

ante which might, in effect, abrogate the Monroe Doctrine by permitting Soviet Communist influence and control to continue in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

31. Also, petition of Mr. Fred C. Koch and other citizens of Wichita, Kans., calling on the Congress to give full and public consideration to any Presidential guarantee

which might, in effect, abrogate the Monroe Doctrine by permitting Soviet Communist influence and control to continue in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Why Should All Other Taxpayers Pay This Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, asking that he disapprove two outlandish proposals now being considered by the Bonneville Power Administration, one of the agencies in his Department. In one instance, the agency is proposing to extend its market area to sell power it does not have in an area that has plenty of power at reasonable rates. The taxpayers would be called upon to furnish around \$100 million for the extension at a time when our national debt exceeds \$300 billion and a deficit of nearly \$12 billion is forecast for the next fiscal year. It is unthinkable that any consideration be given to such a proposal at any time, and particularly so when BPA is currently running into the red at a rate in excess of \$15 million annually.

The second proposal is to extend the payout period and thus permit a new phony paper accounting through which a large part of the present deficits of the agency could be hidden.

In addition, I understand the two proposals taken together are to provide for setting up a basinwide payout scheme, whereby approval of uneconomic and unjustified reclamation projects would be requested on the basis that they could be paid for in the far distant future from presently nonexistent surplus BPA power revenue.

My letter to the Secretary follows:

JANUARY 23, 1963.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the early days of your administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior, I had the feeling we were poles apart on many features of the Federal power program. However, some of your actions in 1962 lead me to believe that you desire to operate in a manner that will protect the taxpayers' interest and also provide a desirable degree of cooperation with both the private and public utility groups.

Recent articles in the press indicate that the Bonneville Power Administration—one of the Interior agencies—is considering two far-reaching proposals that I believe are neither desirable nor justified. I hope that you will come to the same conclusion.

The first of these is a proposal for a new payout system for Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest that would extend the payout on individual power projects to way be-

yond the 50-year payout periods currently in use.

When the funds for the construction of the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest were approved by the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, it certainly was with the understanding that repayments would be based on a 50-year payout period. To now change the basis for repayment of the taxpayers' money appropriated for these power projects would not be keeping faith with the Nation's taxpayers.

The present Bonneville power rate is the lowest in the Nation. This low rate was only made possible by the use of—

1. Over \$2½ billion in taxpayers' money.
2. Interest charge below interest cost of long-term U.S. bonds.
3. No local, State, or Federal tax charge.
4. Excessive allocation of Federal project costs to nonpower uses.

Even with this subsidized low rate, Bonneville is currently operating at an annual deficit in excess of \$15 million. Bonneville contends that it will be ahead of scheduled payout by around \$6 million as of the end of the present fiscal year. Actually, if the payout was based on a proper interest charge in keeping with actual interest cost on long-term U.S. bonds, as it should be, there would be a deficit in payout of around \$100 million.

The Bonneville proposal for a change in the payout basis appears to be an attempt to show a paper reduction in Bonneville's tremendous annual losses. I am surprised that Bonneville would put forth such a proposal.

The Bonneville Act provides for making periodic examination of Bonneville power rates to see that the required revenue to meet the payout is obtained. It seems to me Bonneville should be spending its time, not on studies of how to hide its present losses but on studies of what increases in rates are necessary to provide for the actual interest cost on and the repayment of the taxpayers' funds provided for the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest. Personally, I think Bonneville power rates should also provide for in-lieu-of-tax payments to Federal, State, and local treasuries, equivalent to those being assessed against private utilities.

I am sure that you will not approve this outlandish proposal by Bonneville before it has been considered by the proper committees of Congress.

I cannot believe that the people in the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent, as well as the people in most other areas of our Nation, should be called upon to help provide lower-than-cost power for the Pacific Northwest. Surely, if the Missouri River Basin power rate of 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour and the Colorado River Basin power rate of 6 mills can be absorbed in those areas, there can be no justification for trying to juggle figures in an attempt to justify holding the present BPA rate at a little over 2 mills.

The second Bonneville proposal relates to a proposed extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. From the press reports, it appears that Bonneville and Bureau of Reclamation officials have held a number of public hearings in Idaho to build up support for their scheme. At such hearings, the Federal officials were forced to admit that no economic analysis had been made in the matter. Also, accord-

ing to the press, an Idaho State official has labeled the proposed BPA report "an absolute farce" and said that the report was being made without the necessary background data.

I can agree with the Idaho State official that the BPA proposal is a farce of considerable magnitude, when by Bonneville's own admission it will be short of firm power in its present market area by 1965, and that there are estimated to be increasing deficits in firm power with the total reaching over a million kilowatts by 1970.

The extension of BPA power into southern Idaho appears to be coupled with a proposal for a sort of basinwide payout of reclamation projects to be accomplished by administrative action.

In my opinion, neither of these Bonneville proposals is justified in itself. Taken together, they constitute a brazen attempt to achieve by administrative action some very questionable end results not considered or approved by the Congress. It is an attempt to hide part of Bonneville's large annual deficit, on the one hand, and on the other hand to achieve a basinwide payout system to secure approval of regionwide projects on the claim that they can be paid for from theoretical surplus BPA power revenue in some far distant future.

In order that the other Members of Congress and the people of the Nation may be made aware of what these two bureaucratic agencies in your Department are proposing, I am inserting this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope you can advise me that no serious consideration will be given either of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Federal Bar Association's "Justice" Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of Congress will be pleased to learn about a new series of radio programs entitled "Justice" which has been inaugurated by NBC Radio Monitor in cooperation with the Federal Bar Association.

For about 26 weeks on Saturday or Sunday, on approximately 200 stations around the country, millions of listeners will hear how the Government agencies safeguard the rights of all citizens.

The "Justice" series is intended to give listeners a more intimate knowledge of the various law enforcement agencies in the Federal Government from the Secret Service agent protecting the life of the President to the Food and Drug inspector protecting the interests of the corner drugstore shopper. The objective

to generate a greater respect for the law and those who enforce it by presenting a fuller understanding of the work of these Government agencies.

The National Broadcasting Co., Inc. is to be highly commended for this important public service. I want to especially mention the following representatives of NBC whose vision and creativity made this series possible: Howard Monderer, Esq., NBC Washington attorney and member of the Radio and Television Subcommittee of the Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association; Russ Ward, NBC commentator; Ted Steele, NBC commentator; Bob Mauer, executive producer of Monitor; and Robert Wogan, director, programs, NBC radio network.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD, who is the national president of the Federal Bar Association, is to be congratulated on the work of the association's law observance committee, which arranged the series.

Federal Intrusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received information calling to my attention what appears to be another step toward moving into the field of private enterprise by the Federal Government. This, as often is the case, is done under the guise of being for the public good. Not through the legislative process but rather by rules established by governmental bureaus.

A case in point, I believe, is the proposed rulemaking as it appears in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, relating to electric power transmission lines traversing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

It should be pointed out that federally owned land, whether a large national forest or a tiny post office lot, are held in public trust. As the Government is the servant of the people, so are its lands similarly expressed. It would thus appear reasonable that they should not be used as a pawn in the intrusion of Government into the field of gainful activity.

One can only ask, what is the real motive behind this proposed rule change? Within reasonable bounds of public safety and welfare and the preservation of natural resources from unconscionable dispersion of destruction, Government lands have always been available to persons for traversal upon payment of a fair price. If this statement is correct and I am confident it is, then I ask in all candor, are the proposed rules reasonably appropriate or are they arbitrary and capricious?

Mr. Speaker, today we hear much of back-door referendums and back-door spending. Well, it occurs to me that this

sort of blow by regulation is a kitchen-door approach—a foot-in-the-door entry by Government into the field of gainful production.

Both departments in this particular instance allude to the right to withhold a right-of-way grant if it is not consistent with the Federal marketing program. What is this program? Nowhere in the proposed rule change is it described nor its limits defined.

Once more we tread on dangerous ground. Let us all be more alert to the dangers ahead. Thanks for the opportunity to express myself on this subject.

Eliminate the Two-Price Cotton System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made yesterday before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee which is considering legislation to end the two-price cotton system:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY A. TAYLOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Since 1956 the Federal Government has subsidized the purchase of U.S. cotton by foreign buyers to the extent of 8½ cents per pound, creating a two-price system for U.S. cotton. A substantial quantity of U.S. raw cotton is exported under this subsidy plan and later shipped back into this country in a manufactured form to compete with the output of U.S. mills.

It is not right that foreign buyers should be permitted to continue purchasing American cotton on the world market 8½ cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers can buy the same cotton on the domestic market and then sell the finished products on the American market in competition with the American textile industry.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of cotton products have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 234,000 bales in 1958, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and approximately 672,000 bales in 1962. This upward trend in the main has occurred since 1956 when the two-price cotton system was created.

Since the advent of two-price cotton in 1956 active cotton spindles have dropped 9.1 percent. Textile employment has declined 176,000 workers. Mill consumption of cotton has declined and imports of cotton textiles continue an upward surge.

The textile industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by imports from low-wage countries. The American cotton farmer is being hurt by this decline in the textile industry on which he must depend. A bale of cotton has little value until it is processed. The export market is uncertain so the strength of our Nation's cotton production industry must depend on a healthy American textile industry. The two-price cotton system is not only weakening the textile industry but is hurting the American cotton farmer.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district pointing

out the necessity of early action to eliminate the two-price cotton system. I hope that new cotton legislation can be passed by Congress in time to apply to the 1963 crop. We cannot afford to delay, with textile employment shrinking, and the number of cotton spindles being constantly reduced. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

President Kennedy has characterized the two-price cotton system as "a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future."

We must quickly eliminate the system under which overseas textile mills may buy American cotton at \$42.50 less a bale than U.S. mills must pay.

Congressional Fellowship Program Benefits Fellows and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to participate this year for the first time in the congressional fellowship program of the American Political Science Association. As many of the Members of this House already know, this program provides congressional experience for young journalists, political science teachers, and career Government employees, and also includes a group of fellows from Asia.

I would like to point out that this nationwide fellowship program is the only one operating in Congress which provides congressional offices with the services of professional men, who already have proved their talents in their chosen professions. While the program benefits the fellows in large measure, it also is a boon to the congressional offices able to utilize their services.

I highly commend to my colleagues the nonpartisan congressional fellowship program. And I submit for publication in the RECORD the following list of congressional offices, the names of the fellows working in them this session, and the newspapers, colleges, and Government positions from which the fellows came:

HOUSE OFFICE ASSIGNMENTS—1963 CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts—Augustus Adair, of Gramling College, Louisiana.

HON. NEIL STAEBLER, of Michigan—Dale Arnold, of the Detroit Free Press.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois—Bruce Beacher, of the Department of Agriculture.

HON. RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri—Jerald Bilzin, of the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times.

Republican Policy Committee—Terry Cahug, of the Philippine Senate.

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania—Everett Cataldo, of Ohio State University.

HON. JOHN BRADEMANS, of Indiana—Carl Chief, of the University of Nebraska.

Office of the Speaker of the House—George Condon, of Washington State University.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—Howard Parkas, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California—Fariborz Patemi, of Syracuse University.

Hon. KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia—Daniel Fleming, of Marietta, Ohio, High School.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri—Jerry W. Friedheim, of the Joplin, Mo., Globe.

Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas—George Herzog, of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota—Andrew Hickey, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey—James Hoge, of the Chicago Sun Times.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota—William Jacobson, of NASA.

Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio—Cott Johnson, of Columbia University.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan—S. K. Law, of the Sarawak Information Service.

Government Operations Committee—Thomas King of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania—John Lim, of the Korean Foreign Service.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES, of Maryland—Richard Melton, of the Department of State.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, of California—John Morgan, of the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent.

Hon. JOHN KYL, of Iowa—Shams Nizami, of the Pakistan Ministry of Justice.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida—Kenneth Olson, of Smith College.

Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin—Ronald Steel, of Scholastic Magazine.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama—George W. Tourillot, of the Forest Service.

Hon. PETER FREELINGHUYSEN, JR., of New Jersey—Thomas van der Voort, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan—Bruce Van Dusen, of the Providence, R.I., Journal.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York—George Von der Muhll, of Harvard University.

Office of the majority whip—Eric Wentworth, of the Portland Oregonian.

In an age of cynicism and helter-skelter, he provided a breath of freshness and rest.

He has now passed. But he has left behind an enormous and immortal contribution to the American spirit and culture.

The American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is suffering a great disadvantage in the highly competitive textile market by reason of the advantage enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in the purchase of American cotton. Under the existing law foreign mills can purchase American cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper, or at a cost of \$42.50 less per bale than can the American manufacturer.

Legislation has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] to remove the inequity existing in our two-price cotton program. Yesterday I appeared before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in support of the legislation, and it is my earnest hope that some relief will be secured for the textile industry in the immediate future.

I commend the members of the Agriculture Committee on the approach that the committee is taking to this vital matter, and I include the statement I made before the Cotton Subcommittee yesterday on the two-price cotton program in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, 10TH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 30, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity that is being given for the presentation of my views with reference to the two-price cotton problem. As I understand it, the committee has two bills before it; one of these is the Cooley bill and the other is the Gathings bill. I further understand that these bills are intended generally to be a basis from which to work in arriving at legislation which will serve the public interest.

By way of introduction let me say that I represent a congressional district which has a very keen interest in the entire cotton economy. One of the counties in my district is the second largest cotton producing county in North Carolina, and the district is the largest textile manufacturing congressional district in the United States. It is, therefore, necessary that I take into account the interest of agriculture and industry in what I say and do in dealing with legislation affecting cotton.

The members of this committee are well aware of the genesis and history of the two-price cotton system. It is, therefore, not necessary that I take your time to give any detailed statement as to reasons for the present price differential of 8½ cents per pound, or \$42.50 per bale, which is enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their

competition with the domestic textile industry.

