Diem met with a violent and ignominious death. There is something tragic about that because, at one time, he had been a national hero who fought with courage against great odds.

The fact that the government of President Diem has been overthrown does not mean that the problems that existed have now suddenly disappeared into thin air. The provisional government of South Vietnam, however, gives every appearance of offering the kind of leadership the South Vietnamese people want—greater personal freedom and

liberty and more vigorous prosecution of the war against the Communists. It is of course too early to be absolutely certain, but the new government seems extremely conscious of the failures of the preceding regime of President Diem and is taking steps to correct them. The new government has vowed to guarantee fundamental liberties, in particular, freedom of religion and freedom of opinion. It has also promised to rewrite the constitution and pave the way for free elections within the next year. We have been encouraged by such expressions of intent.

We also recognize, however, that South Vietnam remains a country with few democratic traditions. There is the risk that the new leaders will drift toward dictatorial rule. The experiences in other countries where the military have taken over the reins of power should make us view the ruling junta in South Vietnam with caution. And aside from this uncertainty the problem of the Vietcong guerrillas still exists. These dedicated Communists remain very strong and very determined. It appears, in fact, that they have stepped up their attacks in recent days. There is no sign that the Communist bloc is faltering in its support of the Vietcong. We are dealing with an enemy that is patient and that is willing to suffer adversity. There still is going to be a long, hard struggle ahead in South Vietnam before we achieve a final victory.

There are good reasons to be optimistic but cautious about the future. The Vietnamese have demonstrated their capacity for sacrifice and their determination to survive as a free people. In South Vietnam the Communist attempt to dominate the Pacific area has been halted. To appropriate a phrase that President Kennedy used in his state of the Union message, the spearpoint of Communist aggression has been blunted in South Vietnam. It is a statement with an optimistic ring to it, and I think we are justified in feeling hopeful about the situation there. We enjoy an advantage which the Communists have not been able to match. In South Vietnam and in the Pacific area as a whole we are working in free association with free peoples. There is no stronger basis of relationship between countries. It seems to me that the American commitment in the Pacific is essentially a wise one, and it deserves our continuing support.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BURLSON), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for November 14 and 15, 1963, on account of official business in Los Angeles.

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. HECHLER), on account of official business.

Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. HECHLER), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 1 hour, on November 13.

Mr. SIBAL (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 1 hour, on November 21.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. REIFEL), for 15 minutes, on November 14.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. STEED the remarks he made earlier today and to include a tabulation.

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

Mr. BARRY.

Mr. CURTIS.

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

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. LEGGETT.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain submerged lands to the Governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana;

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; and

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1363. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as of the period ended September 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1364. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend 18 U.S.C. 1114, relating to assaults and homicides, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1365. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report on the study of the causes and prevention of injuries, health hazards, and other health and safety conditions in metal and nonmetallic mines conducted pursuant to the act of September 26, 1961, Public Law 87-300; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 10. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 898. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 8986. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 899). 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. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9104. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9105. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the period within which (in certain cases) the adoption of a child by the surviving spouse of an insured individual will entitle such child

to benefits on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9106. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 9107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10-year net operating loss carryover for losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of property by governments of foreign countries and to specify the tax treatment of the recovery of such losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9108. 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. MATHIAS:

H.R. 9109. A bill to prohibit interference with the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9110. A bill to provide for the health care of senior citizens through a program of voluntary medical and hospital insurance and tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 9111. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize loans to small-business concerns injured by their inability to process and market certain products because of disease or toxicity in such products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 9112. A bill to grant officers and employees subject to the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, the opportunity to examine and reply to certain evaluations of their promotion qualifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 9113. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which does not grant to the United States most-favored-nation treatment with respect to the admission of our exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9114. A bill to provide a method for collection of certain erroneous payments of water rents in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9115. A bill for the relief of Georgious Kaloides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 9116. A bill for the relief of Prof. and Mrs. Evangelos Moustakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9117. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael L. Fernandez Rivas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 9118. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 9119. A bill for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 12, 1963, was dispensed with.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

450. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Charles W. Winegarner, legislative secretary, Citizens Congressional Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., to take the initial steps necessary to bring about an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will forever guarantee the protection of our Christian traditions and the right of our people to pray and honor Holy Scripture in their institutions, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday,
October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

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

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted: From the flickering torches of our own understanding, into Thy holy light we would lift the difficult decisions of the public service which are focused within these walls. In the brooding silence of this still moment may the open windows of faith flood our darkness with the radiance of the eternal, that in Thy sunshine's blaze this toiling day may brighter, fairer be.

We give Thee thanks for all interpreters of Thy mind who, with brush or pen or winged words, bring even one more syllable of reality, one more gleam of the truth which makes men free. Clothe our failing flesh with Thy renewing grace, as now we bring our incompleteness to Thy completeness. Grant us inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large designs of this glorious and challenging day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on.

In the dear Redeemer's name we pray.
Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 2073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain submerged lands to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana;

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; and

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison, Col. Erwin Case

Hostetler, Col. Robert Louis Stevenson, and Col. Thomas Roberts White, all of the Adjutant General's Corps, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army in the grade of major general, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and sixty-six postmaster nominations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Otto E. Graham, Jr., to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy, as an associate professor with the grade of commander; and William R. Gill, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

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

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip Elman, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years, from September 26, 1963.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 619, Senate Resolution 218.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 218) conveying to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council congratulations for its contributions to science and technology was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby joins with the President and people of our Nation in conveying to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council of such Academy congratulations and appreciation for the many outstanding contributions made by the Academy during the