I would also hasten to point out that I believe that it is important to our economy that our cotton farmers continue to receive a fair price for the cotton which they produce upon their farms. I think it is equally important that we take the long-range view and try to protect the cotton farmer from losses of his market in future years. If we confine our action to the picture as it exists today and disregard the future, we will not have served either the farmer or the public generally in a very commendable fashion.

Already your subcommittee has had testimony from economists and other interested parties giving you statistical data with reference to the failure of cotton fiber to keep pace with the growth and use which has been experienced in the use of manmade synthetic fibers. You have had testimony which is uncontradictable setting forth the reasons that there has been a great acceleration in the use of these manmade synthetic fibers in the production of many end products which were formerly produced entirely from cotton fiber.

Let me first deal with the matter of the future of the cotton farmer as it relates itself to the question of eliminating the two-price cotton system.

On November 13, 1961, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a letter to the President of the United States, recommended that the President request the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with reference to the effect of the two-price cotton system upon the cotton programs being carried out under the supervision of the Secretary. I know that no one would even suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture in making this request was speaking as a representative of industry. It is abundantly clear that his concern was for the future of the American cotton farmer. His request to the President was made solely with the view of serving what he deemed to be the best interest of our cotton agricultural economy.

In his letter the Secretary pointed out that the programs and operations for upland and long-staple cotton which were being threatened by the two-price system included our price support programs, acreage allotment, marketing quota program, and the export subsidy program for cotton and cotton products.

The Secretary pointed out that during 1961 525,500 bales of cotton were used to manufacture cotton textiles imported into the United States and that this was a new high. He further pointed out that for the 5-year period ending in 1960 there had been an average annual rate increase of 69,000 bales of cotton imported into the United States in the form of cotton textiles.

It was also interesting to note that Secretary Freeman found that the aggregate mill consumption of cotton in the United States had shown a decline in the average of about 29.3 pounds of cotton per person in the 1946-55 period to about 23.9 pounds per person in the period between 1956 and 1960 and that imports of cotton textiles had increased from about the equivalent of 0.5 pound per person in 1955 to approximately 1.4 pounds per person in 1960. These findings by the Department of Agriculture properly alarmed them with reference to the future of the cotton programs heretofore enacted by the Congress.

Related to this problem and its threat to the farmer is the rapid growth in the total textile output of goods made of synthetic fibers. Wherever possible, textile mills have been shifting into the use of synthetic fibers or blends of such fibers with cotton in such a manner as to turn their spindles and looms away from cotton textile productions. This has been done for several reasons, but primarily because of the price situation. Of

Eulogy for Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of Robert Frost, dean of American poets, and know that all my colleagues in this House join me in mourning his loss.

Frost was close to nature, and wrote of it as perhaps no other American poet ever has. His poetry was quiet and deep and brought the spirit of nature close. All Americans are familiar with the fields and woods of New England as Frost described them. We all know of his immortal, "Road Not Taken," in which the poet faced two imaginary roads. He took "the one less traveled." Few men indeed travel the road of art, and fewer still travel it with such success as Frost did. His poetry came to be read and loved more than that of any living poet in our country.

course, there has been a great deal more attention given to research and development and promotion of synthetic fabrics than has been given to cotton fabric. Another factor which enters into this shift to synthetics is the uniformity and quality of the synthetic fiber as compared to the lack of uniformity in cotton, together with a predictable source of supply at predictable price rates in a manner not enjoyed by industry when dealing with cotton.

I am told by many of our manufacturers that in recent years this item of quality of cotton fiber has been a major consideration with them in the operation of their plants. Within the past few days members of the textile community have told me that it is most difficult to find cotton grown in the eastern part of the United States which measures up to the requirements for the production of fine-combed yarns. They attribute this to a multiplicity of factors. Some of these factors are the production by the farmer with the view of producing quantity rather than quality because of our supported price situation; the use of mechanical pickers and subsequent overginning of cotton; and the weather elements which always enter into the cotton-producing experience of our farmers. These are problems which do not face the producer of synthetic fiber who can bring forth his production with chemical processes under fully regulated climatic and plant facilities.

So, the cotton farmer today is threatened in his domestic market by the rapid growth of the synthetic fiber industry with its advantage in price, quality, and convenience.

The legislation that the committee has under consideration would approach this price differential problem by an additional subsidy which would reflect itself ultimately in the price paid by the domestic textile manufacturer for the cotton fiber which he processes in his plant. Candor compels me to state that from my contact with industry people that they do not feel that they should be paid a direct subsidy at the expense of the taxpayers. Their reasoning, in my judgment, is sound when they say that they do not want to be accused of seeking a direct subsidy for themselves when they have no responsibility for creating the situation which makes an artificial price equalization program necessary. They correctly aver that the two-price system results from the action of our Government in placing artificial prices upon domestically grown cotton through the price support program at such a level as to make our American cotton sell at such prices as to remove it from competition in the world market with foreign-grown cotton. They contend that it was not by any action on their part that the price of American cotton has reached the level at which it has become necessary for our Government to place a price on our cotton in the foreign market place at a level of 8½ cents per pound or \$42.50 per bale cheaper than the same American cotton may be bought by an American manufacturer.

The American cotton textile manufacturer, however, does take the position that he should be permitted to purchase American-grown cotton at the same price that the same can be purchased by a foreign textile manufacturer. He further feels that it is the obligation of his Government to bring about this result and that this should be done in such way as not to have a direct subsidy paid by the Government into the hands of the textile manufacturer and subject him to the accusation of taking a handout from his Government. Basically, gentlemen, I believe that it is the attitude of our American textile people that they are entitled to be dealt with equitably and fairly by their own Government. So long as the price differential in the raw material which they use in their plants exists by reason of Government action, equity and justice will not have been met

out to this important segment of our economy.

I would also like to present for your consideration another contention which I do not believe has been presented to this committee in connection with its consideration of the problem of two-price cotton. This relates to the effect that it would have upon the pocketbook of the American taxpayer.

I know that there are those who apprehend that the subsidy approach encompassed in the bills now under consideration would constitute an excessive burden on the American taxpayer. I believe, however, that it can accurately be said that when we talk in terms of subsidy from the taxpayers that we are engaging in illusory conversation. This is true for the reason that it seems logical that a reduction in the cost of cotton to the American mills to the extent of 3½ cents a pound would result in a substantial price reduction in the end product which is purchased by the American consumer. In fact, when profit margins are considered in the various stages of manufacture and distribution, the reduction in raw cotton prices of 8½ cents per pound could result in savings to the consumer equal to 17 cents per pound, or in excess of \$700 million annually.

You will no doubt immediately ask how this is possible. Consider with me some of the basic facts which lead to this conclusion.

The cotton textile industry is one of the most competitive industries in America. A study of mill margin reports over a period of years indicates that the price of cotton tends to follow closely trends in the price of market cotton. Any reduction in the price of raw cotton would be reflected in reduced raw material costs to processors of cotton textile products and would ultimately pass on to the consumer. In the industry there is a tendency for a savings at an early stage in the productive and distributive process which is magnified on an absolute basis through later stages, resulting in the maintenance of a more or less constant percentage price.

During the early stages of a reduction in raw cotton prices this reduced cost of the end product to the ultimate consumer would not, in my judgment, dramatically present itself. This is because of a general tendency of prices to remain at a certain level pending the industrywide experience of reduced production costs to the extent necessary to make the normal competitive practices come into play. You can well understand that this delayed action, insofar as price reduction to the ultimate consumer is concerned, would be a natural experience because of the considerable period of time involved between the opening of the bale of cotton and its being converted into yarn, and then fabric, and then cut and sewed into wearing apparel, and then going into the retail market. In the case of wearing apparel this could vary from 3 to 8 months from the opening of the bale until the date that the apparel is placed on the retail counter. So, when I project the thought that the ultimate consumer—the American taxpayer—would realize a saving in excess of the so-called subsidy, I would want you to understand that I am not predicting that it would be an overnight occurrence.

As a basis for this projection I would point out that in the years 1958-61 approximately 4.2 billion pounds of raw cotton was consumed in the United States. Of this total 0.6 billion pounds went into industrial goods, and 3.6 billion pounds went into consumer goods, including 1 billion pounds for home furnishings and 0.4 billion pounds for other consumer-type products. Experts estimate that a reduction of 5 cents per pound in the production of raw cotton would result in a minimum saving to ultimate consumers in nonindustrial goods of \$180 million per year. These same people state that in their judgment the savings to the ultimate consumer

of industrial fabrics would be even greater and that it would probably amount to \$30 million per year as a minimum. They state that as a broad overall figure that it can be assumed that the percentage of markup on the value of goods moving through manufacturing and distributive channels beyond the stage of first consumption of cotton can be taken as approximately 100 percent. This would mean that while the savings to the ultimate American consumer flowing from a 5-cent-per-pound reduction in raw cotton would eventually be a minimum of \$210 million per year that the more probable figure is \$420 million per year.

Based upon an estimate that the saving to the consumer resulting from each 1-cent-per-pound reduction in the price of raw cotton would amount to \$84 million in the United States and that the saving can be estimated on the most conservative possible basis at no less than \$42 million a year, it appears that it is probable that a reduction of 8½ cents per pound would bring to the ultimate consumers in America a saving of \$714 million.

If these projections from expert observers are at all accurate, it is readily apparent that in the final analysis the American taxpayer will be benefited rather than burdened by the equalization of the price which he pays for cotton with that paid by his foreign competitor.

Another benefit that would no doubt flow from elimination of the two-price cotton system would be the improvement of our competitive situation in the world market for finished yarns and fabrics of the type having a high cotton content. As you no doubt know, coarse carded yarns and cotton fabrics made of that type yarn have a high cotton content which means that the ultimate price of this type product is more greatly influenced by the price of cotton than is true in fine combed yarns and products made of that type yarn. American manufacturers of these types of textile products have particularly felt the cutthroat competition from foreign textile manufacturers, and the elimination of the price differential of 8½ cents per pound on cotton would open up new foreign markets for our domestic manufacturers because of the ability that they would then have to meet the lower cost of foreign-produced yarn and fabric. Generally such foreign-made products are quoted in America at approximately 10 cents per pound lower than domestic prices. The 8½-cent-per-pound reduction in the cost of cotton to the American manufacturer, together with the loss resulting from waste, would make the American manufacturer more nearly competitive on the foreign market and would clearly make him competitive with the foreign producer in the American market.

It is apparent that once we have attained this goal of unquestioned competitive equality for the American textile market and possible competitive opportunity for the foreign textile market, we will see a greater demand for the product of our cotton farmers and at the same time will be creating American jobs for our own people.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many aspects of this problem that I would like to discuss with this subcommittee, but out of consideration for others who have come here to testify I do not feel that I should consume more of your time. Let me conclude, however, with the expression of my sincere hope and the hope of the people that I am privileged to represent, that this committee will act with real dispatch in bringing out legislation which will bring about equality of opportunity for our American industry and the people who earn their livelihoods in the American textile industry insofar as cotton pricing problems are concerned.

I have said that I hope you will act with dispatch because this is essential. You

gentlemen are familiar with the devastating effect that the uncertainty of the course of action which the Congress will take has brought about at all levels of the cotton industry. Cotton purchases have been limited by industry to the bare minimum, and the purchase of finished textile products by the customers of the mills are being held at a minimum awaiting the outcome of the matter which you are considering today. Mills are already curtailing because of this condition. Certain types of textile products are becoming more difficult to buy because of this uncertainty. For these and other reasons with which you are familiar I believe it is imperative that we give to the American people an answer on this question at the earliest possible date.

In closing I express to you again my deep appreciation for your willingness to hear me today in my effort to present to you the need, as I see it, for legislation eliminating the unfavorable differential which has been forced upon our domestic textile industry.

Thank you.

The Agricultural Program—Address by the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 22, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered before the National Limestone Institute an excellent speech relating to certain phases of our agricultural program. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, AT ITS BANQUET ON JANUARY 22, 1963

It's a great pleasure and a privilege to be here with you tonight to enjoy this very generous hospitality, and, I might add, to have the opportunity to speak to so many Members of the Senate and the House so early in the session; but according to ground rules, I understand they don't have much chance to talk back. I assure you that this is a very desirable situation, particularly for a Secretary of Agriculture. This is a most impressive gathering and it provides a very real opportunity to visit with you a bit about matters of common concern that we share. In agriculture and soil improvement and in the modern roads so vital to rural America and agriculture—the farm-to-market roads—we have very real and common interests to share.

I thought I might direct my remarks this evening to some of the great changes taking place in rural America in this rapidly growing, expanding, and changing land of ours—to the broad subject in which I know we share a very real common interest—conservation. And I'd like to preface my remarks by saying at the outset that I dislike the words "soil bank," "diverted acres," "idle acres," and the whole concept of nonuse that they represent. To me these terms and the practices they describe are the direct opposite of true conservation. For true conservation in a real and meaningful sense means serving people—the use of land and

water to meet human needs now and in the future. Unless we use the land and water to satisfy human needs—what purpose does it serve?

So the question is: Are we making the best and wisest use of our land and water to serve our national well-being?

I think we all would agree here this evening. The answer is "No."

But I believe we are moving in the right direction. Your organization, the National Limestone Institute, has contributed mightily to a more rapid movement toward the goal of real conservation. And I believe that in the future you will continue to play a critical role in pointing the way to proper and beneficial land use—true conservation in this great and changing land of ours.

Today and for the foreseeable future, our American family farm agriculture will be able to feed our people at home and to make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world. I make this most significant statement not as conjecture, or even as an estimate, but rather as a simple statement of fact.

From this statement of our very great potential for production flow some other very, very important facts that I think we need to keep in mind as we work together to chart the path to take maximum advantage of the changes, to apply our resources, for the betterment of the lives of our people; and, yes, for the building of a better world, for the road to a peaceful world is surely the building of a better world for people everywhere.

At home, this great miracle of abundance which we enjoy has meant great things to our people.

It has meant that the average farmworker now feeds himself and 26 others—freeing the vast majority of our people for productive work of other kinds.

Food in these United States today is the best bargain we have. A lot of people don't know that. A lot of housewives don't know that. The food budget of the average family accounts for less than 19 percent of the family's income after taxes. In 1952, Americans were spending 23 percent of their income for food—and in 1947 it was 27 percent. The people of this country are getting better food, better packaged, and more of it pre-prepared—but at less real cost than any people, anywhere in the history of the world.

In the different countries of Western Europe—where living standards are relatively high—consumers spend anywhere from 30 to 45 percent of their after-tax incomes for food. In Russia the proportion is well over 50 percent.

Sometimes I think that the people of other countries have a finer appreciation of America's abundance than we do—because they have food problems. The hungry of the world know about American agricultural abundance because food for peace is supplementing the food resources of more than 100 countries. The Iron Curtain countries know it—and their leaders are struggling to find a formula for a similar success.

Every single country behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—and the Sugar Cane Curtain too—is having food problems.

Just 4 years ago Fidel Castro assumed power in Cuba. At that time farm production accounted for over one-third of the national income and employed about two-fifths of the labor force. Food supplies were adequate for the country's people, and farm exports brought in most of Cuba's foreign exchange earnings.

The situation today is quite different, I assure you. Cuba is in the midst of an agricultural crisis—and there is no change in sight. There simply is not enough food—and per capita consumption has dropped a fifth since 1958.

Russia is having its food problems—a failure of communism that even Khrushchev

freely admits. Production is far behind the country's goals—especially for grains, meat and dairy products. And in Red China tonight, where agriculture has broken down, millions of people go hungry. East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria—you name it—every one of the Communist countries has a serious food shortage problem.

There has been no such problem in this generation in the United States because of the productive ability of the American family farm—the most successful agrarian institution ever developed.

But this miracle of abundance of producing more and more on fewer and fewer acres has also meant sharp and very quick changes in the face of rural America. And these changes have brought with them a great deal of hardship.

Farmers and others associated with them in rural America have suffered unfairly as a product of these changes.

In most recent years, American farmers have produced 5 or 6 percent more food than we could consume or give away. And without adjustment programs, overproduction would have much more severe consequences. Individual farmers acting alone can do little to prevent overproduction.

Overproduction in a free enterprise economy means, of course, sharp downward pressure on prices. The result is the cost-price squeeze we are all so familiar with. In the decade of the 1950's, net realized farm income declined more than a tenth at a time when other incomes were rising steadily.

Many family farmers were pushed off the land. In the 5 census years between 1954 and 1959, the total number of farms declined 15 percent.

And it wasn't only farmers who suffered. I know that many of you in this room live in and serve small rural communities. Others of us have revisited the small towns we know. And we see many of these communities have fallen into the backwater of America's economic growth.

In many of them, agriculture was once—but no longer is—an economic mainstay. Many of these towns were once—but no longer are—bustling centers of opportunity in business and agriculture.

There are many ways to measure what has happened.

You can measure it in the changing character of our population. In the decade of the 1950's, our national population increased by 29 million people. Yet, population declined in most towns of fewer than 2,500, and increased only slightly in those of 2,500 to 10,000. The farm population that supports these smaller towns and cities fell off by a third.

You can measure it in the lack of adequate opportunities for education. Urban people over 25 years of age have on the average a fourth more formal schooling than do their farm counterparts.

You can measure it in the lack of job opportunities. Underemployment in rural areas is the equivalent of around 4 million entirely unemployed.

You can measure it in the unwillingness of younger people—especially the more ambitious—to remain and work in their hometowns. For many rural communities, this rapid outmigration of the young is particularly tragic. Opportunity could have been created locally as well as at a distance.

You can measure the rural problem in the incidence of actual poverty. More than half the poverty in the United States today is in rural America—a rural America which has at the same time created a worldwide success story in food production.

Yet these communities, even where economic problems are most acute, all have important resources—both natural and human resources. They deserve the best efforts we can give to their problems—through every public and private source available.

Change is inexorable. We may disagree as to whether or not a particular change is beneficial or otherwise, but we cannot disagree with the fact that change takes place. It is a law of life. Yet the threat to rural America does not lie in scientific and technical change itself. The threat lies in the failure to direct changes growing out of that progress in ways to meet the real needs and wants of all the people. Change must be shaped to work for people—not against them.

And I sincerely believe that if we are alert and willing to act, we can shape these changes so that rural America as well as urban America will prosper and benefit from the production miracle that is American agriculture.

There is no reason for income in rural America to lag—and I think we ought to be challenged as long as the income in rural America lags so significantly behind that in the urban areas. Even though we've seen in these past 2 years an increase of gross income in agricultural of over \$2 billion a year, which has reflected itself in a more prosperous business community, in higher bank deposits in rural towns, in farm machinery sales, in the sale of household appliances, and many, many other things we can name. Even so, this \$2 billion income increase, or \$1.1 billion net increase, still leaves per capita agricultural income only about 60 percent of that in our urban areas. And until we have real parity of income, by that I mean equality of income between rural and urban America, there is work to be done—the kind of work I know this institute seeks to contribute to. It all comes down again to conservation—to proper land use in the most meaningful sense of that word.

We know that we don't need all of our land and water to produce the food and fiber we require. During the past 2 years, we have been using for crop production less than two-thirds of the land we classify as cropland. With acre yields growing more rapidly than population year by year, we know that we can produce all the food and fiber we need with much less cropland than we have available.

At the same time, we do need land and water for other things. We have growing needs for recreation, for timber, for grazing, for livestock, for industry. The expanding urban character of our population indicates a growing urgency for the preservation and use of green areas around cities and towns, or simply open spaces to look at, climb on, walk through, or meditate in.

We are a people with a pioneer tradition. Open space is a part of that heritage, and it is essential that we maintain the opportunity for Americans everywhere to make use of space as one of our natural resources.

So now as true conservationists, our challenge is clear—to make the land adjustments needed, we must work not idle, use not bank, apply not divert, our great natural resources of land and water.

We must seek alternative land and water uses that will serve our people in worthwhile ways, now and in the future. This isn't an easy proposition.

It is relatively easy to generalize about, but to do it in a free economy, to do it in an economic manner, that will contribute to the economic well-being and the standard of living of the people in the city and the country alike, is something that taxes our ingenuity, and that will tax our foresight, our thinking and our cooperation. But it is something, I believe, that can be done, and I believe that progress is beginning, or at least we see the glimmerings and the beginning of things that might be.

And as a part of this, we have developed a program in the Department which we call the rural areas development program. You may see more of these words—"rural areas development," "the rural areas development program." The philosophy behind this program

is the effective use and adjustment of our great natural resources. Incidentally, as many of you may know, your president, Bob Koch, is a member of the national advisory committee on rural areas development, has been most faithful and attentive, and has contributed significantly as we've attempted to think our way forward and to test and to try and to experiment in terms of trying to move in the direction of real use and meaningful adjustment.

The rural areas development program is a blending and coordination of all available resources—private and public, local, State, and National—toward the common goal of a prosperous rural America.

Let me describe a number of things we have done in the Department. One has been a departmental reorganization. With us here this evening is Assistant Secretary John Baker, the man who directs the rural areas development program. Under him are related programs that contribute to the overall rural areas development purpose, mainly the Forest Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. Playing a very vital part in all of this, too, are agencies working closely with him—particularly the Federal Extension Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Many of you know the Administrator of that program, whom you honored a year ago, Horace Godfrey and his assistant, Ed Jaenke, and their ladies who are with us here tonight. They work through Assistant Secretary John Duncan, whom many of you know. I mention this because I would like to emphasize that the rural areas development program is a top-priority effort within the Department of Agriculture, and I can assure you that it will continue to command our best energy, our know-how and all our resources.

In this description of rural areas development, I would like to pay tribute to the Members of the Congress here tonight. They have contributed vitally to what was highly significant legislation in the farm bill passed last year. You know the commodity programs—where there is always strong controversy and very heated feelings on occasion, and I am sorry to say sometimes partisanship—tend to attract the most attention. I would hazard a prediction that 10 years from now, or maybe 5, commodity programs will be long since forgotten. But the action in land and water conservation, in programs for credit, in providing cost-sharing and adjustment payments under long-term cropland conversion programs, in the authority to initiate rural renewal projects through technical assistance and loans to local public agencies will mark this act as one of the most significant in the annals of history.

Regardless of what we may do, however, and we're proud of the Department of Agriculture and the dedicated able people in it, and despite what Congress in their wisdom may do, any rural areas development program rests on local people and local leadership. Happily we have found a great deal of enthusiasm in local communities. Today there are rural development committees in 1,800 counties—and they are preparing thousands of projects that will help create the conditions essential for economic growth.

One of the most encouraging things about the program is the growing evidence that Federal funds can be used to stimulate a many-fold investment from other sources. In other words, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by bringing about the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources.

For example, the Rural Electrification Administration surveyed about 400 industrial and commercial projects that REA borrowers had helped to launch. It was found that

the 400 projects are being financed by more than \$250 million of private capital compared with only about \$15 million from Federal sources.

Incidentally, it is anticipated that those 400 projects will directly create some 30,000 new jobs—and indirectly, another 22,000.

Another, much broader survey discloses that throughout the country 133,000 jobs have been created or saved already as a result of rural areas development activity.

A key role in the rural areas development program is being carried out through cost-sharing under the agricultural conservation program. In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, agricultural conservation program was placed on a permanent basis for the first time—which is quite a landmark for the program. In the past, agricultural conservation program has been known as a "continuing" program that had to be renewed periodically by the Congress. This will no longer be necessary.

The 1962 act also amended the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for long-term agreements under the agricultural conservation program, to help farmers change their cropping systems and land use and to develop soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources. And it authorized USDA to share with local public bodies up to half the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for small watershed projects to be dedicated to public recreation.

The Department is already developing pilot projects under this legislation—to help farmers shift unneeded cropland to other uses. Last month, we named 41 counties in 13 States for long-term test programs to shift land out of crops and tame hay. The main idea is to convert this land to grass and forest—although water storage, wildlife habitat, and recreation uses will also be encouraged. In addition, other counties throughout the Nation are eligible to participate in a pilot program to convert cropland to income-producing recreation uses.

In some States, the test program will be tied in with small watershed projects authorized under Public Law 566. Such watershed work is underway or approved in 13 of the 41 counties where conversions to grass and trees are being started.

Farmers who are interested in this cropland conversion program will be helped through adjustment payments, cost sharing on conservation practices, and technical assistance. Farmers can enter into long-range agreements to shift land under plans which they have developed in cooperation with their local soil conservation districts. In addition, farmers or groups of farmers will also be able to obtain credit to help pay their share of the cost of conversion.

As I said, this pilot program, under the leadership of our ASC committees, is limited to this year. Our intention is to expand this cropland conversion program very rapidly and widely.

So far pilot projects in cropland conversion and recreation are limited to an expenditure of \$10 million. The extension of the conservation reserve authorized by Congress is for only 1 year. So this is something the Congress will again turn its attention to. The basic legislation and direction is there. The implementation to carry forward the blueprint is something that will be in active consideration in the days ahead as we seek to convert and use land for new purposes which serve the changing needs of all people.

This, then, is a kind of quick recap of an important new thrust and direction in rural America. I do not suggest that this is a complete answer for all problems, but I would suggest to you that it is a meaningful beginning.

May I then conclude this address as I began by repeating: The answer is not to idle

land, but rather to use it to meet other needs, and, as we do so, to provide constructive opportunities in areas other than farming for those who remain by choice in the rural community. There is important work to be done by such people. Our challenge is to work out the proper balance—a better word is conservation—the proper use of land and water to serve people.

This is an exciting enterprise—and 1963 is a key year. I invite each of you to look at your own community in terms of these opportunities—and to give your cooperation to these long-term programs for conservation and rural development. The reward will be great and long lasting to rural communities and to the Nation.

**Part 4: Let's Keep the Record Straight—
A Selected Chronology of Cuba and
Castro, March 12, 1962–September 13,
1962**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now offer part 4 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro, as my continuing effort to refresh the memories of the Congress and of the American people on the course of events taking place between Cuba and the United States and which now are a part of our modern history.

We find detailed here the desperation of Premier Fidel Castro in his efforts to cope with economic chaos in Cuba. We find the Cuban youth being urged to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and their Premier promising them the glories of a "more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

Then we find on March 28, 1962, the first U.S. State Department reports of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

We find \$62 million in ransom demanded for Cuban prisoners taken during the abortive uprising of the exiles.

And we find the odd spectacle of President Kennedy announcing that these Cuban prisoners are really a responsibility of the United States because they were "trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration" and given the "signal to let them go by the Kennedy administration." However, he states the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. And the thought occurs to us that the American public then must pick up the pieces and be responsible for Government actions of which they were never really officially informed—and at this late date still have not been—if we analyze the President's thinking correctly. And our thoughts further turn to the four Americans known to be imprisoned in Red China: Hugh F. Redmond, Richard G. Fechteau, John T. Downey, and Bishop James E. Walsh. These men are known to be political hostages and our State Department de-

clares their release and return to this country to be an issue of utmost importance.

We remember, too, the 21 prisoners of war who first refused repatriation after the Korean war was ended. Ten finally became disillusioned with dialectical materialism and returned to this country. One died in Red China. And 10 still remain there.

We think of the 389 American soldiers still officially regarded as missing out of the original figure of 944—and of whom no trace, report, or record has been found—since the Korean war.

And we finally think of the eight American prisoners—one being held in the Soviet Union, three held in the Soviet Zone of Germany, one held in Czechoslovakia, and another still thought to be held in Czechoslovakia.

And we wonder how the families and friends of these American prisoners feel and if perhaps the American public should not be reminded that these men, too, were caught in a Communist trap and deserve to be considered a national responsibility by the public and the American Government.

In this portion of the chronology we find reports of weapons, ammunition, and propaganda in the form of a Communist-authored book on how to wage guerrilla warfare are being sent to nine Latin American countries from Cuba. Then we learn of 20 Soviet ships carrying from 3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians, goods and weapons, arriving in Cuba—with an acknowledgement 2 days later by the President that this was indeed true.

This recalls to mind the press conference on November 29, 1961, in which President Kennedy declared that the United States would be "most concerned" if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American state. And that prior to the news report of the shipments to Latin American countries of weapons and propaganda, the Guatemalan Government—on March 20, 1962—formally accused Cuba in a note to the Organization of American States of aiding an uprising in Guatemala.

The chronology details our military callup of 150,000 members of the Reserves to active duty and that three of our Republican Senators proposed amendments to the Presidential request for authority for the callup, which would give him added authority to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba, if it became necessary.

The American public, along about this time, was admonished by the President to "keep both their nerve and their heads." This brings to mind Plutarch, who in commenting on a man being praised for his foolhardy bravery, stated:

There is a wide difference between true courage and a mere contempt of life.

And this quotation—in a nutshell—describes the difference in the attitude of a truly republican form of government—and the Communist form of government—toward human life.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, MARCH 12 TO OCTOBER 24, 1962, BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

March 12, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro announces nationwide food and soap rationing to become effective March 19. He links shortages of food and consumer goods to a "brutal economic blockade" against Cuba. He denounces "Yankee imperialism" for making "desperate efforts" to destroy the Cuban revolution. He also says that "we have the shame of not being able to fulfill promises because we made subjective analyses" and because many of Cuba's most skilled workers were either "taken away by imperialism" or "driven away by our mistrust although they could have been won over."

March 14, 1962: Premier Castro (at a University of Havana rally) urges Cuban youth to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and says that the young in Cuba will some day live "in another more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

March 17, 1962: Premier Castro (in a television broadcast) declares that "the revolution needs to revise all the revolutionary nuclei and all the political apparatus * * * to do away with the errors and abuses and to gain good performance." He singles out those "who think they are more revolutionary than anybody and have the right to mistreat and humiliate others." He also criticizes the watchdog defense committees set up to guard against counterrevolution (which exist in every big city and throughout the countryside) as having committed injustices. "Observers linked Premier Castro's statements to the advancement of Communist Party assumption of authority in the Castro regime at Havana" (New York Times, Mar. 17, 1962).

March 20, 1962: Guatemala formally accuses Cuba of aiding an uprising in Guatemala: the charge is made in a note to the President of the Council of the Organization of American States.

March 22, 1962: House Government Operations Committee urges the U.S. Government to press a \$99.4 million claim against Cuba for seizure of the Nicaraguan nickel plant in Oriente Province, because the plant had been operated by the U.S. Government.

March 23, 1962: U.N. Security Council rejects by a vote of 7 to 2 a Cuban charge that the Organization of American States violated the U.N. Charter in barring Cuba from the inter-American system. The Security Council also rejects by a vote of 7 to 4 a Cuban request that the question of the legality of the OAS action be submitted to the World Court.

On the same day, Fidel Castro and his brother Raul are named to the two top posts in the Secretariat of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization, the 25-man directorate which is to set up a single political party in Cuba. The Premier is named the organization's first secretary and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro is named second secretary.

March 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a radio-television broadcast) denounces Anibal Escalante, a long-time Cuban Communist leader, for having brought "real chaos to all the country" and having "tried to create an apparatus to pursue personal ends." He adds that Escalante has been "separated" and that he had much to do with inspiring a spirit of "sectarianism," leading many to believe that the only ones who could be given important posts "were the old and militant revolutionaries."

March 28, 1962: U.S. State Department issues report of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba; it estimates that Cuba has received

\$100 million of military aid to train several hundred Cuban pilots in Czechoslovakia and provide 50 to 75 MIG jet fighters, and provide modern weapons for Cuba's ground forces of 300,000 men. These weapons include: 150 to 250 heavy and medium tanks, 50 to 100 assault guns, 500 to 1,000 field artillery pieces, 500 to 1,000 antiaircraft artillery guns, 500 mortars, 200,000 small arms, and some patrol vessels and torpedo boats.

March 29, 1962: Government begins trial (at Principe prison, in a suburb of Havana) of 1,182 prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion last April.

On the same day, the Council of the Organization of American States votes by 16 to 0, with 3 abstentions, to express a firm hope that the rebel prisoners will have every legal guarantee of their trial.

April 3, 1962: Ecuador severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, and becomes the 15th nation of the Americas to do so.

April 8, 1962: Military tribunal sentences each of the prisoners to 30 years imprisonment, but offers to free them on the payment of a total of \$62 million in ransom. The ransom is set at \$500,000 each for the 3 leaders of the invasion force, \$100,000 for 221 others, and \$50,000 or \$25,000 for the remaining 995 men.

April 11, 1962: Pravda (official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party) endorses the expulsion of Escalante by Premier Castro for trying to further his personal ambitions.

The Cuban exiles report from Havana that Cuba will release 54 sick and wounded prisoners, in return for ransom payment.

On the same day, President Kennedy (at a news conference) declares that the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. "[These men] were trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration * * *. Can the U.S. Government * * * wash its hands of them? We think not. Though the idea of bartering with Castro for human lives is deeply repulsive, the United States still has a responsibility for those lives."

April 28, 1962: Premier Castro demands that the committee pay the \$2.5 million ransom within 1 week; if not, he states that the remaining prisoners will be sent to the Isle of Pines to begin serving terms of 30 years imprisonment.

May 14, 1962: Tass (Soviet news agency) reports that the Soviet-Cuban trade agreement for 1962 is to be increased to about \$750 million under an agreement signed in Moscow, a level of trade almost 40 percent higher than in 1961. The supplementary agreement calls for the supply of considerable quantities of wheat, corn, beans, fats, canned meat, and milk.

June 3, 1962: New York Herald Tribune states that President Kennedy has been given an intelligence report of clandestine movements of rifles, automatic weapons and ammunition from four dispersal centers in Cuba to nine Latin American countries: Nicaragua, Honduras, Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay and Bolivia. The report asserts that the arms have been accompanied by hundreds of copies of Maj. Ernesto Guevara's book, "Guerrilla Warfare."

June 16, 1962: Government parades tanks, troops, and artillery through the streets of Cardenas, a port 90 miles east of Havana, in response to popular demonstrations over food scarcities. President Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado denounces (at a political rally in Cardenas) "wretched counterrevolutionary provocations."

July 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a speech at a celebration in Santiago de Cuba of the 9th anniversary of his 26th of July Movement) declares that President Kennedy "is set on launching an attack against our country." He announces to thousands of

workers that rationing will be extended from food to shoes and clothing.

August 6, 1962: James Donovan, the U.S. lawyer representing the Cuban Families Committee, announces the opening of a public drive to raise the \$62 million ransom required to free the 1,180 Cuban rebel prisoners. (Donovan is the American who arranged for the exchange of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers for convicted Soviet spy Rudolf Abel.)

August 20, 1962: Press reports state that between July 27 and July 31, 20 Soviet ships arrived at 4 ports in Cuba—3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians and large quantities of goods and weapons are said to have been landed. "The equipment may include ground-to-air missiles, largely defense weapons. There apparently is transportation, electrical and construction equipment, radar vans and mobile generators. These appear to be going into coastal and air defense."

August 22, 1962: President Kennedy acknowledges, at a press conference, that Communist "supplies and technicians of rather intensive quantity in recent weeks" have been landing in Cuba.

August 24, 1962: Several buildings in Havana are damaged by shellfire from two small powerboats sent from Miami by the Student Revolutionary Directory, an exile group of former University of Havana students. The U.S. State Department states that the U.S. Government was not involved in the raid and had no prior knowledge of it.

August 28, 1962: Tass, the Soviet press agency, reports that the volume of shipments from the Soviet Union to Cuba in 1962 will be double that of 1961, and that 10 Soviet ships and 5 ships of West German, Norwegian, Greek and Italian registry are on the way to Cuba.

August 29, 1962: President Kennedy (at a press conference) states that United States has no intention of invading Cuba "at this time." He adds that "the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba." He declares that the United States has already been in consultation with NATO nations whose shipping firms have chartered vessels to the Soviet Union to haul military goods to Cuba. "Even to consider [blockade or invasion] as possibilities requires far greater Latin American sympathy for Washington's attitude than now exists."

August 31, 1962: U.S. Navy plane on a training flight over international waters near Cuba is fired on by two naval vessels. The White House announces that the ships are believed to be Cuban, and that U.S. aircraft and ships have been authorized to use "all means necessary" to protect themselves against any similar attack in the future.

September 2, 1962: Soviet Union announces (in a communique issued on the talks between Minister of Industries Ernesto Guevara and Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders) that it has agreed to supply arms to Cuba and to provide specialists to train Cuba's armed forces. The communique states that the arms are intended to meet the "threats" of "aggressive imperialist quarters," a watershed in hemispheric history. It was a power move in the cold war by the Soviet Union, as if a pawn had been advanced on a global chessboard. It was also a daring and defiant gambit by Premier Castro to strengthen his regime and his revolution. Cuba now cannot be invaded * * * without killing Russians. The added dangers of an invasion are clear. Far more than Cuba and Fidel Castro are involved. The wrecked Cuban economy will take a long time to rebuild—4 or 5 years at least, if the revolution lasts that long * * *. No direct move on our part could succeed unless the other Latin American powers went along with us.

"It took 50 years to create the OAS, and only the most extreme emergency would

justify breaking it up" (New York Times, Sept. 9, 1962).

On the same day, a U.S. State Department spokesman declares that the Moscow announcement "merely confirms what has been going on in recent months."

September 4, 1962: President Kennedy declares (in a statement issued after consultation with congressional leaders) that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent Cuba from exporting "its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force" against "any part of the Western Hemisphere." The President adds that "there is no evidence of any organized combat force from any Soviet-bloc country: of military bases provided to Russia * * * of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles * * *. Were it to be otherwise the gravest issues would arise." He states that the Cuban question must be dealt with as part of the worldwide Communist challenge and in the context of the "special relationships which have characterized the inter-American system."

On the same day, the Latin American Free Trade Association (in its second conference in Mexico City of the nine members who have signed the association's charter so far) votes by 7 to 0, with Mexico and Brazil abstaining over juridical procedure, to reject Cuba's application for membership of the association, declaring that a Communist economy is incompatible with the market principles of free enterprise and free competition.

September 5, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk holds a meeting with 19 Latin American Ambassadors in Washington and informs them of the U.S. determination to prevent the export of communism from Cuba. Press reports state that there was "full unanimity" with President Kennedy's "containment policy" that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent aggression by Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

September 7, 1962: President Kennedy asks Congress for authority to order 150,000 members of the military Reserves to active duty for a year, if necessary, "to permit prompt and effective responses * * * to challenge * * * in any part of the free world."

September 11, 1962: Soviet Union (in a statement issued by Tass, Soviet press agency) warns that any attack by the United States on Cuba or upon Soviet ships bound for Cuba would mean war. It asserts that Soviet arms in Cuba are for defensive purposes only. It adds that the Soviet Defense Ministry is taking "all measures to raise our armed forces to peak military preparedness."

On the same day, Premier Castro (in a speech to an educators' convention in Havana) declares that the United States is "playing with fire and with war," and adds that "we do not want imperialism to commit suicide on our coast."

Also on the same day, the Havana radio reports that a "pirate vessel" entered a harbor in north-central Cuba and fired more than 60 shots into a British freighter and a Cuban ship. An exile organization in Miami known as Alpha 66 acknowledges responsibility for the attack.

September 12, 1962: Three Republican Senators propose amendments to President Kennedy's reserve mobilization bill that would authorize the President to take "such action as is necessary" to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba.

On the same day, Moscow newspapers publish the statement of the Soviet Government warning of war if the United States interferes with Cuba.

The effect on Soviet policy of the Russian people's reactions toward Cuba: "There is considerable sympathy for the Cubans among the Russian people. However, there was an adverse public reaction in July 1960, when Premier Khrushchev implied that So-

viet rockets would be launched if the United States attacked Cuba. The Premier later qualified this remark as symbolic. Experienced Western observers [in Moscow] believe that a large section of Soviet public opinion will feel unhappy about Soviet involvement in the Caribbean. Fear of war is often the dominant motivating factor in the reaction of the Soviet people to international crises. The defensive tone of the Soviet statement in describing the nature of military aid to Cuba lent support to this theory * * *. Mr. Khrushchev has barred world wars and * * * 'imperialist local wars' as instruments of policy * * *. However, he has appended two stipulations to this rule, both of which fit the case of Cuba * * *. First, Communists must support without reservation wars of 'national liberation.' Then, once such a war has been consolidated internally, as in the instance of the Castro revolution, it must be shielded by the Soviet Union under the slogan 'no export of counterrevolution.' In the Soviet statement this thesis was translated into the warning to the United States * * *. Western observers interpreted [the Soviet warning to the United States] as an indication that Soviet leaders were worried over the possibility that the United States might confront them with the necessity of intervening militarily in the Caribbean or retreating from their doctrine of "no export of counterrevolution." They believe that Premier Khrushchev, well aware of the attitude of his people, will go to great lengths to avoid a conflict with the United States. But few were willing to predict what the Soviet leader would do if a [rebel] motorboat * * * suddenly put a torpedo into a Soviet ship in Caribbean waters." (Seymour Topping, New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962.)

September 13, 1962: President Kennedy asserts (at his weekly news conference) that the United States would move swiftly against Cuba if the military buildup there threatened U.S. security in any way, "including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union." He says that if the United States should ever find it necessary to take military action against the Castro regime, the Communist-supplied weapons and technicians "would not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve the result." The President adds that the Cuban economy is crumbling as a result of Premier Castro's "own monumental economic mismanagement" and the economic boycott by the United States. He criticizes loose talk in the United States which serves "to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat [of an American invasion] exists." He expresses the hope that "the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, keep both their nerve and their heads."

Father Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the date of November 24, 1963, marks the

CIX—103

250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, the Franciscan priest who was the founder of the 21 California missions. One of the most beautiful of these missions is Mission San Jose, situated amongst the vineyards in the foothills of southern Alameda County, in the Ninth Congressional District of California. We Californians are proud that a statue of Father Serra stands in Statuary Hall, here in our Capitol.

At the annual convention of the 17 Serra Clubs of northern California, held in Monterey, October 19, 1962, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas it is the custom of the U.S. Post Office to issue commemorative stamps marking significant dates and events in history; and

Whereas November 24, 1963, will be the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, founder of the California Mission; and

Whereas Father Junipero Serra is regarded by the people of California, of all denominations, as a leader, a teacher, an administrator and a perfect exemplar of the humility and spirituality of St. Francis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the northern California district of Serra international, in regional convention assembled, does hereby urge the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1963 in honor of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra.

Mr. Speaker, I think the request of Serra international that we honor the birth of this gentle and saintly priest in this way is entirely fitting. I am therefore today introducing a bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and respectfully request the favorable consideration of my colleagues and the Postmaster General.

With the Boy Scouts, Character Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 marks the 53d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. An organization incorporated in 1910, chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president, and dedicated to the development of good citizenship among the rising generation, is an organization which we as a nation proudly salute.

The young people of our great country are today, as in the past, faced with the task of preparing themselves to meet an uncertain future, one which holds many grave responsibilities and duties, both private and public; many opportunities, rights and privileges, both those granted by law and those gained through individual initiative. Perhaps never before in the history of our democratic process have the meeting of these responsibilities, and the utilization and exercise of these opportunities and rights

been so necessary to the perpetuation of the doctrines and beliefs upon which this country is founded. The Boy Scouts of America is an organization in the finest American tradition. It teaches the values of both responsibility and opportunity.

The principles underlying the Boy Scouts' activities and practices are framed to develop character, intelligence, skill, handicraft, physical, mental, and moral health, self-care and reliance, and the practice of service for others. The efficient individual becomes an asset to his community and in turn to his Nation.

The thousands of men and women who have contributed countless hours to perpetuate the teachings of the movement deserve our respect and gratitude, for without their tireless efforts, the high ideals and purposes set down in the charter would not be fully met. The feeling of belonging to a group is a basic need in every young boy, and the competition, group activity, firm and able leadership offered to a Scout do much to meet this need. It is therefore not surprising that where the scouting movement is strong and vigorous, the amount of juvenile delinquency is proportionately less.

The Explorer Scout has a code by which he tries to live. It is a code from which every American might profit:

I believe that America's strength lies in her trust in God and in the courage and strength of her people.

I will, therefore, be faithful in my religious duties and will maintain a personal sense of honor in my own life.

I will treasure my American heritage and will do all I can to preserve and enrich it.

I will recognize the dignity and worth of my fellow men and will use fairplay and good will in dealing with them.

I will acquire the Exploring attitude that seeks the truth in all things and adventure on the frontiers of our changing world.

The REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration, which has provided through the years one of the greatest benefits to the rural citizens of our Nation, has again come under attack from one of our Nation's large newspaper chains.

On the same day that the REA was being taken to task for providing long-term loans to assist many rural areas in our country in obtaining electricity and in improving their electrical service, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman was addressing the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Convention in Nevada on the service that REA has provided the Nation.

Secretary Freeman pointed out the very valuable assistance the REA has provided our farm citizens through the years and particularly some of the more

important achievements of the last 2 years.

The Secretary points out that in order to serve the sparsely populated rural areas rather than the high-density urban areas it is necessary to provide the REA cooperatives with low-interest-rate financing and that through this type of financing REA cooperatives have provided a great benefit to our Nation's farmers and residents of rural areas.

He states as one example that REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of electric lines in order to serve 4.8 million rural customers. This means that the REA cooperatives serve 3.3 customers per mile and the average urban-based utility has 32.2 customers per mile. Thus, it is much less profitable to serve the areas covered by REA cooperatives than by the urban-based utilities. Therefore, a low interest rate for REA loans is both justifiable and needed.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary points out other important services of the REA in his very interesting and informative speech.

Under unanimous consent, I include the remarks of Secretary Freeman in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, LAS VEGAS, NEV., JANUARY 14, 1963

I welcome this opportunity to speak to the 21st annual meeting of your association for several reasons:

First, it is a good time to review the progress of the last 2 years, progress in rural America, in agriculture, and specifically, progress by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Second, it gives me an opportunity to take a close look with you at some of the policies which guide REA, to reexamine their validity in this time of change.

Third, I want to discuss the need to apply more broadly the local leadership tradition which REA cooperatives have developed to such a significant degree.

As 2 years of the Kennedy administration draw to a close, it is appropriate to bring to farmers and city people a report of the highlights of the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Since 1960, through actions by the Administrator and by the Congress, we have seen: An increase in gross farm income of \$2 billion in 1961 and \$2.5 billion in 1962, as compared to 1960. Net farm income in both years averaged \$1.1 billion higher than in 1960.

Grain surpluses have been reduced 700 million bushels, and taxpayer costs will be down some \$300 million this year as a result. With continued progress over the next 2 years, we can see the end of feed grain surpluses in 1964. The end of wheat surpluses is in sight, if favorable action is taken this spring by wheat farmers in the referendum for the 1964 crop.

With a favorable vote, wheat farm income can be maintained at the favorable 1960-62 level, and the wheat surplus can be scaled down to near an adequate level in about 3 years. If the referendum fails, the surplus will remain and wheat income will decline sharply, as wheat prices fall from \$2 to \$1 per bushel. The effects will be disastrous to farm and city and to foreign markets alike.

While these advances in agriculture have been taking place, the cost of food has remained stable, increasing about as much as the overall cost of living.

Today we are sharing our food abundance more widely at home and abroad, thus ful-

filling our moral responsibility to those who do not have enough. In March 1962, as many as 7.4 million persons in needy families in this country shared in our food supplies through the direct distribution program compared with 4.1 million in March 1960. The food stamp program launched by direction of the President is being expanded to 48 areas, and has become one of our most successful programs. The food-for-peace program during fiscal 1962 moved a record volume of \$1.6 billion worth of food and fiber overseas to feed needy, hungry people. Food and fiber is becoming an increasingly vital tool in our programs to stimulate the progress of developing countries all over the world.

We have launched a massive, all-out effort to infuse new economic vitality in rural areas through the redirection of old programs and the creation of new programs in rural areas development, a subject I will have more to say about shortly.

Now these are just a few of the accomplishments of 2 years, all of them together represent only the beginning of our effort to meet the task ahead in agriculture and rural America. But I am proud of the start we have made.

I am proud, too, of what we have done in REA where, as you are well aware, there is much progress to report.

Last year the President requested and the Congress authorized an increase in REA loan funds to permit the financing of additional generation and transmission facilities. For fiscal year 1963, \$400 million was authorized for the REA loan program, including \$100 million for a contingency fund. This made a record \$250 million available for generation and transmission loans. By comparison, 1960 authorizations were \$161 million, and only \$89 million was loaned for G. & T. purposes.

Since January 1961, REA has approved 28 loans to borrowers seeking new or additional sources of power. Seven of these loans represented new starts. Overall, these 28 loans will mean a 10-year saving of more than \$47 million as compared with the power supply arrangement available to the borrowers at the time their loan was approved.

An equally significant measure of progress in REA is the recognition by the President of those policies which are essential to the vitality of the REA idea, to the integrity of the rural electric cooperative.

Let me be more specific.

This administration supports the 2-percent interest rate. This is not a recent or a capricious decision. It is based on a careful analysis of conditions inherent in the job you are trying to do. There are vast differences between the conditions under which you operate and the conditions which prevail on the city-based utility systems.

Some of the special handicaps you face in providing areawide service which will permit your consumers to use power fully and efficiently bear repeating. They are not generally known, and need to be emphasized. I want to take this occasion to set them down clearly and carefully.

Low density: In order to serve 4.8 million rural consumers, the REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of line. It means that you have 3.3 customers per mile. The average urban-based utility has 32.3.

Lack of diversity: Where farms in a particular area are of the same type, and this is usually the case, power needs tend to be heavy during certain periods of the day, and often negligible in the rest. REA systems, with few small commercial or large powerloads to provide diversity, must make proportionately greater investments in facilities used only a few hours a day. Interest charges are based on a 24-hour day.

Low revenues: Low density and lack of diversity keep revenues low. In 1960, for example, when commercial utilities reported

revenues of \$6,580 per mile, REA-financed systems had average revenues of \$414 per mile. On a per customer basis, your revenues averaged \$127, or a little more than half the \$204 reported by commercial utilities.

Low load factor: Whether you generate power or buy it, low density and lack of diversity work to increase REA co-op power costs. This is true because the capacity and the facilities you build for certain peak loads, a necessity, are used on an average of only 50 to 60 percent of the time.

Isolated systems: REA co-ops have undertaken to serve the remote and out-of-way pockets in America. Here in the West, for example, you have mountains, deserts, and large forest areas which create special problems. These and other factors have kept many systems small and separated from other REA borrowers. Low interest rates enable such borrowers to perform the services expected from rural systems.

Yet, despite these handicaps, rural electric cooperatives have made an outstanding record in repayment of their loans. Last year, repayments passed the billion-dollar mark, representing 29 percent of the funds advanced. Only two electric borrowers are behind in their payments and these total only \$140,000.

Another policy of great importance is the increased emphasis on generation and transmission loans. We propose to continue this emphasis.

During the past 2 years, G. & T. loans have accounted for about 57 percent of all approved loans. Each was in response to a demonstrated need for lower cost power, the low-cost kilowatt that permits your consumer-owned systems to get on with their essential job in rural areas.

This policy which has made possible the expansion of the REA co-ops as their task has grown is also designed to meet two other particular needs, to enable you to take advantage of new technology, and to help preserve your territorial integrity.

It is essential that the REA-financed generating stations, which account for less than 1 percent of the Nation's total electric power capacity, be geared to the technological advances within the electric power industry.

In the last 2 years, this new emphasis on G. & T. loans has been applied by rural systems to take practical advantage of savings in power pooling, system interconnections, large-scale generating units, and in the location of plants adjacent to sources of low-cost fuels.

The use of G. & T. loans to block raids by private power companies seeking the historic area of rural electric co-ops is new. Where such situations arise in the future, G. & T. loans will be approved.

This criterion has been used only once. It was in an area where a supplier, who was serving several distribution co-ops at wholesale, insisted that he be able to go into their territory and pick off retail consumers as he chose. This demand posed a distinct threat to the service capabilities, and to the existence, of the cooperatives.

I hope raids on REA territory will stop. But as many rural electric cooperatives build their power volume, this problem remains a very real threat. It must be recognized that the expansion of urban areas into the surrounding rural countryside provides a particularly inviting target to raid.

It is possible, therefore, that more G. & T. loans will be made to strengthen REA co-ops in the immediate months and years ahead. In the long run, however, I hope and I believe raids will cease as the more moderate leaders in the private power field prevail.

When that day comes, real cooperation between all commercial and cooperative power systems, with the resulting maximum use of all systems, will mean increased benefits to all users.

I repeat, it is not asking too much to recognize that the service areas you have developed are rightfully your own, and that the consumers within them, new and old, are rightfully your consumers.

On review, then, I believe these past 2 years have shown that the pledge which President Kennedy made in 1960 in Billings, Mont., has been kept. He said that his administration would: "Restore REA to its former role of preeminence, freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher interest rates and budgetary starvation, and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

For my part, the contribution which rural electric cooperatives have made to my own State of Minnesota, to its farm families, has long ago earned them my dedicated support. I have worked on farms before, and after, REA. To me, REA is more than a concept, it is the difference between a kerosene lamp and an electric light; between a hand-cranked cream separator and one driven by an electric motor; between a refrigerator and an icebox with an overflowing pan of water; between milking by hand and by machine; between an electric clothes washer and the old type of washer I pumped back and forth when I was a boy.

Each of you can be extremely proud of the accomplishment you have made in electrifying rural America, in meeting a challenge which many people considered beyond hope. I salute you for progress. At the same time I challenge you as we look to the future.

If one reason had to be selected as to why the REA idea has achieved its great success, I would give the credit to the unique pattern of local leadership which you have developed.

Perhaps other factors, such as effective Government assistance and a helpful attitude from local, State and Federal governments, have been important—but the quality and leadership of REA people have been the determining factor.

And this brings me to the third point I made in my opening remarks, there is a very real need to apply your local leadership pattern to a new program, to use your skill for a task greater than REA, a task which encompasses all rural America, and for which you are only beginning to mobilize your talents and resources.

That task is to wipe out the causes of rural poverty.

Let me briefly describe the nature of this new challenge.

First, there is more poverty in rural America today than in all the urban sector combined. More than 15 million Americans in rural areas live under poverty conditions by our standards today. Of the 8 million families in this country today who earn less than \$2,500 annually, some 4.1 million live in rural America. In other words, rural areas account for only a third of our population but for over half the poverty.

Second, the commodity programs which have monopolized public attention for so long will, at best, even when full parity income is attained, provide adequate incomes for less than half of those who now live on farms.

Strangely, much of this poverty has come in the wake of astonishing advances in farm technology and production. It underscores the fact that an expanding rural economy necessary to combat this problem cannot be achieved by conventional commodity programs alone.

In fact, I believe that farm programs as we are familiar with them will at best be able to do only half the job that must be done.

This, then, is a real challenge. It is a challenge that I am confident we can meet. But nothing less than a massive counter-attack combining the resources of both government and local people will do the job and

reverse the downward spiral in which rural America finds itself today.

Such a counterattack has been launched through a dynamic new action program. Most of you have heard something about this program called rural areas development—or RAD, for short.

The RAD program is a blending and coordination of all available resources of the Department—conservation, credit, forestry, recreation, industrial development, education and other public services—into a long-range effort to erase the blight of rural poverty.

A very important responsibility in this program has been assumed by the leadership of the cooperative movement, and your REA co-ops, in particular, have much to contribute. As you know, your dynamic and driving general manager, Clyde Ellis, recognized the importance of this program very early, and has been a strong force in it for effective action.

As a result, the REA has been assigned primary responsibility for developing industrial and commercial projects under the area redevelopment program, and other programs, as well.

You already have some experience in this task through the use of consumer facility loans authorized in section 5 of the REA legislation. Under this section, some of you have assisted industries and businesses in your areas with the financing of electrical equipment and plumbing. Using these funds only when financing is not available on reasonable terms from any other source, public or private, you have made possible new job opportunities that could not otherwise have been created. Since July 1961, you have used these funds 14 times and for only a little over a million dollars, but the availability of section 5 loans has made much else possible.

In helping the local community within your territory to increase jobs, and expand the benefits of economic growth, you also are increasing your own business. It is a natural combination, and fulfills the basic aim of REA to bring progress to rural America in many forms.

However, REA leadership in stimulating community development is not always tied to a direct REA power benefit. The manager of a local electric cooperative in Pennsylvania, for example, has led the drive in his community to get four new industries, and each buys power from a private power supplier.

The manager maintains, and correctly so, that both the private and cooperative power suppliers are benefiting, the co-op from new consumers who live in its territory. But most importantly, the community, the people, will benefit from new opportunities.

I am encouraged to see the dedication and energy which local REA co-ops are giving to the RAD program. Reports from about one-third of the REA borrowers indicate that since July 1961 they have helped to launch 400 industrial and commercial projects. It is anticipated that they will directly create 30,000 new jobs, and indirectly, another 22,000. When reports are in from all co-ops, undoubtedly these figures will be higher.

More than one-fourth of these new enterprises involve processing and marketing of farm and wood products, which mean additional outlets for farm and forest products as well as new jobs for rural citizens. This is a real "double shot" in the arm.

It is also important to note that in these newly launched projects, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by stimulating the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources. The REA figures indicate that the 400 projects are being financed by more than \$250 million of private capital compared with about \$15 million from Federal Government sources.

These projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project

in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a packing plant in Nebraska, and a chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition, the 600 REA borrowers report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities, hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

Thus, we have, with your assistance, made a good start with the RAD program, but it is only the beginning, for we have only scratched the surface of the need in rural America.

A good start means that rural electric cooperatives will have more and more to do as rural America responds to the challenge of the sixties, as it moves positively forward once again. And as these things take place, demands for power will expand rapidly.

Presently your members are doubling their power needs every 7 to 10 years. Today, the power requirements of your systems are about 37 billion kilowatt-hours. By 1970, those requirements will soar to 68.6 billion (or more) and by 1985 to almost 200 billion (or more).

President Kennedy has said that power is the key to this century, power on the farms and in rural areas as well as in the cities. At Oahe project in South Dakota last summer he said: "The role of the REA is not finished, as some would believe. To be sure, most farms now have electric lights. Most REA cooperatives and power districts are well established. But we are rapidly approaching the time when this Nation will boast a 300 million population, a \$2 trillion national income, and a grave responsibility as the breadbasket and food producer for a world whose population will have doubled. That is the prospect for the end of this century, and the key to this century is power, on the farm, in the factory, in the country as well as the city."

The role of the REA is not finished, it is only beginning.

This, I submit, is sound policy and one that will serve the Nation well. Let us, working together, militantly carry it forward.

Civil Rights and the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions recently held its 10th anniversary convocation at the Americana Hotel in New York City. Leaders from all over the world attended and many fine analyses were presented under the subject "Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade." Among these was an address by the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, entitled "Civil Rights and the Cold War." As we read his speech, I am reminded what James Baldwin has said, "Great men have done great things here and will again, and we can make America what America must become."

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech in the RECORD.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE COLD WAR

BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

First, I want to congratulate President Hutchins and the Board for Directors of the Fund for the Republic for the imagination and the initiative that have gone into the

preparation of this 10th anniversary program, Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade.

Secondly, I wish to express my appreciation for being asked to consider with you the question of individual rights and privileges in this troubled time. It is a time of hope as well, as we have seen in recent months, even days.

But bright as we believe the world could be, we must face it as it is, a world of nation states seeking public solutions to what are inherently personal questions. This is the dimension of the time we live in and which we call the cold war, a struggle very grand in scope but very personal in importance. For this reason an examination of those personal questions, the rights and interests of individual human beings is as timely as ever before.

Some of you may be familiar with the recent classroom scene in a Russian elementary school. A little boy, when asked to describe the United States, said, "The United States is a sad country where workers and peasants are starving under capitalist exploitation by the cynical ruling classes." "Correct," said the teacher, "and what is the major goal of the Soviet Union?"

"To catch up with the United States," was the sober reply.

Throughout our parallel histories, I believe the United States, as a whole, has lagged behind Russia in the exploitation of one class by another.

The comparison is an old one. De Toqueville concluded his treatise on America with these prophetic words:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world which started from different points, I allude to Russia and America." "The principal instrument," of America he went on, is "freedom" and of Russia, "servitude."

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

In today's terms this may seem a generous oversimplification. We have only to look at the growing power of free Europe, or the snarling giant tiger that is Red China, or the awakened democracy of India, or the rising nations of Africa and Latin America, to know that there are other handholds on the globe, other forces capable of swaying its destiny. It would be quite wrong, and quite unlike a group such as the one assembled here, to become mesmerized by the present confrontation of the Soviet Union and the United States. Yet in this brief moment in time we can see some polarization of allegiance, some to the Communist way, some to the way of freedom.

This is the tug of the cold war. We should be excused if we venture the opinion we are winning. As the President said last week in his state of the Union message: "Not a single 1 of the nearly 50 United Nations members to gain independence since the Second World War has succumbed to Communist control." In one case, a wall has gone up to prevent a great people from accepting the tug of freedom. History will record that while the Great Wall of Old China was built to keep barbarians out, this brooding ugliness by the Brandenburg gate was built to keep civilized people in. And men may speculate on the current Soviet proficiency in the high jump.

But overall, we are winning—Why? What is it we have that others will reach for, run for, die for? Surely, it is more than houses, cars, and dishwashers. Even communism, with some rearrangement of production priorities and a few other sacrifices by the new class, could provide these things. No, the attraction of the so-called materialist West is more a thing of mind than of matter. Why then do young foreign students become dis-

affected with Iron Curtain curriculums and seek out our consuls? What is it that brings tears to the eyes of new Americans as they take the oath of citizenship? What is it they sought? What is it men want? Isn't it freedom of conscience and action conditioned only by the legitimate needs of private and public security?

Our civil rights laws and actions are founded on that premise. No recitation of them should be necessary. Observance of them is entirely necessary. Encouraging lip-service is paid also in articles 124 and 125 of the Soviet Constitution to the principles of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. But they have gone the way of many a New Year's resolution. The British have proved a constitution needn't be written. The Soviet have proved a constitution must be more than written.

This discussion deals primarily with the United States and the Soviet Union, not because we are the only nations involved, but because there is still some reason to believe we are the leaders respectively of the free and Communist worlds.

Our Bill of Rights, particularly in the first nine amendments, holds out a series of personal promises. The addition of the 14th amendment increased the commitment of the National Government to insure that those promises are kept. In most respects, our legislatures have followed with the greatest care the mandates implicit in the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment. An independent judiciary has served well to correct misconstructions of those principles. And while the matters affected have ranged from freedom of speech and press to questions of search and seizure, and right to counsel, most of these protections were well established from our early times and are invoked today not at all with regard to their validity, which is certain, but to their vitality in a modern society.

But the matter which the very term "civil rights" brings most immediately to mind in our time is the position of the American Negro in American society and the treatment accorded him in all walks of life.

In this respect I would like to glance at the record.

For the headline hunter the violence at Mississippi has been the most noticeable event of the current period. The historian, however, will record the progress made, not only in the unflinching commitment of the Federal Government to civil rights, but more importantly, and more notably in the amount of voluntary compliance by southern officials and citizens in this area. For example, over the past year in voting—in 29 counties in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, officials have voluntarily made voting records available to us without need for court action.

In about 50 counties in the same States, discriminatory practices have been abandoned voluntarily, avoiding the need for suit.

Where voluntary action was not forthcoming, however, we have brought suit.

Under the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the Department of Justice has undertaken 32 suits and 82 voting record inspections.

In transportation: Discrimination of interstate travel has disappeared. Virtually all bus and rail terminals were desegregated in 1961 pursuant to ICC regulations sought by this administration. In 1962 we surveyed 165 airports and found 15 still segregated. All are now desegregated, 13 voluntarily and the other 2 after suit.

At present, the only such segregated facilities in the country are bus and rail terminals in Jackson, Miss., and there we took successful legal action, which is now on appeal.

In education: In 1962, 28 more southern school districts desegregated voluntarily and peacefully, many after consultation with the Department of Justice.

As Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, Vice President JOHNSON pointed out in November that Negro employment in the Federal Government stood at 28,986 at grades GS-5 through GS-11, an increase of 18.3 percent over the previous years, although the increase in such job vacancies was only 4 percent.

In grade GS-12 through GS-18, the number of Negroes increased from 343 to 1,380—a 33.1-percent increase, as compared with a raise in the total number of such jobs of 7.8 percent. In the private sector 104 major national business firms have signed equal employment pledges under the plans for progress program.

The right to travel, to share public facilities and accommodations, together with the right to equal education, these rights have been given Federal impetus as never before, but again, more importantly, they have received wide public acceptance in a quiet, normal way that hasn't hit the headlines.

The President's order last November prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted housing, together with the actions of some 17 States and 55 cities barring discrimination in that area is a milestone on the march. And on this march the American Negro himself has walked well. Much depends on the scope and dignity of Negro leadership; and it is equal to the test.

The trail is long, we've crossed rough terrain; and there's more ahead, much more to do for the American Negro, the American Indian, the migrant worker, minorities yes, as the American people themselves a minority in this world.

Meanwhile, back in the Kremlin's shadow, what do we find? We find over 100 persons executed in the past year for economic crimes, most of them Jews. We find Christian faiths harassed and Christian peoples persecuted. We find a statement last year by Roman Rudenko, Soviet Public Prosecutor, that the very causes of crime in capitalist countries are absent in the Soviet Union. Then we find a complaint in Pravda that Muscovites removed daily without paying, 77,000 bus tickets from help-yourself dispensers. We find a law branding as treason any unauthorized departure from the country, and the unhappy story of a Jewish woman sentenced to be shot last February for "currency manipulation," after a prior 3-year sentence in Siberia for trying to escape to Israel, and long after seeing her two daughters murdered by the Nazis. And we find a 1961 commentary on lawyers in a Soviet paper as follows:

"There are two groups of lawyers—one: Modest, quiet, unobtrusive, who will acknowledge guilt (if his client is guilty) and refer to mitigating circumstances.

"The other, working with his vocal chords and elbows, even shedding some tears. His voice going through the whole courtroom, 'My client's arrest is due to a mistake.' When the case was retried at the public prosecutor's demand, the same man was found guilty when another lawyer took his defense."

Another unobtrusive lawyer no doubt. Save us from them.

What is the difficulty here? What's missing in communism's instant utopia?

An appreciation for the natural rights of man? I should think so. It suffers from an overdose of Marxism-Leninism and a deficiency of Lockism-Jeffersonism. It would benefit so much from just a little exposure to first amendment principles.

If freedom is to thrive in any corner of the world, there must be communication and a sense of law. There can be no meaningful discussion of civil rights until these concepts have been examined.

Turning first to communication, if our Constitution had followed the style of St. Paul, the first amendment might have con-

cluded, "But the greatest of these is speech." In the darkness of tyranny, this is the key to the sunlight. If it is granted, all doors open. If it is withheld, none. But a truth unheard is as much a social force as a tree falling in the lonely forest is sound. Truly free speech implies a guarantee of the right to listen. In passing, it was my impression that it was to prevent truth from going unrevealed that the center itself was established on Eucalyptus Hill. There's no such hill in Russia.

Those matters which a government tries to conceal from the outside world are guides to its personality, but what it would hide from its own people is a reflection of its character. Thus, the secret speech denouncing Stalin in 1956, hidden from the public, told as much about its authors as its subject. More recently, in the past year, mobs of angry people have tested the laws of many nations. We read about the Walloon-Flemish differences in Belgium, violence in Paris and Mississippi. But what did we hear of the wage and price riots in southern Russia—that left hundreds of dead and wounded, what beyond vague references to rowdiness, while during that same week both Pravda and Izvestia highlighted the following earthshaking events:

The stock market dropped in New York.

A group of New Jersey students protested U.S. atomic tests.

Two unknown persons slipped into the Soviet sector of Germany.

This is the fact of Soviet news policy. What is the doctrine? I take it we can still look to Lenin for guidance on Soviet doctrine.

In 1903 he wrote indignantly: "Until freedom of speech and of the press is declared there will not disappear the shameful Russian inquisition which persecuted profession of unofficial faith, unofficial opinions, unofficial doctrines."

Later he wrote: "The periodical and non-periodical press and all publishing enterprises must be entirely subordinated to the Central Committee of the Party."

Thus, today's Soviet leaders have a fairly wide latitude of Leninist press policies to draw on.

There is, of course, freedom in the U.S.S.R. to say the right thing. This was brought home to a young American visitor to Moscow who was earnestly explaining how any American could openly denounce the life and morality of the United States, even ridicule the President.

"It is the same here," said the guide. "A Soviet citizen may also denounce life and morality in the United States and ridicule your President."

Freedom of communication involves both information and expression. I have touched on information. It is crucial to a dynamic society, which communism claims to be. But expression is no less so. Thus we read with concern the Soviet party's reply last month to Russian intellectuals who had claimed that "without opportunity for different artistic directions, art is condemned to death." The reply said that the party does not tolerate experimentation in the arts, and "is determining the tasks and directions of artistic creativeness." What sad rebuff; but what a fine claim.

And we shall wait to see if and how a young Soviet poet changes a now famous poem of protest, particularly so since it concerns racial persecution.

The Soviet Government seems to have good working relations with the Soviet press. If the Soviet chief of state should take exception to the editorial policies of a paper, he needn't cancel his subscription; he just cancels the paper. But that is hardly necessary at present.

Soviet papers serve their party well, re-writing human history even as it rolls off the presses of human endeavor. As the great hand writes, and having written, moves

on, the agitation that follows is a team of Soviet historians with erasers. Someone should tell them to relax.

I have tried to explain how difficult it is for me at least to picture the struggle for civil rights where there is a limit of communication.

It seems to be recognized by some Soviet authorities that terror is inefficient. The so-called Special Board of Ministry of Internal Affairs has been abolished, and with it, its function, which was to send people to labor camps without a hearing, in secret procedures without right of counsel or appeal. Confessions must now be corroborated by other evidence. And all in all there seems to be a growing appreciation for what the Soviet calls legality, and a growing awareness among the Soviet legal profession itself of the obligation of law to society, and of lawyers to the law. The outcome of this trend remains uncertain. You may recall that after a great deal of noisy pride about abolishing the death penalty, the Soviet Union in 1961, reinstated it for crimes described as economic and specifically for illegal transactions in foreign currency. Subsequently, two men were executed under an ex post facto application of the currency law.

From Harvard's expert on Soviet law, Prof. Harold Berman, I learned of a conversation he had on this incident with a leading Soviet jurist. Berman had remarked on the unusual nature of the trial and sentence and suggested it violated the 1958 Soviet Principles of Criminal Procedure. The jurist replied, "we lawyers didn't like that," a response, Berman noted, which was no less remarkable for its "we lawyers" as for its "didn't like that."

I suppose what is needed is more lawyers who don't like things.

The law's slow progress in the Soviet Union may be due, in large part, to the lack of public debate. Thus the recent "anti-Parasite" laws by which people not doing socially useful work may be exiled to remote areas for 2 to 5 years, went into effect as quietly as the falling tumblers of a combination lock.

All great questions must be raised by great voices, and the greatest voice is the voice of the people, speaking out in prose, or painting, or poetry, or music, speaking out, in homes and halls, streets and farms, courts and cafes—let that voice speak and the stillness you hear will be the gratitude of mankind. Man giving thanks—Jews thanking the God of Abraham for their lives, Siberian Christians thanking the Lord for their children—people giving thanks. It is a good sound.

And the world is listening, watching, weighing, deciding.

Latin Americans listen to the stifled sounds of Cuba. Macao and Hong Kong receive the gaunt refugees of Red China and hear the unspeakable. Europeans watch what they hope is the final chapter in subjugation on that continent.

Africans can see these things, and there is much to occupy their own moralists on their own vast continent.

There is ample evidence that dictatorial conduct is not confined to societies ruled by whites. South Africa's sabotage bill, and restrictive laws on voting and free speech, are no less encouraging than the Preventive Detention Act of Ghana, which empowers the government to imprison without trial for up to 5 years all persons suspected of subversion, or Ghana's dignity-of-the-President bill passed last year which subjects presidential detractors to £500 fines or 3 years' imprisonment. (If there is a Ghanaian Vaughn Meader, he's laughing on the inside.)

Wrongs that passed as white no color can make right.

A nation, it is true, must work its own evolution in its own way and at its own

pace. Time and tide have favored ours. The best hope we can have perhaps is that governments may listen to the voices of their people. American governments have tried to do that. We have found that when people find a willing ear they are more disposed to lend a willing hand. We think with Jefferson that our Government is, "The world's best hope; the only one where every man at the call of the law would fly to the standard of the law and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." This is a Virginian's answer to the demagogues of today, both foreign and domestic. It is the answer of thousands of southern citizens and of the U.S. marshals, most of them southerners, who held the line at the Lyceum in Oxford.

It is clear that the standard of law in America flies to protect the civil liberty of all American citizens from private as well as public invasions. Thus the Sherman Antitrust and Interstate Commerce Acts give protection from excesses of the business community. Other legislation guards the public and the workingman from the abuses of labor. And today we face in this country a conspiracy which could be extremely erosive of the rights and liberties of our citizens, organized crime. So when we move against these excesses, we do so on behalf of all our people, and at their call. And the agencies and bureaus of government which answer this call, with the patience and care their work requires, deserve the respect of all Americans.

Finally, we have found that man's handhold on the globe is a precarious one. But we had always believed that. We always thought that our destiny was cradled in another Hand. And when Mr. Khrushchev reported that the cosmonauts, like the Bolshevik pilots of the early twenties, reported seeing "no signs of God," we can only suggest that they aim, with the rest of mankind, a little higher. In the meantime, there is work to do here on earth, to that day when Caesars render unto man what is man's.

Key West Naval Base 140 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago tomorrow—February 1—naval orders were issued to the distinguished Commodore David Porter, U.S. Navy, to take command of the West Indies Squadron; to sweep away the buccaneering brethren of the coast, whose piratical domination of the seas extended from the West Indies into the Gulf of Mexico; and to establish a naval depot on Key West in the Territory of Florida to supply the vessels of the squadron.

Today, from that embryonic post—which was the first U.S. naval base in the Territory of Florida—the U.S. naval base at Key West, Fla., has evolved into an expansive and strategically significant naval complex ranging over 135 miles from Key West to Florida City, Fla.

Commodore Porter, when he first saw the area, called it the "Gibraltar of the gulf" and envisioned the naval base as the place "to watch and guard our commerce passing to and from the Mississippi" as well as the "key to the commerce of Havana."

The missions carried out with high honor by the men of the Key West Naval Base since that time have paid tribute to Porter's words.

The function of the naval base from its birth until the Civil War was one of a coaling and supply depot. When the conflict between the States arose, the base fulfilled its first strategic mission as the home port for the Eastern Gulf Blockading Squadron. This naval group, operating under the commands of Flag Officers Farragut and McKean—with some 32 ships—cut off southern commerce and captured a total of 229 blockade runners and brought them to the island.

As the only Southern port in Union hands throughout the war, great quantities of contraband were amassed at Key West and it was from this naval station that the joint Army-Navy amphibious operations were launched leading to the destruction of the Confederate-held Florida salt works.

Following the war, the Key West Naval Station quickly returned to activities of peacetime progress and assisted the International Ocean Telegraph Co. in 1866 to lay the cable connecting Key West with the mainland of the United States and with Cuba. In 1881, a naval lieutenant named Robert E. Peary—who was to make history far to the North—reconstructed the Naval Wharf and further storage facilities were added in 1895.

As it was during the October days of 1962, the Key West Naval Base took on a role of major significance during the Spanish-Cuban days of the decade of the 1890's.

The battleship *Maine* departed from Key West on its death cruise and her dead and wounded were returned to this base. On April 23, 1898—reminiscent of recent days again—military observers on the Key West shores saw the first shot of the Spanish-American War when the U.S.S. *Nashville*, operating out of Admiral Sampson's squadron, encountered the Spanish steamer, *Buena Ventura*, fired across her bow and took the first prize of the war.

During the crest of this struggle, the entire Atlantic Fleet operated from the Key West Naval Base as well as the entire force of correspondents who reported on the war.

By 1903 Key West was the headquarters for the newly established Seventh Naval District and a radio station marked Navy technological advance in 1906.

As the ravages of war swept across Europe in 1914, the Key West Naval Base began to take on its present day appearance with the arrival of seaplanes, submarines and blimps.

The primary mission of the base as the war raged on was then, as it is now, "supply and maintain the forces afloat." These were active years with the establishment of a seaplane training center, yachts being converted for destroyer patrol, submarines from the German patrol to be serviced, a naval magazine constructed, hospital facilities going up, and the radio operations reaching our farflung fleet in action.

With the return of the hope of peace following World War I, Key West re-

laxed in the magnificent Florida sun with only a single officer and 16 men operating the radio station until the Cuban revolutionary activities in 1934 brought the return of destroyers and Coast Guard craft.

Quiet returned again for a few years—civilian yachts used the submarine basin and swimmers used the military piers. The relaxation was halted with the return of war to the nations of Europe and the naval station was reactivated on November 1, 1939.

Destroyers pulled alongside the piers—the men of Patrol Wing 5 arrived—and Key West's role as an essential base for the neutrality patrol had begun.

The wartime role of the Key West command illustrated Commodore Porter's vision of the island's place in national defense. Missions were flown from the air station against German submarines in the gulf—the blimps resumed patrol—support of our submarines became a major activity—and a convoy control center effectively operated to reduce ship sinking from 107 in 1942 to only 4 in 1943.

Seventh District Headquarters returned to Key West in February 1942, and the gulf sea frontier was established in May 1942, with both commands moving to Miami in June of that year.

Following the cessation of hostilities, there was little retrenchment at Key West for the strategic importance and ideal climate for year-round operations—as recognized in 1823 by Porter—came to be recognized. The Atlantic Fleet's submarine development detachment transferred to Key West and the island was redesignated as a submarine base.

Soon came the helicopters and the jets—training and research brought expansion of land and facilities and the base acquired a tridimensional strength—on, under, and above the sea.

The eyes of the world focused on the Key West Naval Station just a few short months ago as we escalated toward the threat of nuclear war—a crisis once again involving Cuban affairs.

As we mark the 140th anniversary of the establishment of this stronghold in our defense system, I wish to join Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy in saying to the officers and men of the U.S. Navy at the Key West Naval Base: "Well done."

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, if passed, would amend our Social Security Act to permit both men and women to retire at the age of 60 and receive full benefits at that age.

It would also eliminate the age requirement for spouse's benefits—thereby

permitting the payment of spouse's benefits simultaneously with that of an eligible retiree. In other words, should a man reach the legal retirement age and secure his social security pension, his wife—although she may be younger than he—would also be eligible to receive her benefits. This, too, would be true in the case of a wife becoming eligible first—the husband would then be eligible to receive benefits as her spouse, unless, of course, his own earnings would entitle him to greater benefits and he chooses to wait for benefits under his own eligibility.

It would also permit the retiree to receive a larger annual income from other sources and still be eligible for social security benefits. The present allowance is \$1,200 annually, and my proposal would allow \$2,000 annually.

I feel that these amendments would not only be beneficial to the recipients of our social security benefits but would also be most helpful to our general economy.

By permitting full benefits to be paid at a lower retirement age, many who are still employed would be more inclined to retire, with the possibility of job opportunities then being available to younger people. With both husband and wife receiving benefits simultaneously, and with a slightly larger outside income permitted, the consumer purchasing power of our retirees would be increased, and this—in turn—would help out the national economy.

The 1960 census disclosed the fact that we had 17 million citizens 65 years of age and older. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that we have—each day—a net increase of 1,000 persons reaching the age of 65. In fact—by 1980—it is expected that 10 percent of our national population will be comprised of this group of 65 and older. Today it is 9.3 percent.

If we lower the retirement age to 60—this percentage would be increased.

In our present list of unemployed—we have many in the age bracket from 60 to 65—too old to be reemployed but too young to retire on full benefits. This results in ever-increasing public assistance rolls.

My amendment would remove many from public assistance—from mere existence, so to speak—and permit them to qualify under a program to which they have paid their money for many years. My amendment would reduce the amount of money the State and Federal governments must pay out of general taxation for relief, while—at the same time—assure these recipients of a better income and increase their purchasing power for consumer products.

A prospective consumer market of 15 percent of our total population would be quite an incentive for our small business people throughout the Nation, if one cares to look at this problem strictly from a monetary viewpoint.

However, from a humanitarian viewpoint the wealthiest nation in the world could well afford to permit its elder citizens in this age of rapidly advancing technology to live their remaining years with dignity and respect, especially when you stop to consider the benefits which

they receive are from a program to which they have contributed since 1937.

This legislation permits the Members of this Congress to be both practical and humane and I sincerely hope it will receive the support of all.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, water, its adequacy both in quantity and quality, continues to be without question the most significant consideration confronting the Nation in the entire resource conservation field. These two water aspects, quantity and quality, are inseparably linked together in our concern. We have only to recall the plight of the ancient mariner to remind us that water supplies are less than useless when they lack the necessary quality for the specific uses they are called on to fill.

The measures authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, encompassed the preservation and maintenance of water quality adequate for all legitimate uses, public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses as well as the protection of the public health. Water pollution control is not, therefore, any longer solely a health problem. Its impact extends to all water resource considerations. The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 87-88, stressed the significance of this wide sweep of Federal interest and responsibility by vesting in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the former responsibilities of the Surgeon General for administering the act's provisions. It was fully anticipated and intended that in this manner the upgrading within the Department of the Federal water pollution control program required for the effective achievement of its purposes would be satisfactorily resolved. Only one of the desired effects has resulted. Overseeing responsibility has been assigned to an able and conscientious Assistant Secretary additionally burdened with other Department affairs. At the same time, however, the operating program, itself, remains submerged in its long-occupied basement within the Public Health Service.

The bill, which I introduce today, would establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration as an independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would be headed by a Commissioner acting under the supervision and direction of the Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. My proposal in no way impugns the Public Health Service

but the realities involved point to this action as the best means of securing effective administration of all of the act's provisions.

In accord with the emerging necessities for keeping our waters clean for the future, my bill states the purpose of the act in establishing a positive national policy in this regard as opposed to the irresponsible policy of using our streams for waste assimilation to the limits of their capacity.

Major concentrations of our population reside in our larger cities. Provision by these cities of treatment facilities to service the needs of their inhabitants demands the expenditures of proportionately great amounts. To remedy the ratio of inequality that obtains in regard to the provision of construction grants funds as concerns these larger municipalities, and to provide a more adequate degree of inducement toward their construction of needed treatment plants, the dollar ceiling limitation presently authorized in the act are proposed to be increased from \$600,000 to \$1 million for a single project and from \$2,400,000 to \$4 million for a joint project.

Municipal and industrial wastes are admittedly the major contributory sources of this pollution. Accordingly, the predominant share of our current water pollution control effort is focused on these two major contributors. The stimulatory grants-in-aid to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been greatly successful in this respect, so much so that the Congress in enacting the 1961 amendments authorized a continuation of this program at twice its previous rate.

Little if any regard has been given, however, to the outmoded waste collection systems in many of our older cities that in themselves serve to greatly reduce the benefits to be expected from the installation of new treatment plants. This is because, on an annual average, 10 percent of the municipality's sanitary sewage never reaches the treatment plant. This amount of the city's raw wastes is carried off by storm overflow directly into the nearest waters. The fact that many cities collect the wastes from their industries in their municipal sewers to receive treatment at the central plant adds to the gravity of the situation.

Many municipalities at the turn of the century constructed a system of combined sewers to carry their sanitary wastes and to collect the runoff from their streets after a rainfall. At that time, this was an economic course for the cities to take. The sanitary wastes from their smaller populations used only a small portion of the combined sewer capacity. The portion of this sanitary sewage that was carried off by storm overflows into the receiving wastes was readily diluted by the proportionately larger street runoff collected by the sewers.

As a result of the vast population increase, the huge centers like New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and others find that their

combined sewers are sufficient only to handle the sanitary sewage with little or no capacity remaining to cope with storm runoff. With these combined sewers filled to capacity with sanitary wastes, the runoff resulting even from a short summer afternoon rainfall causes the sewers to overflow at spillways necessarily provided for this purpose directly to the stream. It is conservatively estimated that as much as 35 percent of the sanitary sewage bypasses the treatment plant and is carried directly into the watercourse after a heavy rainfall fills the sewers and pours out of the convenient spillways.

In the opinion of experts it is this factor which is directly responsible for the serious interference with recreational and other legitimate uses of the waters that are adjacent to our larger communities. For example, the city of New York administers conscientious treatment of its sanitary waste discharges. Its bathing beaches, however, are to a great extent posted as unsafe due to the unusually high coliform count samples obtained there. This situation is attributed in large degree to the storm overflow from its combined sewers, carrying a large amount of raw sanitary sewage. Similarly, the closed beaches at Milwaukee, now an annual affair, are also traceable to storm overflow. The pollution of the Potomac River caused by storm overflow from the combined sewers in the Nation's Capital was recognized and cited as a principal cause of the shameful condition of this stream in the Federal enforcement action begun in 1957 to restore the quality of these waters. The conferees recommended as one of the absolutely necessary remedial measures that pollution from storm sewer overflows be substantially alleviated by the end of 1966.

Our programs of municipal treatment works construction should be accompanied by the construction of separate storm and sanitary sewers in our metropolitan areas. This is necessary and imperative to assure the efficiency of the treatment plants themselves, which are designed to handle sanitary sewage without the complicating factor of intermixture with storm runoff. And, more importantly, the deleterious discharge of raw sewage will be effectively halted—allowing our streams to recover without the necessity of experiencing periodic heavy doses of the pollutants that have so long plagued them.

In order to alleviate this problem my bill includes provisions for a program of grants assistance to municipalities in separating their combined systems. For these purposes, outlays of \$1 million annually are proposed, from which grants in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable costs of combined sewer systems projects would be made.

The impairment of the growth and well-being of our urban centers must not be permitted to result from the injudicious use of Federal funds no matter how well intentioned. In order to assure that grant-assisted projects conform with metropolitan area plans for their regulated development, an additional 10 percent of the grant amount would be authorized to be made in the

case of projects so certified by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency.

Pollution control and prevention guideposts are increasingly sought and requested by conscientious water users mindful of their responsibility for preserving water quality. Equally, the furnishing of such guideposts would greatly facilitate taking enforcement measures against those who perform acts in disregard of officially promulgated regulations. To this end, my bill would require the issuance of regulations by the Secretary setting forth standards of quality applicable to interstate or navigable waters and the type, volume, or strength of matter which may be safely discharged into these waters. The regulations are to be based on consideration of the present and future uses of interstate or navigable waters for all legitimate uses. Violation of the regulations is declared a public nuisance and made subject to abatement under the act's enforcement provisions.

Our efforts to control and prevent water pollution must be fully and aggressively responsive to the challenge before us. In order that we may not fail through any lack of sufficient powers and resources, I ask for the early consideration and enactment of my bill.

We Must Work Out a Truly Equitable Answer to Aid to Education Within the Framework of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the closing dinner of the Catholic Youth Organization Diocesan Youth Congress, in Providence, R.I. on January 27, 1963.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Your Excellency, the most reverend bishop; right reverend and very reverend monsignor; Father Charles W. McConnell, diocesan CYO director; and reverend members of the clergy; distinguished representatives of State and local governments; CYO regional officers and representatives; members and friends of our outstanding Catholic Youth Organization here in Rhode Island, in an address to a group of teachers, the late Pope Plus XII urged them to take as their ideal the training of fine young Christian men and women, who would be prepared to participate as active members of modern society. And the Pope went on to say, "By the perfect Christian we mean the Christian of today * * * a citizen and not something apart from the life led in his own country."

It seems to me that these words perfectly express the aims and objectives of the CYO, which is an organization that applies the eternal truths of religion in the daily life of young people who are learning to become the future leaders in both civic and religious activities.

And I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to be with you and

to participate in this evening's program. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long been identified with the battle against juvenile delinquency. Consequently, I have heard a lot of testimony about what is supposed to be wrong with our youth. But I have also been impressed with the fact that in spite of the seriousness of the delinquency problem, the vast majority of our young people are doing a very fine job with the difficult task of growing up in this complicated modern world. Looking at this CYO congress tonight, I know that it represents a very important part of what is right with America's youth.

The five CYO members who have been awarded the Eagle of the Cross Medal certainly deserve special congratulations. In order to gain this honor they have had to demonstrate, not only real moral integrity, but they have had to work in apostolic activities and display true Christian leadership. As we all join in honoring them, I feel sure that their example is truly symbolic of what every CYO member believes in and works for.

Here is an organization in which laymen and the clergy are working together with young people to improve, not only the physical, but the spiritual and intellectual life of its members and the entire community. All of us owe a debt of gratitude particularly to the lay directors; past, present, and future; who volunteer their help in this good work.

Men and women of all faiths have been impressed and encouraged to hear of the deliberations of the Vatican Council, in which our own bishop is a participant. And we know that the Council is much concerned with the important responsibility of laymen in the field of Catholic action. Here in Rhode Island the hard-working lay directors of the CYO are certainly among those who have already shown practical proof of the good that can come when members of the laity assume their responsibilities for service to their church and their fellow citizens.

In every area of our national life today cooperation is essential if we are to defeat the drive of atheistic communism and build a better life of peace and freedom from want and fear. But in no area is cooperation more important than in matters which pertain to youth and its education. Our whole American educational system is, in fact, a great partnership. It is a vast and varied cooperative enterprise, which involves publicly and privately controlled schools. It is the responsibility of government at every level and of taxpayers who are parents, as well as taxpayers who are not. The American ideal of democracy calls for equality of educational opportunity, and we cannot rest satisfied until that goal is achieved for every American child and young person of school age, regardless of the type of school to which his parents, in the free exercise of their conscience, may decide that he should go.

It should be obvious that in the face of mounting costs and rising enrollments, we cannot achieve a national goal of equal educational opportunity without an increasing degree of cooperative effort between all concerned, especially in solving the problem of financing. Local school districts will have to be given more cooperative help from the States and the States in turn will have to be given more cooperative help by the Federal Government, without undermining either local autonomy or destroying local incentive.

Admittedly, this presents what looks like an almost insurmountable problem, to which no one has yet offered a complete solution. And the problem is complicated by the complex constitutional questions which arise when it is pointed out that our democratic

goal of equality of educational opportunity must include consideration of those who exercise their free right to choose independent schools, many of which have religion as a part of their curriculum and are church related.

In this connection, I should like to point out a few facts that are revealed in the most recent Government survey of enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

Between 1950 and 1960 nonpublic school enrollment increased by an estimated 82 percent, while public school enrollment increased by 43 percent. If this trend continues, it is estimated that nonpublic school enrollment will increase from 100 to 123 percent during the period between 1960 and 1980, while public school enrollment will increase 48 to 66 percent. In 1960 there were 6,224,000 children in the grades from kindergarten through high school enrolled in nonpublic schools, but in 1980 that figure may well go over 12 million.

Today, at the precollege level, about 15 percent of the total enrollment is in nonpublic schools; but the comparative growth rate shows that this percentage will rapidly increase. At the level of higher education, where private institutions have always played a vitally important role, 40 percent of the present enrollment is in nonpublic institutions.

In the light of these facts, it would be most unrealistic to talk about educational equality of opportunity without giving consideration to the private or independently supported segment of our educational structure. We must, and will, work out a truly equitable answer within the framework of our Constitution. The best legal minds do not yet agree as to what the precise relation between Government and church-related schools ought to be under our Constitution. A study of the decisions of the Supreme Court from the Cochran Louisiana textbook case of 1930, the Everson bus case of 1947, and the Zorach released-time case of 1952 does, however, point to a possible solution: Wherever aid directly benefits the pupil and his parents and is not directed to church-related institution or does not use public facilities for direct sectarian instruction, that aid can be considered to be constitutional. As time goes on and more legislation is tested, our understanding will be further clarified. I see the method of educational tax relief for parents as very desirable and I have sponsored such legislation. But we are not going to solve all the questions affecting elementary, secondary, and higher education in one law or one court decision. As is the case with civil rights, so it is with achieving real equity in the question of school aid. The constitutional process is deliberative; it is not going to be rushed. But all who believe in constitutional democracy know that this deliberation is the firm guarantee of that justice which will, in the end, be done.

And I think that considerable progress has been made under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, with which I have been closely identified. For example, under that legislation, private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools are eligible for loans to purchase equipment, instructional materials, and to do minor remodeling in order to improve their teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Such loans have already amounted to more than \$2 million.

As the Supreme Court pointed out in the released-time case of *Zorach v. Clauson* in 1952, the first amendment "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state." A rigid theory of secularism in government may fit the ideas of communism, but it does not accord with either the spirit or the history of this Nation, which has inscribed upon

its coinage the motto, "In God we trust." As Dr. Robert Hutchins, the noted educator and president of the Fund for the Republic, has recently observed in an address before the University of Chicago Law School, the theory of an absolute wall of separation is an unworkable idea that is "hampering us in our search for what we need * * * a national idea of education and a national program to carry it out."

The history of America is a story of the search for the attainment of equality of opportunity, not only in education but in every aspect of our social, political, and economic life. This is in complete accord with the ideals of the great social encyclicals of the Popes, which teach that every person has a right to the opportunity to live a reasonable, moral life, and the right to social justice. Through legislation, through court de-

isions, through cooperation between the agencies of government, steady progress is being made in this direction. But each American also has the responsibility to rid his heart and mind from social, ethnic, and class prejudice. In this effort, the CYO spirit can and should continue to play an important part, for it is the spirit of true Christian charity and loyal citizenship. It is the spirit which can help most to make this truly "one nation, under God."

Many of the old prejudices which once divided America are disappearing. Who would have thought a generation ago that we would have a Catholic as our President or that Protestants would send official observers to a Vatican council? Here in Rhode Island the discussion of textbook aid to nonpublic schools has been conducted in an atmosphere of reason, good will, co-

operation and understanding which has set an example to the whole country. In the same way, I believe, we are moving away from the habit of judging people on the basis of what country their ancestors came from. Ethnic prejudice is just another form of racial discrimination, which has not only been condemned by the Popes but also by the leaders of all our major faiths at a recent conference in Chicago. Those of us in public life who believe, as I do, that no candidate should be either elected or defeated on the basis of his ancestry look to young people like yourselves to help us in our fight to end ethnic prejudice. As Americans, and as Catholics, I know that we share the belief that God made all men equal, with a right to equal opportunity, not only for personal development but also for public responsibilities.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Romans 8: 38: *I am persuaded that nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, from whom neither space nor time, darkness nor distance, can ever separate us, we rejoice that Thou art here in this Chamber, for Thou art everywhere.

Grant that we may be sensitive and responsive to the presence of Thy gracious spirit, drawing us together in one solemn and sacred aspiration to know Thy truth and do Thy will.

We pray that in the midst of the world's crises and confusions, its fears and frustrations, its sorrows and sufferings, we may hear and heed Thy voice of gentle stillness inspiring us to be faithful and fearless, strong and steadfast, patient and persevering for we are in the keeping of One who is far greater and wiser than man.

In Christ's name we offer our prayers and petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 31, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that during general debate?

Mr. BOGGS. Today.

Mr. HALLECK. I guess we will not have any general debate today. I shall not object to this request, but I want it understood, Mr. Speaker, that when we get going here, that I am not going to agree to the meetings of committees when matters are actively under consideration on the floor. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

FEBRUARY 1, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been a pleasure to serve as a member of the Committee on House Administration. I am particularly grateful to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], for the fine and impartial way in which he has presided.

Because of the assignment which I have just received to serve on another committee, I am regretfully obliged to tender herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 233) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 57)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and,

together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit the Second Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 1963.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 404(a) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, I transmit herewith the required report covering activities in connection with the national program for the establishment of a commercial communications satellite system.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1963.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRATT O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House 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. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of America, through its historical developments by men there are those renowned who have served its purposes and its institutions, have enjoyed the civic responsibility of its obligations to the citizenry, have served in the military forces in war, have contributed to the uplift of human beings, because of the fact that those human beings represent the common denominator of the sinews and strength of America—we are this